

**Dr. Richard E. McArdle:**

**An Interview with the Former Chief,**

**U.S. Forest Service, 1952 – 1962**

**Conducted by**

**Elwood R. Maunder**

**Forest History Society**

**Santa Cruz, California**

**1975**

Forest History Society, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1581  
Santa Cruz, California 95061

Copyrighted (c) 1975 by Forest History Society, Inc.

All rights reserved.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	vi
BIOGRAPHIES OF THE CO-AUTHORS.....	ix
I. EDUCATION AND EARLY CAREER IN FORESTRY, 1923 TO 1935.....	1
EDUCATION.....	2
University of Michigan.....	2
Filibert Roth.....	4
Graduate School.....	5
PACIFIC NORTHWEST FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION, 1924 TO 1934.....	10
Thornton T. Munger, June Wertz, and others.....	10
Educational opportunities in the Forest Service.....	12
Research appropriations and Earle H. Clapp.....	13
William B. Greeley.....	14
Marriage and career.....	15
Staff development in the Forest Service.....	17
DEAN, SCHOOL OF FORESTRY, UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, 1934 TO 1935.....	19
II. U.S. FOREST SERVICE CAREER, 1935 TO 1962.....	22
EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS.....	23
LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL FORESTS.....	28
PUBLIC INTEREST IN CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES.....	33
REGULATION OF TIMBER CUTTING ON PRIVATELY OWNED FOREST LAND.....	37
Introductory statements.....	37
Summary, 1877 to 1952.....	39
The Clapp years, 1939 to 1943.....	44

The Watts years, 1943 to 1952.....	55
The McArdle years, 1952 to 1962.....	58
The present and the future.....	61
And the small landowner.....	62
SMALL FOREST LANDOWNERS.....	65
FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREE REGENERATION AND TIMBER SALES.....	67
FRED A. SEATON AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION, 1958.....	72
NATIONAL FOREST DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, 1959.....	75
An effort at balanced use.....	75
Comparing the 1959 program with previous projects.....	75
Long-range and short-range goals.....	76
Balanced use objective and a budget.....	81
THE STEARNS LUMBER AND COAL COMPANY STRIP MINING ISSUE, 1955.....	84
SAMUEL TRASK DANA.....	89
FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS MOVED FROM AGRICULTURE TO INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES, 1956.....	93
PRESERVATION OF DOCUMENTS.....	97
The chief's papers.....	97
Importance of preservation.....	98
Louis Brownlow on Harold Ickes.....	100
ERVIN L. PETERSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, 1954 TO 1960.....	103
OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LANDS.....	105
THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE FOREST SERVICE.....	111
MULTIPLE USE MINING ACT, 1955.....	115
The mining claim problem.....	115
Attempt at a solution.....	118
Aroused public opinion.....	119
Congressional activity during the McArdle years.....	121
The Al Sarena case.....	124
AFA calls a meeting of government and industry.....	129
Passage and implementation of the mining bill.....	133
Summary.....	135

CARL ALWIN SCHENCK.....	137
THE WILDERNESS STORY.....	144
Wilderness defined.....	144
Designation of wilderness areas.....	146
Legislative history.....	149
Wilderness: A resource or a use?.....	160
Robert Marshall and the establishment of wilderness areas.....	162
Conclusion.....	164
EDWARD C. CRAFTS, LEGISLATIVE ADVOCATE.....	166
CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNMENT..	168
Too much or too little?.....	168
And the U.S. Forest Service.....	169
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN THE FOREST SERVICE.....	180
McARDLE RECOUNTS HIS FOREST SERVICE CAREER.....	187
Research, state and private cooperation, administration.....	187
Employer expectations.....	192
Employee expectations.....	212
Concluding remarks.....	215
APPENDICES.....	219
INDEX.....	238

## INTRODUCTION

Richard E. McArdle served as Chief of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, from 1952 to 1962. He was appointed under President Harry S. Truman, succeeding Lyle F. Watts, and continued to serve in the post under Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy. The Forest Service marked important physical achievements in that ten-year span: Timber sales on national forests more than doubled and the wealth of timber which the Forest Service had conserved for more than half a century began to meet national needs when mature stumpage on private lands ran low. During the same years, grazing in national forests was sharply reduced when the number of livestock on the range was cut by approximately one-quarter. Recreational use leaped threefold; tree planting increased fivefold; and a vast new network of roads, fifty- six thousand miles of them, were added to the national forests.

But the McArdle years are not to be judged alone by physical standards. There were important achievements in national forest policy, organizational composition, Service morale, and research which expanded into a broad range of problem areas. McArdle patiently and diplomatically built detente between the public and private sectors of forestry and persuaded Congress to provide legislative recognition of multiple-use principles that had been defined but not always practiced. He worked successfully with the Civil Service Commission to raise the grades of those who worked under him and brought American forestry to a pinnacle of international prestige through forceful leadership at the Fifth World Forestry Congress at Seattle, Washington in 1960.

No former Chief of the Forest Service, with the possible exception of Gifford Pinchot, enjoyed a more devoted following of men and women in the ranks of the Service. McArdle had the common touch, a capacity to remember names of his employees, and the great energy to constantly move among them. For those who worked under him, McArdle was a man bigger than life. As one young forester who began his career at the ranger district level under McArdle told me, "McArdle was more like a God figure than anyone I have ever worked under. He could be counted on to hear your need and usually could do something about meeting it." Those who have known McArdle most intimately speak of his finely honed administrative skills. The Ford Foundation was quick to take advantage of these when McArdle retired at age 63 from government service. He was

pressed into being the Executive Secretary of the National Institute for Public Affairs for two years. With steady hand McArdle managed the tiller of whatever enterprise he ran, while delegating responsibility to his deputies, nonetheless. This may be seen clearly in his relations with two of his contemporaries who were also principal competitors for the top job in the Forest Service, Edward P. Cliff who succeeded McArdle in 1962, and Edward C. Crafts who went on in the same year to head the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior after having forged a solid array of legislation for the Forest Service.<sup>1</sup>

While still in graduate school at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, McArdle met his wife-to-be, Dorothy A. Coppage. They were introduced in September 1927 and were married in December of the same year. Dorothy McArdle has for nearly fifty years lived the peripatetic life of a career government forester's wife and is as widely known and loved as her husband. The Forest Service became as much a part of her life as that of her spouse. Three sons were born, Richard Coppage McArdle in the summer of 1929 when the couple was still engaged in graduate studies and John Parker and Michael Robert during the troubled years of the Great Depression. It was in that period that their father was beginning to move up through the ranks of the Forest Service.

As evidence of the high regard of his profession and his country, Dr. McArdle has received the Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Agriculture, the President's Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Award, the Rockefeller Public Service Award, and the Sir William Schlich Memorial Medal of the Society of American Foresters. He has been elected a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters, and other honors and honorary degrees fill many lines in Who's Who in America. Some of those of which the recipient is most proud came from the Public Personnel Association, an Award of Merit; from the Boy Scouts of America, their Silver Buffalo; and from the German Nation, its Knight Commander Order of Merit.

The McArdle Years will be remembered perhaps most vividly as having marked a watershed in public-private forestry relations. Historians will be busy for some years researching the massive, still only lightly probed documentation which will reveal that important shift in national policy. It is our hope that this personal memoir constructed through the oral history method may contribute useful insights for those who take up that task.

<sup>1</sup> Forest Service Researcher and Congressional Liaison: An Eye to Multiple Use, typed transcript of an oral history interview with Edward C. Crafts by Susan R. Schrepfer (Forest History Society: Santa Cruz, Ca., 1972).

This interview was made possible through a cooperative agreement between the Forest History Society and the U. S. Forest Service. Special thanks are due to Clifford D. Owsley, Frank Harmon, and Nolan O'Neal of the Washington Office of the Forest Service, for the assistance they provided in preliminary research of Service records.

Further research for this interview was conducted by the staff of the Forest History Society. The interview sessions were conducted in the headquarters of the American Forestry Association in Washington, D.C. on October 18 and 19, 1973, and March 21, 1974. Dr. McArdle painstakingly sought out documentary sources and supplied them in full text. Questions in some subject areas such as Fred A. Seaton and the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the National Forest Development Program, the Stearns Lumber & Coal Company Strip Mining Issue, Louis Brownlow and Harold Ickes, Oregon & California Railroad Lands, the Multiple-Use Mining Act of 1953, Carl Alwin Schenck, and the Wilderness Story, he answered by mail or telephone communication.

Eleanor L. Maunder transcribed the tapes, and Barbara D. Holman processed and indexed the volume.

All uses of this work are covered by a legal agreement between the directors of the Forest History Society and Richard E. McArdle. The work is thereby made available for research purposes. No part of the work may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Executive Director of the Forest History Society.

Rights for permission to quote from the publication should be addressed to the Forest History Society, P. O. Box 1581, Santa Cruz, California, 95061, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. Under the written agreement between the Forest History Society and the two authors, Richard E. McArdle and Elwood R. Maunder, all requests for use of this work are referred to the authors. Each is allowed thirty days in which to respond.

Elwood R. Maunder

Santa Cruz, California  
May 8, 1975

## BIOGRAPHIES OF THE CO-AUTHORS<sup>2</sup>

Richard E. McArdle was born February 25, 1899 in Lexington, Kentucky. U.S. Army (overseas service) 1918-19. University of Michigan, B.S. (forestry) 1923, M.S. 1924, Ph.D. 1930, Sc.D. (honorary) 1953; Syracuse University, LL.D. (honorary) 1961; University of Maine, Sc.D. (honorary) 1962. Junior forester to silviculturist, Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, 1924-34; dean, University of Idaho School of Forestry, 1934-35; director, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, 1934-38; and Appalachian Forest Experiment Station, 1938-44; assistant chief of the Forest Service in charge of cooperative programs (state and private), 1944-52; chief, 1952-62. Executive director of National Institute of Public Affairs, 1962-64; Member, Board of Directors, Olinkraft, Inc., 1967-; Member, Royal Commission on Forestry, Newfoundland 1967-70; Consultant, National Wildlife Federation, 1967-. Recipient of the United States Department of Agriculture's Distinguished Service Award, 1957; Career Service Award, National Civil Service League, 1958; Distinguished Service, American Forestry Association, 1958; Award for Merit, Public Personnel Association, 1959; the Rockefeller Public Service Award, 1960; Distinguished Service, Forest Farmers' Association, 1960; the President's Gold Medal for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service, 1961; Distinguished Service, New York State College of Forestry, 1961; Silver Buffalo, Boy Scouts of America, 1961; the Sir William Schlich Memorial Medal of the Society of American Foresters, 1962; the Knight Commander Order of Merit, Germany, 1962; and from Mexico the Order of Merit for Forestry of Miguel de Quevedo. He was president of the Fifth World Forestry Congress in Seattle in 1960, and a member of the United States delegation to the Sixth World Forestry Congress in Madrid in 1966, and honorary president of the Seventh World Forestry Congress, Buenos Aires, 1972. He is a Fellow of the Society of American Foresters and a three-term member of the Council. Since 1958 he has been a director of the American Forestry Association. He was a founder of the North American Forestry Commission of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Elwood Rondeau Maunder was born April 11, 1917 in Bottineau, North Dakota. University of Minnesota, B.A. 1939; Washington University at St. Louis, M.A. (modern European history) 1947; London School of Economics and Political Science, 1948. He was a reporter and feature writer for Minneapolis

<sup>2</sup> These biographies were adapted from, Henry Clepper, ed., Leaders of American Conservation (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1971).

newspapers, 1939-41, then served as a combat correspondent in the Coast Guard during World War II, and did public relations work for the Methodist Church, 1948-52. Since 1952 he has been secretary and executive director of the Forest History Society, Inc., with headquarters in Santa Cruz, California, and since 1957 editor of the quarterly Journal of Forest History. From 1964 to 1969, he was curator of forest history at Yale University Library. Under his leadership, the Forest History Society has been internationally effective in stimulating scholarly research and writing in the annals of forestry and natural resource conservation generally; 46 repositories and archival centers have been established in the United States and Canada at universities and libraries for collecting and preserving of documents relating to forest history. As a writer and editor he has made significant contributions to this hitherto neglected aspect of history, and in recognition of his services the Society of American Foresters elected him an honorary member in 1968. He is a charter member of the international Oral History Association of which he was one of the founders. He is also a member of the Agricultural History Society, the American Academy of Political and Social Science, the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the Society of American Archivists, and the American Forestry Association.

## I. EDUCATION AND EARLY CAREER IN FORESTRY, 1923 TO 1935

## EDUCATION

### University of Michigan

Elwood R. Maunder: Could we begin with where you went to college?

Richard E. McArdle: I went to the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor both as an undergraduate and graduate. I think, looking back, that was a mistake I should have gone to three schools instead of one. Actually, it wasn't so bad because in my graduate work I was in an entirely different atmosphere and I was dealing with different people.

ERM: Do you consider yourself one of Daddy (Filibert) Roth's boys?

McA: I was in the last class that Roth taught. He was in the process of retiring when I went to Ann Arbor. I had a great deal of contact with Professor Roth. I used to go to his house after he retired. I like to feel that I was one of Daddy Roth's boys.

ERM: Was your choice in going to Michigan in any way connected with your knowledge of him ?

McA: No.

ERM: Why did you go to Michigan, then?

McA: To answer that I'll have to step back three paces and tell you how I happened to study forestry. I was in the American Expeditionary Forces in World War I. Shortly before the Armistice, my company of engineers was transferred to a newly created motor transport corps. The whole outfit, whether we could drive cars or not, was sent off to Paris to drive VIPs. After the war, I was walking along a Paris street one day when I saw a sign saying American Library Association. (I had been brought up with books; in our house books fell out of bookcases, were piled up on floors, and tumbled over each other.) In this library I found two books, Elements of Forestry

by Moon and Brown, and the First Book of Forestry by Filibert Roth.<sup>3</sup> I had never heard the word forestry before and I was interested. When I came back home to the United States, I got a job with the Roper Lumber Company on a land-survey crew in eastern North Carolina and eastern Virginia.

I was uncertain where to go to school to study forestry. My mother had some friends who knew—as I recall this incident—the former secretary of the chief of the Forest Service or someone high up in the Service. A letter was written to this woman asking advice on where to go to school. The answer came back that while the Forest Service couldn't recommend any one school, privately they were partial to the University of Michigan.

Prior to my joining the land-survey crew there had been on it a war veteran named Horace Andrews. Most Forest Service people in the twenties and thirties knew him as Hoss Andrews. He was later regional forester in Portland, but before that was one of the first to work on the nationwide Forest Survey. Hoss Andrews had left such a good impression with this land-survey crew and I heard so much about him that I asked some questions. I found that he was a forestry man and that he came from some school up in Michigan. I thought, “Well, I've had a good word about Michigan from two sources, perhaps I'll try it out.” That is how I got into forestry and that's why I went to Ann Arbor. I have never regretted either decision.

ERM: Did you have previous plans for going to college before you got involved in the military?

McA: No, I didn't want to go to college. I was reluctant even to finish high school but my parents insisted that I finish and gave me great encouragement to go on to the university.

<sup>3</sup> Frederick F. Moon and Nelson C. Brown, Elements of Forestry (New York: J. Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1914); Filibert Roth, First Book of Forestry (Boston and London: Ginn & Co., 1902).

## Filibert Roth

ERM: At Michigan you came under the influence of Filibert Roth, the founder of that school. You mentioned your personal contacts with him. Could you give us a thumbnail picture of Roth as you knew him and remember him?

McA: I'll try, though it is difficult to do in a few words. Anyone who wants to know more about Filibert Roth should read an article written by Sam Dana entitled, "Filibert Roth—Master Teacher."<sup>4</sup> Roth came to this country as a boy in his early teens with a tag tied to his coat saying, "Send me to Ann Arbor, Michigan." He spoke no English. He came from a small village in southern Germany. It used to surprise me when I talked to Professor Roth to find how broad his early experience was. One day while visiting with him, I learned that he had been attacked by Indians on the Great Plains while he was ferrying a load of buffalo hides. He married a very fine woman and they had one daughter, Stella Roth, who married Orlan Boston, eventually head of the engineering laboratories at Michigan. Stella's only child was born about the same time as my first child. My wife and I were graduate students at the time. We were very friendly with Professor Roth's daughter up until the time of her death, and we still keep in close touch with her son and his family.

ERM: How did Roth make an imprint upon you as a young man?

McA: Professor Roth would deliver out-of-hand lectures. (There were very few textbooks at that time and many of those had been translated into English from German, some by Professor Roth.) Before Roth had gone very far the class was arguing with him and each other over some technical forestry point. Eventually we'd simmer down to two opposing parties. After the class was over we would cut the next one and go up to the forestry seminar room to continue the argument.

Roth taught us to teach ourselves. He inspired us to learn on our own, not for fear of examinations, but because we wanted to. He would sit up there and look benign and say as we argued back and forth, "Well, gentlemen, you see the doctors disagree." He taught us that forestry is not an exact science, nor an exact art, but some of both. And it requires judgment and a lot of background knowledge.

<sup>4</sup> Samuel T. Dana, "Filibert Roth—Master Teacher," Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review 61 (Winter 1955), 100-10.

ERM: Beyond his obvious talents as a teacher did he have a human quality that appealed to the boys who studied under him?

McA: Yes. Roth carried on a tremendous correspondence with his graduate students. I wish that I had saved some of the letters he wrote to me. They were in longhand, and he wrote so rapidly that he'd leave out small connecting words. He'd just go to the important words to get his thoughts across.

I recall one time when I was in Oregon soon after I graduated. There seemed to me at that time no future in forestry. The yards were full of lumber ready to be shipped but without buyers. The log decks were piled high with no purchasers. I wrote to Professor Roth and said something about this. I got back one of his immediate answers—only one sheet of paper hastily scrawled. The words went something like this: “Never be discouraged about forestry, McArdle. Wood is like bread, a necessity of the people. We'll always need wood and we'll always need foresters to produce the wood.”

Roth had died before I returned to Michigan for graduate work. I went back for graduate work because I was in research at the time and it seemed to me that if my life was to be spent in research, I should prepare myself for it.

ERM: There was a hiatus of about six years, was there not, between getting your master's degree at Michigan in 1924 and your going back and getting your Ph.D. degree in 1930?

McA: It was six years between the granting of the two degrees. After I graduated in 1924 I went to Portland, Oregon, to the newly organized forest experiment station (Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station) of the Forest Service and stayed there for ten years.

## Graduate school

I was granted a leave of absence and went back to Michigan in the fall of 1927. I deliberately went out of forestry because emphasis in the forestry schools in those days seemed to be on memorizing, hiking and drawing. We were not often asked to do hard thinking.

That may not be true today, but it was true then. I could think of only three or four teachers at Ann Arbor who had asked me to think. So I put myself under one of those men when I went back for graduate work. He was C.H. Kauffman of the botany department. Kauffman's specialty was mycology. I was not particularly interested in mycology and forest pathology but I was interested in Kauffman. He had had a thorough research training and I thought that he might impart some of that training. Kauffman's philosophy was that earning a Ph.D. degree was not a mere formality; you put yourself in the mentor's hands and you were hazed, so to speak, for three solid years from 8 a.m. until midnight.

I had sense enough when I went back to study under Kauffman to do some studying with other people. I took a freshman course in philosophy not because I was interested in philosophy but because I was interested in Professor Wenley, the head of the philosophy department, and the one who taught the course. Something told me that if I sat in the front row and made myself receptive, perhaps something of what Wenley was as a man might be transmitted to me. It's like catching the measles. The point I'm making is that you don't catch the measles unless you're dealing with a person who has them.

I also took a freshman course in geology from Professor W.H. Hobbs, though I wasn't particularly interested in geology. Some people thought he was a peculiar old gent, but I thought he had a lot under his noodle.

I took a course in biochemistry from Professor Harley Bartlett, head of the botany department. I was interested in biochemistry, but I could have gotten what I needed in biochemistry in other ways. However, I wanted the association with Bartlett. He was one of the most absent-minded professors I ever ran across. I recall one evening going into his office at six o'clock and hearing him on the telephone saying something like this: "No, no. Thank you very much. Some other time I'd be glad to come to dinner with you, but I must find out where I'm supposed to go tonight." But he was absent-minded only in some things. He could go up to a blackboard fifty feet long and cover it with a structural organic chemistry formula with not a bit of hesitation. He had explored in Ceylon, Sumatra, and other places. This was a one-hour course. I suppose I studied twenty-five or thirty hours a week in preparation for it. I would have to remind Bartlett starting about nine o'clock Friday morning that we had a date at four o'clock that afternoon. When we did meet, after he had asked me a few penetrating questions to see if I had done my homework, we'd be off on other things.

We discussed all manner of things until late at night. Once it was until three in the morning.

I got a job teaching crystallography in the mineralogy department. I wasn't particularly interested in tetragonal trisectahedrons but I was interested in E.H. Kraus, who was head of the department, Professor Hunt, and some others. I knew that as a laboratory and teaching assistant I would sit in on faculty seminars.

What I'm trying to say is that I have forgotten what Wenley tried to teach me about philosophy, Bartlett about biochemistry, Kauffman about mycology, Hobbs about geology, or Hunt about crystallography, but I will never forget what those men stood for, their standards of integrity, of accuracy, of thoroughness. And I must not forget the influence of Sam Dana who took over as chairman of my doctorate committee when Kauffman died. I am indebted to Dana in many ways. Dana came to Michigan when the forestry school was reorganized in 1927. Had I known he was to be there I would have registered in forestry.

These things that I caught like the measles have had a powerful effect on me all through my professional career. It was for this reason that after I retired from the Forest Service, I used money made available to me by John D. Rockefeller to visit some of the forestry schools for short periods, not to give prepared lectures, but to be available for consultation with faculty and students. This was an attempt to pay my debt to Wenley, Bartlett, Hobbs, Roth, Dana, and all the others. I don't think I could ever repay it but I do think that they would have appreciated that kind of coin more than any other I could have given them.

ERM: I think this is an experience repeated in other men's lives. It has its counterpart in my own formal education and graduate school. What we learn formally from lectures or book courses is perhaps of less importance in the long run than what rubs off on us from the strengths and the personalities of the people we sat under. I had a similar experience with at least four men at Washington University in St. Louis, and at the London School of Economics.

McA: One of the great difficulties in professional forestry education today is that, with our genuflection before the Ph.D. degree, teachers too often go straight through school, acquire three degrees, and begin teaching. What I was acquiring from my good teachers might be summarized in one word, character. To acquire character you have to have some experience; it doesn't come automatically. We are born with certain elements, but other aspects of our character are shaped by our parents and other people with whom we associate.

ERM: Did you participate in extra-curricular activities or have any cultural interests that were of major importance during those years?

McA: Woody, that's too far back for me to remember in much detail. I was never one to keep my nose too close to the forestry grindstone. I tried to have an interest in many other things. One of the things Roth told me is that we need to know more than forestry; forestry is only the starting point. He said that we would be dealing with non-foresters and we should learn to speak their language. I'll tell you a story to illustrate that.

One of my latter-day hobbies has been the esoteric study of symbolism especially as represented on ancient Chinese court costumes. One time, while I was chief, the Forest Service was having a good deal of trouble with one of the larger forest industry companies. It has never been my policy to fool around with the lesser lights on something of this kind but to go to the top. I made a date with the president of the company and we had dinner at the Waldorf in New York. Each of us was fencing around, neither of us obviously going to give the other anything. During the course of our conversation it came out that my forest industry friend was pursuing almost the same hobby that I had. The rest of the story is simple. We spent the evening until after midnight sitting out in Peacock Alley at the Waldorf talking about this and other subjects, and really enjoying each other. We discussed no forestry, we discussed no problems between his industry and mine. When we left I said, "I forgot completely to talk about what we came to talk about." "Oh," he says, "forget it. Send one of your men to see so and so next week and we'll straighten it all out."

Roth was right, you see. There are other instances when my interests beyond forestry came to my aid furthering my forestry interests.

ERM: This is interesting because history can't be understood unless you understand something about people who are involved in it. I'm curious about who that industry man was that had the same esoteric interest. Do you remember who it was?

McA: Yes, I do, but I'm not going to tell you.

ERM: Why not?

McA: Because I don't want to. I don't think it belongs in here. I've given you the point and that's enough.

ERM: I see, all right. It is rather interesting when you relate that an industry man had such an interest, and I am curious to know who he is.

McA: One of the things that has impressed me over the years, and I've tried to get this point across to our people in the Forest Service and later when I went to the forestry schools, is that the major decisions in forestry are not made by foresters. They are made by people who came up through other disciplines—lawyers, doctors, bankers, politicians. I'm not talking about a decision as to whether you would plant spruce trees or fir trees. I'm talking about a decision as to whether you would plant any trees. And if so, how much? I'm talking about a decision as to whether you'd have recreation on privately owned lands or whether you wouldn't. I'm talking about decisions not on what system of silviculture you would practice, but whether you would practice any silviculture. The technical decisions rest on the decisions made by others who are not foresters. It is important that foresters recognize this and are prepared to talk in the other fellow's language.

ERM: Do you feel that foresters have been too narrowly trained to do this job?

McA: Yes.

ERM: Do you think that they continue to be too narrowly trained?

McA: Every forestry dean and professor in the United States will disagree with this statement, but you asked my opinion and I'll give it to you. They still are too narrow.

ERM: You had a remarkable opportunity as a graduate student at the doctoral level to follow the wide-ranging course that you did. This would not easily obtain in many professional schools today, would it?

McA: They don't prohibit the students from doing it.

## PACIFIC NORTHWEST FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION, 1924 TO 1934

Thornton T. Munger, June Wertz, and others

McA: I think it would be a mistake to let this record of people who have had an influence on me stop here. I should bring in the influence of some of the people in the Forest Service. I'll name a few. My early days in the Forest Service were particularly influenced by Thornton Munger, who was director of the forest experiment station at Portland, and by June Wertz, the chief clerk.

Thornton Munger forced me to achieve standards of thoroughness and accuracy that I had not believed possible, and to make these standards so much a part of my life that it would never occur to me to have lesser ones. He was a wise counselor in many ways. He was not an easy man to work for because his standards were high. He was tremendously patient with me. I recall one time after leaving Portland, I went back for a visit and was sitting in his office while he signed the end of the day mail—we were going out to dinner together. He tossed one letter aside with an exclamation of disgust and said, "These young men we are getting now are just no good!" I said, "Thornton, why don't you get them in and work them over the way you did with me?" He looked at the ceiling for a moment and said in all seriousness, "I guess I wore myself out on you." I expect he did.

June Wertz was a number of years older than I and had been in the Forest Service a long time as secretary to the regional forester before she came over to be chief clerk at our station. She was patient and wise and she obliged me to toe the line. I recall June many times getting upset over some of my youthful foolishness or my immaturity. I won't quote her exact words because I shouldn't put such language in print for a lady, but they got across. She made sure I didn't make a fool of myself in the same way next time.

Earle H. Clapp forced me to learn accuracy and thoroughness and carefulness in writing. The same could be said of Ray Marsh. Chris Granger was another. To go outside the Forest Service, Dave Mason had various and sundry influences on me.

ERM: In what ways did Mason influence you?

McA: In being a friend and in giving me the impression that he was interested in me, that he had faith and confidence in me. He offered me a job at one time. Perhaps I was mistaken not to take it, but I had cast my lot with the Forest Service and after a great deal of hard thinking I decided to stick with it.

I want to come back to Thornton Munger. When we were just a small station, about five of us, there was one particular project that I knew Munger was much interested in. None of us could tackle it because all of us were overloaded. I was not married then, and used to go down to the office after hours, sometimes staying until one or two in the morning. After a couple of months, I finished this project, wrote it up, and put it on Thornton's desk. This is where I was youthfully foolish—I wanted to be sure I got credit for what I had done. When I laid it down on his desk I said, "I did this on my own time." Munger looked up, glared at me, and said, "You don't have any own time. The government has it all." This was the way he operated. In the field we went to work as soon as it was light and we worked until we couldn't see anymore. This kind of attitude may not be prevalent today, but it was prevalent throughout the Forest Service then. I'm not sorry I started with a man who insisted that I devote my full time and attention to the job that I was hired to do.

ERM: That's a great testimony to Thornton Munger. I'm sure that he'd be very pleased to know that.

McA: Woody, if I have any good qualities you can attribute them to Thornton Munger and June Wertz. The bad qualities I developed all by myself.

ERM: What did you actually do under Thornton Munger's leadership at Portland?

McA: My first job was to take charge of a study of the yield of Douglas-fir. This was a continuation of a study begun in 1909 by Munger and continued in 1911 by E. J. Hanzlik. I worked on this for two years and completed the study. Then I was transferred to forest fire research.

## Educational opportunities in the Forest Service

It wasn't too long, however, before I went back to school and I was gone nine months out of each year for three years. My position was held for me at Portland, and I went back during the summers. When I returned to the station I was put in charge of forest management research. I left the station in 1934 to go to the University of Idaho.

ERM: What direct help or encouragement did the Forest Service give you to go back to school?

McA: None.

ERM: None at all? Your job was kept open. In other words, you were on leave of absence to return to school?

McA: I shouldn't be critical of the Forest Service for not encouraging me to go back to school. Those were early days in research in the Forest Service. Today this situation has changed. We have a federal law, which permits and encourages exactly this sort of thing.<sup>5</sup> I think it was enacted in 1958. The Forest Service is making considerable use of this law. When I went back to the Forest Service and was a station director—before this law was enacted—I not only encouraged brighter members of my staff to go off for advanced work, but practically insisted that they do it. We had no legal basis but were able to work out arrangements whereby they would forego taking their annual leave for a certain number of years, and then take it all at once. In those days they could accumulate enough annual leave so that they could be away at school for a total of nine months and satisfy the residence requirements. And if the thesis work done for the graduate degree could be the same as the project work at the station, then they could get paid for the work they did on the thesis while away from the station. It was good for the government because we got the free services of a top-flight professor. It was good for our men, because they were on full pay at least for one whole year. Even without specific legislation, we managed to give this kind of encouragement. Because I didn't get it perhaps made me more aware of the need for giving it to others. This was no fault of anyone in my day.

<sup>5</sup> Government Employees Training Act of 7 August 1958, 72 Stat. 327.

## Research appropriations and Earle H. Clapp

ERM: What could you say today about the character of budgeting Forest Service activities at the regional level during those early years? In my own brief exploration of the subject in the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, which as you know, just celebrated its 50th Anniversary, I found that the overall budgeting was very slim and there were hard, dragging years before they got anywhere.<sup>6</sup> Was this true in the northwest, too?

McA: There have been cycles all the way through. On the whole, appropriations for research have steadily climbed from a very small amount in the twenties to a very large amount now. The Forest Service research organization is better financed today than the whole Forest Service was when I started. Research in the Forest Service is large enough to be a separate bureau. It started with a few isolated field stations, Feather River in California; Wind River outside of Portland, Oregon; Fort Valley in Arizona; Priest River in Idaho; and the Fremont Station on the slopes of Pikes Peak. Only a few people were working on research. All of this research was under the direction of the regional foresters.

ERM: Each of these stations had rather narrowly prescribed areas of interest at the time of their beginnings, did they not?

McA: Yes. That is what I meant when I said that research in the early days was done at isolated, small places like Priest River, Flagstaff, Feather River, and Wind River, usually by one man, at the most two, with a few assistants. There was an annual conference at which were discussed the needs of the national forest organization for research. As a result, the research that was done was pointed mainly toward specific needs of the national forests. Later on, in the latter twenties, Earle Clapp put research on a completely different basis. It was made an independent organization reporting directly to Washington. Funds were obtained to adequately support research. The McSweeney-McNary Act of 1928 authorized the establishment of regional experiment stations, each of which would have a whole flock of minor subsidiary stations or research centers.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, [A History of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, 1923 to 1973](#), by Susan R. Schrepfer, Edwin H. Larson and Elwood R. Maunder, General Technical Report NE-7, (Upper Darby, Pa.: Forest Service, 1973).

<sup>7</sup> Act of 22 May 1928, 45 Stat. 699.

The basic philosophy for this separation of powers, as I've said, was Earle Clapp's. The impetus towards getting money for research was Earle Clapp's. I remember that when Clapp wanted to pay higher research salaries, he went to Bill (William B.) Greeley who was chief. Greeley told him there was no chance to get any more money. To make a long story short, Clapp asked if he could try. Greeley said he might. Clapp did try, and in the process of getting more money for his researchers, he raised the salaries of all the forest supervisors and other administrative people in the Forest Service. He made the research organization separate and independent so that their results would not be controlled by some perhaps, narrow-minded administrator.

William B. Greeley

ERM: How well did you know Colonel William B. Greeley at this time?

McA: My knowledge of Greeley goes back only to 1925 when I spent nine months in Washington working on the Douglas-fir yield study. There were not too many of us young chaps then and Greeley was good enough to ask us to sit in on staff meetings. He took time to talk to us. When he came to Portland to visit with Munger, he made opportunities to talk with me. Munger brought me in on these conferences. Greeley was for some reason interested in me and my career. I'm sure he did many things to further it that I don't know about. Mostly, he gave me encouragement by visiting with me, conveying to me that he had confidence in me, and wanting me to succeed.

ERM: There was a great deal of shock expressed by some of the people in the Forest Service when Greeley elected to resign and go to the West Coast to take over the West Coast Lumbermen's Association. Do you remember that event?

McA: I remember it. I was sorry to see him leave the Forest Service. My attitude was that it was his decision and was really none of my affair. I don't think there was as much feeling about Bill Greeley leaving the Forest Service as some people have said.

ERM: Years ago I talked to his family and they conveyed to me that there was a feeling of deep regret, the feeling a man has when he leaves

one field of endeavor for another. Of course, Greeley was not going out of forestry but he was swinging from the public side of the fence to the private. Some of the men in the Forest Service probably had some strong feelings of the rivalry between the two camps.

McA: I used to visit with Greeley at his offices in Seattle in the late twenties and early thirties. I never heard him express either joy or regret about leaving the Forest Service. His interests were very broad. I think perhaps he felt that he could further the cause of forestry by taking a job with industry. He recognized that the problem in forestry was to get the larger forest owners to practice forestry. I think he felt that in the Forest Service he would not be able to do very much in getting these industries on a permanent basis. He perhaps felt that by taking the forest industry job he could do something to that end. He went quite far in achieving that particular result.

#### Marriage and career

ERM: While you were getting your Ph.D. at Michigan you also met your wife Dorothy A. Coppage. Could you tell us a little about that?

McA: She was a graduate student also working under Professor Kauffman. We met in September 1927 and were married in December of the same year.

ERM: You have three sons.

McA: Yes. The first, Richard C., was born the summer of 1929 while we were still students. Four days after he was born I left for Portland to do my summer's job. Somehow my wife has managed to put up with me and with the Forest Service all these years. When we celebrated our fortieth wedding anniversary she insisted it was her forty-fifth, because she claimed that on our vacation trips she had waited a total of five years outside of Forest Service offices where I had gone just to say hello. The Forest Service has been just as big a part of her life as it has been of mine. I could not have managed anywhere near so well without her.

ERM: How do you mean that the Forest Service has been as much a part of her life as yours?



Richard and Dorothy McArdle. September 1928,  
Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Washington.  
At that time known as Columbia National Forest.

McA: In every place we have been she has participated in forestry work. I don't mean that she has done field work with me or written reports, but has been interested in forestry work. Moreover, she has been active and friendly with the wives of my associates. For example, it would be very easy for a station director's wife to put a sour note throughout the whole organization by affecting the wives of the men. Several places where we went the people were in separate cliques, a good deal due to the wives, and my wife was able to bring these people together. That was very helpful to me.

As an example, when we went to Fort Collins, Colorado to start the forest experiment station (Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station) there, the wife of the supervisor of the Roosevelt National Forest was not friendly with the wife of the head of the forestry department in the university. It would have been very easy to bring in this third forestry unit—the experiment station—and start a third clique. This wouldn't affect the men so much, but it would affect their social lives and in one way or another would influence their work. If the wives are unfriendly, you don't get together for social affairs which are a significant feature of your life when you live in a small town. My wife and I talked it over and decided we would ignore the ill feeling. To start the ball rolling we had a party and invited both cliques. The result is that today in Fort Collins there is what is known as the Triangle Club, consisting of the forestry school, the national forest, and the forest experiment station.

When I went over to the forestry school at Idaho there were two cliques there, I'm sorry to say. My wife was able to harmonize these different points of view. I think they were sick of it anyway. I know of no place that these feelings can reach such heights as in the educational circles.

ERM: I agree with you; academic circles are one of the most savage. You and your wife have lived a rather peripatetic life.

McA: You might say that. I think it has all been for the good. One evening when we were chewing the fat and asking the usual questions, "If you had it to do over again, would you do this or would you do that?" I asked her if she thought we had been imposed upon by the Forest Service moving us about the country. She said, "No, I don't think so. Just think of all the wonderful friends that we would have missed had we not lived in these places." She was absolutely right. These friends mean a lot to us. When our boys were in college and spent the summers working in various

places over the United States, we knew that if one of them had broken a leg or something else had happened to him, there were a dozen people that we could have telephoned who would do everything that nonparents could do. It was a very comforting feeling. As I get older it means even more to me to think back on the friends we've had.

### Staff development in the Forest Service

ERM: Is it an integral part of the philosophy of the Forest Service that you give to your active staff a wide variety of experience and keep them moving around so that they get this? There are a few exceptions to this though. Thornton Munger is certainly the most noteworthy; he stayed at the station in Portland all of his career. But he was atypical of most Forest Service careers. Would you not agree?

McA: I think so. You asked about moving Forest Service people around the country. There is no question that a typical district ranger, if left on one district all of his life, could do a wonderful job. He would learn to know the people and learn the ground, and he would become a fixture. Ranger (William A.) Woody on the Chattahoochee National Forest in north Georgia did that. One problem is not being able to increase his pay over the years. The way the government is set up you are paid for certain duties. So if that ranger wants to stay a ranger, and in that locality all his life, it is perfectly possible. But he will be paid ranger wages. He'll never be paid forest supervisor or regional forester or assistant chief wages. This may not be the ideal system, but this is the way it is.

In defense of the system look at it this way: The national forest system does not consist of one or two ranger districts. I'm not sure how many there are now, but when I was chief there were 804. A ranger could stay in one valley all of his life and get to know it well. But the national forest system and Forest Service responsibilities consist of hundreds of thousands of valleys. So the more valleys that this man can see and become acquainted with, the better able he is to deal with valleys he's never seen before. There is a deliberate program in the Forest Service to broaden the experience of people who may eventually enter into more responsible duties.

There is another side, too. You give people a chance to demonstrate what they can do and you give them a chance to grow. I've seen too much stagnation as people stay too long in one job. They may become better at it and better known, and may eventually be looked on as the old man of the mountain for that locality. But that's all. The Forest Service has to deal with many mountains and many places, so we need people who have had broad experience not only with different conditions but with different people. Otherwise we are not paving the way for filling the top jobs with experienced people.

ERM: What way do you have of cutting out the people who aren't going to grow? Are you stuck with a problem there with civil service regulations?

McA: There is that situation. I don't want to get into a long-winded discussion on this aspect unless you particularly want it.

ERM: This is a problem of Forest Service history that goes back many years. I wonder if you have particular insights that might be helpful.

McA: The problem children of today were problem children thirty years ago. The Forest Service could have done something about it then. It is not so easy to deal with now. It may not entirely be the problem child's fault; it can be the supervisor's fault in part. There are ways to eliminate problem children but they are cumbersome in the civil service system. I'm not implying that the government service is full of problem children or people who should have been gotten rid of. We are not all of the same capacity. Your question was what do you do with the ones with the least ability. There are a lot of things that can be done to utilize those with least ability without firing them.

DEAN, SCHOOL OF FORESTRY, UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, 1934 TO 1935

ERM: You became dean of the forestry school at the University of Idaho in 1934. You were there for one year. How do you explain that step from the Forest Service in Portland to the University of Idaho and then back to the Forest Service in 1935?

McA: While I was in Portland the offer came to me to consider this position at Idaho. I had had other offers but Thornton Munger urged me to take this one. I went with my wife to Idaho and sized up the situation. She was brought up as a faculty brat on a university campus and it seemed natural to her to go back to a university. I felt it was something I wanted to do. So we took the job. It was a rigorous year. I don't think I went to bed before 2 A.M. many nights.

A year later I had an offer from the Forest Service to head up the station to be organized at Fort Collins, Colorado. I thought I should either leave Idaho then or stay with educational work for at least ten years. I made the decision to leave. It was a wrench because I liked university work. The president of the university told me that if he had it to do all over again and have me for only one year, he'd still do it. That's probably an exaggeration but I still appreciate the kind thought. It is another one of the decisions that I've never regretted. I don't know that I've regretted any decisions. Once they are made, that's it.

ERM: During that year at Idaho what did you do for the school of forestry?

McA: The faculty was not what it should have been, and we were able to remedy that in part. For another thing, the curriculum seemed to be rather narrow; there was almost nothing in the way of electives. At this school as in many others, each professor seeking to enlarge his own activity, will try to take on as many forestry courses as possible, and he will try to get these included in the required curriculum. There was a great deal of duplication; we eliminated that.

We had another problem with a branch school at Pocatello which had to be straightened out. We had problems in the Clarke-McNary Nursery, which was operated by the forestry school. We needed a

new building. They had previously handled about 100 forestry students in the whole school, but the day that I arrived in Moscow, a total of 369 had already registered for forestry. This was the postwar upsurge in forestry interests. There was no faculty and no money to take care of this large number.

ERM: You were feeling the results of the post-World War I baby boom.

McA: Yes. I had a class of 198 freshmen. I wish that I could have done more with many of these young men, but between me and the really good students was an impenetrable wall of dumbbells. I analyzed the university records and found that only about 50 percent of those who entered ever graduated. Meanwhile, the poor students cluttered up the place and kept us from helping the good ones.

ERM: What were the employment prospects for these young men after they graduated?

McA: This was the early and mid-thirties, and a great many of them went into the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps). I remember one time when a classmate of mine raised this same question with Filibert Roth. The old man smiled at us and said, "Don't worry, you gentlemen are going to create the jobs in forestry." We did. And the students who graduated in 1935 created jobs, too. I hear from many of them and know they stayed in forestry and have done rather well.

I liked being dean. I recall years later getting out of an automobile in the Blue Mountains of Oregon and having somebody shout at me, "Hi, dean." I liked that title. The students needed to be brought together since there were so many. They needed to feel some pride at being a part of the forestry school. They didn't sing the quaint folksongs of foresters. I can't carry a tune in a basket, but I can whistle. So I took one of the seniors who could play the piano and I whistled the forestry tunes while he wrote out the music. I then got the rest of the seniors and taught them these forestry songs. When we had the 400 or so boys together, we spread the seniors amongst them, and whether I could sing or not, I led them in singing.

I knew all the forestry students by name. One time when the president of the university and I were driving to Spokane, Washington, I saw two boys walking along the road ahead of us. I said, "Stop, let's give these youngsters a ride, they are two of my students." The president used to say afterwards that I was the only dean in the university that could recognize his students from the back.

There were other things that needed doing in order to enliven the morale of the students. They were not having the social life I thought they should have. I got in touch with the home economics department, provided school trucks, and we got the boys and the girls together and had steak roasts on the experimental forest. I encouraged my students to take cooking courses in the home "ec" department. There were lots of things that could be done to make the school a happy working unit. I didn't do this all by myself though.

ERM: I think there is something to be learned from this. I hope I'm not being unkind in my judgment, but it seems that so much of what is projected today as imagery of a profession or industry has become a phony thing. It is presented to the public in such an antiseptic form that it gets rejected right away because people are not that antiseptic. They can't relate to representation of any group as being a bit lower than the angels. I see this particularly as I travel from one association meeting to another; they trot out their latest efforts at public relations. Some of these, from a technical point of view, are probably first rate. But from the standpoint of believability they fall far short of the mark. Yet, people who are assembled to see them in their premier performance think they are great. I don't think they are in touch enough with the rank and file they are trying to reach.

## II. U.S. FOREST SERVICE CAREER, 1935 TO 1962

## EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

McA: Woody, I would be very happy to forget about the rest of this interview and spend all of our time on this subject. After I became chief I had this problem. We had grown to be a big organization. At one time everybody in the Forest Service knew everybody else. But we became 20,000 men and women and didn't know each other. I thought maybe one of my jobs was to go through the organization like a needle and thread and tie them together. I immediately began going around to visit with people all the way along the line— and with the wives.

I remember talking with an industry forester in South Carolina years later. He was moaning about this sort of thing. He said, "I know the president of our company, but he doesn't know me. If I quit the company he'd simply tell the head of our department to go get another forester. I mean nothing to him. My wife was telling me the other night that the head of our woodlands department has been in our yard dozens of times but has never come into the house to speak to her. I was over at such and such a ranger station the other day when you were there and I happened to go around the back of the house and looked in the window. I saw you drinking coffee with the ranger's wife." I said, "Yes, I always visit with the wives, because if it wasn't for their tolerance and their patience, we would never get our work done. They are an important part of this organization, I want to know them – I want them to know I appreciate their efforts. I want to know if they have any particular gripes."

When I visited with the forester in South Carolina, I had just come from New Mexico, and with the regional forester, visited several ranger stations. At one location there were no school facilities and the ranger had three small children. My question to the regional forester was not on forestry but was, "What are you going to do about this man next year when his oldest child enters school?" I suggested that the ranger be moved to where there were schools.

Another example to illustrate this point. On one national forest, I was shown a campground with a small building which had been constructed as a museum. It was full of all kinds of things, stuffed owls, and so forth. It was a rainy day, and we got in the car and drove up the hill to the campground. The forest supervisor mentioned, "There is the newest member of our staff, or rather his family." There was a tent with a lot of baby diapers hanging out on the line in the rain. There was a car parked and some kids playing in it. I said, "You mean to tell me that's one of our Forest Service staff?" He said yes, that they hadn't been able to get a house yet. I went over expecting to be chewed out by the wife, but she spent her whole time telling me how glad they were after having struggled through school to have gotten this wonderful job, that the people were fine to them, that they knew they would have a house soon. We had a pleasant visit, but as we went back down the hill we were all quiet, and I said, "Well, we didn't do too good on that one, did we?" The supervisor said, "What do you mean?" I said, "If I was supervisor of this forest, I'd throw that damned stuffed owl out of the museum and I'd move this Forest Service family into it." He called me that night on the telephone across two states and told me the family was in the museum.

The easiest way to visit with a large group of people is to get them together for lunch or dinner, but most of these young people had to hire a babysitter, travel a hundred miles, and dinner would cost them \$2.00 in those days. I didn't think I was worth that much, so we arranged picnics. Sometimes I went to as many as three in a day. Picnics are horrible things. On one trip through Montana and Idaho I gained twelve pounds. The ladies kept their eyes on me to see whose chicken or apple pie I took. I tried to get around this by having a local committee fill my plate for me. But they came back with a plate that had mezzanine floors built into it and I couldn't begin to eat all that I had.

These picnics were times to get acquainted. I was looking at faces trying to fix them in my mind along with names, so that when I left I could shake everyone by the hand and call him or her by name. I had a list of names of Forest Service people I'd met and periodically I reviewed it. The list got to be 10,000 names long and I couldn't do it all at one sitting, but I tried. This had some helpful influence in building an esprit de corps inside the Forest Service.

I recall how difficult it was to break away from the regional forester and his staff and talk to the district ranger alone. Usually I managed to get in the ranger's pickup with him so we would not

have the others breathing down our necks, listening to everything we had to say. I wanted to find out from that ranger what his hopes and ambitions were, what his official and personal problems were. I had been in his house and looked at his bookcase, and wanted to know if these books were for show or if he had actually read them. By the time I left I wanted him to think I was personally interested in him. I was.

I remember one time getting off a train in a small town. The forest supervisor met me and wanted me to see their new offices before we started out on a three-day field trip. I remembered their old buildings; you walked down the street and pushed on the buildings until you found one that wobbled; that was ours. You walked up the steps to the second floor and at the top you turned to the right and went down the hall to where there was one bare light hanging from the ceiling on a long cord. You turned left and eventually you got to a door saying such and such national forest. You walked in and there was furniture that came over on the Ark, old Oliver typewriters that you had to work with a sledgehammer, dirty windows. Terrible!

We went over to the new offices, which were simply a converted warehouse with partitions around the sides to create private rooms. Out in the middle was the bullpen where the clerical and fiscal staff (who always draw the worst quarters) were at their desks. As I went in the door the supervisor sailed on past to his cubicle in the corner where he wanted to show me his new walnut furniture. I happened to look down at the receptionist and one glance told me that this young lady had put on her Sunday-go-to-meeting clothes because the chief was coming to town and might stop by the office. She pretended to work, but finally looked up. I grinned and said, "I'm McArdle, who are you?" She told me her name and we began to visit.

Going back to the days of June Wertz, I knew how much the efficiency of the Forest Service depended on these people. So I had a deep appreciation for the clerical staff and I thought they ought to know it. Eventually, the office manager came over where I was visiting with the young lady and several other clerical people. The supervisor came out of his office and danced around the edges of the crowd. For once I threw my weight around and let him dance. When we finally got to his office, he was upset and said, "I wanted you to see my new furniture and my new rug." I said, "I remember your old furniture and the days when you had no rug, but you and I should never forget that the Forest Service isn't millions of acres of trees and range. It isn't thousands of automobiles, radios, desks, typewriters, rugs, telephones, and all the rest. It is 20,000 men and women, and they are the important ones. I am delighted that you've

got this wonderful furniture and this rug that you can get mired in up to your knees, but that isn't the Forest Service. The Forest Service is those people out there." This is the kind of thing I think you were talking about. There isn't time to do it but you can make the time.

Since I left the Forest Service, I've been a member of the board of directors of a pulp and paper company. I watched the president of the parent corporation, when we toured the pulp and paper mill in Louisiana, stop and visit with men up and down the line. This was not done in a condescending way, but in a manner that clearly indicated he was interested in the men. This is something the head of an organization must make time to do. Many are not really able to do it well, but all of them could do something that would be very useful to the organization.

ERM: If you lose touch with people you are associated with, you cut yourself off from one of the greatest wellsprings of strength you have.

McA: When I got home yesterday, I had a letter waiting for me from a man out West who had just retired and was remembering some of these things, so he sat down and wrote me about them. I recall the details of one instance he mentioned. We had asked that the ranges on some western national forests be cut back to their proper carrying capacity because they were being overgrazed. This meant cutting the grazing permits of some politically influential people. In this particular instance, the cut came to a prominent person in a small town who organized a no-speaking campaign against the ranger and his wife. (It is tough when your neighbors give you the silent treatment.) When I heard about it I telephoned the ranger – first notifying the supervisor and the regional office that I was going over their heads – from Washington. I asked him if he and his wife wanted to move. He said, "No." I said, "Don't you tell me, talk it over with your wife, then call me tomorrow." They did and said they were going to stay. I said to him, "Keep one thing in mind. I know they have been threatening to take your job away from you. Well, they are not going to do it; they are going to have to knock me over first. If I go, maybe you go, but I don't intend to be knocked over. So keep your chin up and don't worry." Now, that word could have come from his supervisor, but I think it meant more to this man coming from me in Washington. It is not always a matter of having time for doing these things, it is being willing to do it, of wanting to do it, of feeling that it is an essential part of your job. We are straying away from history. We're getting off into philosophy.

ERM: That's all right. That's the essence of history anyway. When you are putting together a story like this you've got to know what makes people tick and why they do certain things. This is a part of your regime in the Forest Service, and it is important to get it down for the record.

McA: I was interested in these people I would back them up and I expected them to back me up. That is what I was trying to get across to you.

ERM: Any organization not equipped with that kind of loyalty isn't an organization at all.

## LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL FORESTS

ERM: What do you consider the most important accomplishments of your time as chief of the Forest Service? I know that some efforts have been made in publications issued by the Forest Service to summarize these, but they are not always representative of what the individual himself may feel have been the most significant things done.

McA: It would be better in appraising my term as chief, to ask someone else to evaluate the accomplishments. For that ten-year period. I'll tell you the major achievements of the Forest Service, not of McArdle. I don't take personal credit for these although I participated in all of them. They are just good jobs done during my term as chief.

One achievement that stands out is the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.<sup>8</sup> Another was the program for development of the national forests, which was sent by the secretary of agriculture to Congress during my time and also sent to Congress by President [John F.] Kennedy in a revised form. Then there was Operation Outdoors, a Forest Service recreation program.<sup>9</sup> Another outstanding

<sup>8</sup> Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 12 June 1960, 74 Stat. 215.

<sup>9</sup> USDA, FS, Operation Outdoors, Part I-National Forest Recreation, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957).

accomplishment was the Multiple Use Mining Law of 1955.<sup>10</sup> During the time I was chief, from 1952 to 1962, tree planting passed the 2 million acres a year mark. This was not only on national forests, but on all forest lands in the United States. During that period, recreation visits to the national forests reached a total of 113 million a year. National forest receipts passed the hundred million a year mark for the first time. And we achieved the first billion dollars in receipts from the time the national forests were first established.

I ought to point out, though I don't want you to take me into this aspect, that sometimes the things that didn't happen are just as important as the things that did happen.

ERM: That would tend to identify you as a person of some conservative point of view if that statement were left to stand as is, would it not?

McA: There is no point at this late date in dredging up issues that frequently involved personalities, and in the course of it somebody got licked. I don't want to give any impression I'm boasting about it.

ERM: I realize that. However, it is part of the purpose of history research to try to get behind the events to find as much as we can about what were and who made the controversies. It boils down to the idea of whose will prevailed. If there is a decision reached in any controversy somebody's will does not prevail. That's part of the give and take of governmental or political life. I don't think you need to be too overly sensitive about statements that might, as you see them, wound other people. It is just a matter of interpretation and recording as you see it. Another man will see it differently.

McA: I wanted only to point out that what you generously referred to as my achievements are actually the achievements of others in larger measure than they were for me. I don't want to discuss here the things that didn't happen. When you folks get to working on the details of Forest Service history, perhaps I can indicate some of these and you can say them. But I'm not going to say them.

ERM: Let's take some of the things you just now listed. The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 came into being as the result of quite a long period of legislative consideration and in-house debate before 1960.

<sup>10</sup> Multiple Use Mining Act of 23 July 1955, 69 Stat. 367, as amended.

Can you shed any light on the reasons for the need for such legislation? Can you give us your impressions of the basic factors that led up to this legislation? I know you have an article in American Forests, and that Ed [Edward C.] Crafts has written another, and the Forest History Society has done a whole series of interviews with other men in the Forest Service.<sup>11</sup> I wonder if there is anything more you could add.

McA: I don't need to add anything more to what I covered rather briefly in American Forests. If we are going to talk about this at all, we either should include that article as is, or else I should try to cover the same ground. What concerns me is when in an interview you refer to a published article, these articles are not always available to the reader, and many don't take the trouble to look them up.

ERM: What we will do is copy the pages of the article and they will be entered as appendices to the interview. It will also be footnoted in the portions of the interview where there is reference to it.

McA: That suits me. It might be well at this time to make reference to another item on multiple use – the keynote speech for the Fifth World Forestry Congress in 1960 at Seattle.<sup>12</sup> I would like to include in this interview the key points I meant when I referred to multiple use in that speech. Today almost every forester you meet

<sup>11</sup> R.E. McArdle, "An Introduction: Why We Needed the Multiple Use Bill," American Forests 76, no. 6 (June 1970): 10, 59. For a copy of this article, see Appendix A, pp.220-1. Edward C. Crafts, "Saga of a Law," American Forests, Part I 76, no. 6 (June 1970): 13-9, 52-4; Part II 76, no. 7 (July 1970): 29-35. Edward C. Crafts and Susan R. Schrepfer, Forest Service Researcher and Congressional Liaison: An Eye to Multiple Use; Frederick W. Grover and Elwood R. Maunder, Multiple Use in U.S. Forest Service Land Planning; Verne L. Harper and Elwood R. Maunder, A Forest Service Research Scientist and Administrator Views Multiple Use; Earl S. Peirce and Susan R. Schrepfer, Multiple Use and the U.S. Forest Service 1910 – 1950; Hamilton K. Pyles and Susan R. Schrepfer, Multiple Use of the National Forests; J. Herbert Stone and Elwood R. Maunder, A Regional Forester's View of Multiple Use (Santa Cruz, California: Forest History Society, 1972). See also Appendix B, pp. 222-4.

<sup>12</sup> Richard E. McArdle, "The Concept of Multiple Use of Forest and Associated Lands – Its Values and Limitations," in Proceedings: Fifth World Forestry Congress, 29 August to 10 September 1960, Seattle, Washington, Vol. I, pp. 143-5. For a copy of this speech, see Appendix C, pp. 225-31.



Dr. and Mrs. McArdle, September 1960, Seattle, Washington. President of the Fifth World Forestry Congress, McArdle is wearing a garland of friendship bestowed by Mrs. C.A.R. Bhadran, wife of the delegate from Madras, India.

has his own definition of multiple use. Some people are giving it other names. I have no concern whether they call it multiple use or something else, as long as the things we had in mind for multiple use are kept.

I have here a letter, which I sent to all Forest Service Officers. It is dated October 28, 1960 and concerns multiple use.<sup>13</sup> In this memo I said:

I usually hesitate to ask you to read speeches, mine or those of anyone else, but I think you should see these two. One is my keynote speech on multiple use for the recent Fifth World Forestry Congress and the other is Ed Cliff's speech later in the Congress. You will note that these two speeches are coordinated; mine is more general, whereas Cliff's is more specific as relates to management of the national forests.<sup>14</sup>

When talking about multiple-use management of national forest lands we should make sure that certain significant points are emphasized and understood. These have not previously been clarified in Forest Service policy statements, nor do they occur in our regulations or manual instructions.

Now for the reason I sent this memo to all of our people:

These prerequisites to multiple use are mentioned in my speech in the five paragraphs on page 6, . . .

ERM: In your memorandum you stated that what was covered in these two speeches was not covered in the Forest Service manual and in the established policy of the Forest Service. What did this mean in terms of imposing new directives upon all members of your organization?

McA: This simply confirmed what they already knew, but by sending it out in this way, I made it official Forest Service policy. Since this time, I suppose it has been added to the Forest Service manual.

<sup>13</sup> Richard E. McArdle to All Forest Service Officers, 28 October 1960 (Washington, D.C.: Forest Service).

<sup>14</sup> Edward P. Cliff, "Multiple-Use Management on the National Forests of the United States," in Proceedings: Fifth World Forestry Congress, 29 August to 10 September 1960, Seattle, Washington Vol. I, pp. 173-81.

ERM: To what extent was this new step in policy necessary from an internal administrative point of view? Prior to this, were there any failings, as you saw them, in the way things were being done within the Forest Service that this tended to tighten up a bit?

McA: So far as I know, multiple use as a policy had already been accepted by all the people in the Forest Service. But I did think it necessary to let everyone know that it actually was our official policy and that I would expect them to be governed accordingly. Just as important, I wanted to spell out the factors, which must be considered to make multiple use really multiple use.

ERM: In different areas of your total operation some men would be naturally inclined towards a larger emphasis on one or another of the many uses of the forests. Did this change in policy in any way put some rein upon them?

McA: As you might expect, there was some unbalanced emphasis and my letter did put a check rein on it. You would expect people in charge of timber management to be wholeheartedly in favor of timber management; the same with recreation people, and so on. I wouldn't want it any other way. But with a national forest, large though it may be, area is strictly limited. And with more demands on that area than we could possibly meet, it was essential that these various activities be better coordinated than previously.

Once I added up all the requests for use of national forest lands. When I got through, I found that the total of the requests of various user groups was more than the total acreage of the national forests. Even this is not an accurate picture of the situation because most of these groups wanted many of the same acres. In our administration of the national forests, to satisfy the requests of these various user groups, there was always pressure on individual national forest administrators to yield more in one direction or another. My multiple-use article in American Forests tells something of that. It indicates the various pressures that were on us. It was my job as chief administrator of the national forests to see that none of these pressures got out of line, that they were all integrated, and that all of the user groups got a fair shake.

I remember sitting down in my office with a delegation of cattlemen. At one point in our discussions I remarked that there were other people in the room. I said my visitors couldn't see these other people but I could. I said every man, woman, and child in the country each owned one share of stock in the national forests and I was representing the absent shareholders.

## PUBLIC INTEREST IN CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ERM: To what do you attribute the explosion of public interest, especially that which has developed since the end of World War II, in use of the national land? What factors do you see as most important in stimulating the growth of that interest?

McA: Shortly before I retired from the Forest Service, I began noticing what I considered a change in public opinion with respect to natural resource conservation, not just forest conservation. I began making notes on these changes in public attitude. A few years later, in 1965, when I was at the University of Maine as a Rockefeller Forester in residence, I was asked to make a talk to the Maine Forest Forum, which is an organization of all the forest landowners and professional foresters in Maine. From my notes, I picked ten instances of changes in public opinion with respect to resource conservation. It is not a published speech but I'll give you a couple of my examples. One change that I saw was greatly increased mention of resource conservation in magazines, newspapers, and TV. (When I was in forestry school, if we saw a two- sentence paragraph on forestry, we cut it out for the bulletin board.) Now, articles were appearing frequently, most of them not written by professional conservationists.

Another change that I noted was the appearance of new leaders in conservation, not professionals, but people who were interested in conservation. Still another change was more leisure time, better roads and better automobiles. Our younger families couldn't afford to take their children to expensive hotels so resorted to camping out, thereby becoming acquainted with forestry conditions. As our population grew, pollution became much more evident and people were more concerned about that and other resource matters. These are only a few of the kinds of changes in public attitudes that have taken place in the last ten or twelve years. This new public interest in resource conservation is something that professional conservationists, those who are actively engaged in managing resources, should recognize. The interest is not going to slack off, but is going to grow. It is going to control what the practitioner can do on his lands. He's not going to be as free an agent as in the past. There will be protests in the press and in the courts. We are being subjected to regulation, which at one time, was a word we were not supposed to use in forestry, according to some people. Some examples are evident today in recent legislation on pollution. Land managers would be well advised to take note that a change in public opinion has come. My speech in Maine fell

flat, I thought. No one believed me. I hope they do now.

I think it is a fine thing that our people are becoming aware of natural resources. When your forefathers and mine settled on new land, they looked for a place where they could get good water and where the soil was fertile. They had to produce all their food, clothing and everything needed to live. My great-great-great-grandfather went out to Kentucky when it was wilderness, and he knew his dependence on natural resources.

It is not that way today. When you rode in this morning down Connecticut Avenue, you saw tall apartment buildings where the cliff dwellers of Washington are not at all aware of their dependence on natural resources. They get their foods from the supermarket and water from the faucet. To many people this is the extent of knowledge of their dependence on natural resources. Yet everything we have depends on natural resources. For caveman existence, the necessities of life were food, water, clothing, fuel, and shelter. Today, I would add to the necessities of life the raw materials that industry uses to make things that provide something more than caveman existence. This table and these chairs, everything in this room, is made from natural resources. This means that we must use natural resources in addition to preserving them. One of the biggest problems today is to bridge the gap in understanding by the general public of the need to both use and preserve resources.

ERM: To what extent do you feel the Forest Service has conscientiously sought a two-way communication with the general public over the past fifty years of its history? Has it as energetically as it should sought that communication?

McA: It is easy to make critical comments when you're looking backwards. I don't think the Forest Service or any public agency, industry, or organization, has been as active and as energetic in establishing communication as should have been done. The real question is: What can we do in the future to improve this situation? To come back to natural resources. Our people are wholly dependent on natural resources for total existence and they must understand that management of resources is essential. Too frequently this is not understood. I think we ought to establish better systems of communication than we have, so the public can know what is involved and can participate in some of the decisions.

ERM: As any institution or organization grows and increases the complexity of its work, there is always a danger that the people at

the top may get isolated from the people at the grassroots. I'm reminded of what you said about visiting the field stations and mingling with all Forest Service personnel when you were chief. You went on to note how much more difficult this is today. Yet we have to find the time to do this. This same thing needs to be done within the mainstream of our citizenry.

McA: I think your question didn't concern communication within the organization, but between the Forest Service and the public it serves. The Forest Service has, rather consistently over the years, used advisory committees of citizens at the national and local levels. For example, each national forest grazing domestic livestock has a committee of ranchers to consult and advise with us on management of grazing lands. We have research advisory committees. We have committees of state foresters and others. Sometimes I think we had too many advisory committees because it takes time, money, and effort to service these committees. But we have found them useful. To take people out on the ground and show them the problems and ask their advice, helps them and helps us. I hope the Forest Service will continue to use advisory committees and will expand on the idea.

ERM: As an outsider, I would commend the Forest Service for its actions. What I was thinking of was the many commissions that have been set up in Washington by the executive branch to do an intensive study of some particular area. They have given a long time to the study, written detailed reports, but then there seems to be no real grasping of findings by the people for whom the report was originally done. No action follows out in any substantial way the recommendations that have come forth from the detailed study. I don't know that that is the pattern that exists all the way through the government, but certainly it has been true in the case of some national studies of major problems.

McA: I think we have a real problem in this respect. In the first place, despite the growing interest in resource conservation by the general public, there are still millions of people in this country who are not aware of their dependence on natural resources, and who are not much inclined to learn anything about it. Or, to take action to better the resource situation. I recall a statement by Ward Shepard, an early day forester: "I've known about the decline in whales since I was six years old, but I've never done anything about it." As I said earlier, the major decisions in forestry and in conservation generally are not made by the practitioners, but by the non-practitioners. If these major decisions are to be good decisions, then there must be some knowledge and understanding behind them. How to achieve

this understanding is something else. People in the Forest Service are struggling to find answers to this. Since I retired, I have had a lot of contact with other federal and state agencies, and I find the same worry and concern there. One aspect of your question is how best to inform people. The other aspect is how to get them to do something. I don't have answers to either.

## REGULATION OF TIMBER CUTTING ON PRIVATELY OWNED FOREST LAND

### Introductory statements

ERM: I would like to get into some discussion of the subject of regulation as an issue in American forest policy. Historians of the present are very much concerned about the controversy of public controls of timber cutting on both privately owned and publicly managed forest lands. In order to set this into the mainstream of our history it would be interesting to hear from you some comment in regard to the management of both private and public lands in American history as compared to a quite different phenomenon that developed in Europe.

There was a totally different concept of land ownership involved in America and this had some very early influence in the emergence of that issue. There was also a rapid expansion of the country, of people filling up land space at a rapid rate. There was an established notion of a higher standard of living throughout the country. There was a speed of technological development that was phenomenal in world history, especially during the last 100 years. Our people have been a more mobile people than any other people in the world; they have been less rooted in one place for many generations; this has provoked them to see and observe a great deal about their land. And it is probably more true today than ever. There is more leisure time for observing the land. People are now mainly urbanized, and they have lost touch with the day-to-day contacts with the land. When they do get out of their urban shells they don't have enough insight into more rural or primitive land to really adequately understand what they see. Therefore, they frequently make bad judgments about what they see.

All along there has been a heightening clash of ideas as to how land should be used. I wonder if you can comment upon this phenomenon as it has become a matter of high concern to this country, particularly to land-managing agencies. I would like you to comment about the impacts of the conflicts between the rural, more conservative philosophy in this country as opposed to an urban, liberal-radical philosophy. There was a time, as you know, when the rural concepts were more dominant in every aspect of American life than they are now. How does this affect us?

Then there is the whole development of concepts of planning which are now in the saddle. The major theme of most of the recent meetings have been land use planning. We are now tackling things on an interdisciplinary approach, rather than the narrower approaches of the past where specialists have dealt with the things at issue.

In your view, are these generalizations valid or not? Could you expand on this so that we can see our forest history more intelligently in terms of not only itself but of its place in the mainstream of our country's history?

McA: This country was settled by people who came here seeking freedom, and we fought a war with the mother country to secure our freedom. At the same time we have to recognize that we can't be completely free. Even the earliest settlers of the United States had to make rules for themselves whenever their communities reached any size. Today our population has increased greatly, has changed from rural to urban, and consequently we are finding it necessary to devise more methods of controlling our actions. The purpose is simply to prevent unwise actions by one or more individuals, which would harm the whole group.

When I was born four-fifths of this country's population was rural. Today four-fifths is urban. As you indicated, this has brought about profound changes in our life and in our need for controls on our lives. The term "regulation," which foresters will remember as being a hot issue at times in the first half of this century, is a term that also applies to other things than forestry. We don't ordinarily think of these things as regulations. But we do have restrictions on how close we build our houses to a property line, we have controls on disposal of trash, there are all sorts of laws governing what we may or may not do. We are finding that public opinion now is more prone to put restrictions on the management of resources than formerly. We are finding restrictions on pollution of water, air, and noise. I noticed on a recent trip, that zoning in various parts of the country has become quite an issue, with arguments pro and con as to how much control the planners shall have over the use to which lands are put.

Forest regulation was, in its time, considered in a vacuum, by itself. It was not considered a part of a much larger concern in development of our whole lives, living conditions, management of our land resources and other resources. Foresters were pretty well worked up over this. I take it you want to talk about regulation as it was proposed for privately owned forest lands.

## Summary, 1877 to 1952

ERM: Yes, I want to explore the various proposals for public control of timber cutting on privately owned forest lands. To what extent was this an integral part of Forest Service policy prior to your coming to the chief's position? It seems to me it was a strong part of the philosophy of some of the early chiefs. There was a period when things changed under Greeley. Then there was a resurgence of interest in regulation during the thirties. When was regulation first proposed and by whom?

McA: I am not sure when the first proposals for regulation were made or who made them.<sup>15</sup> The issue of public controls was thoroughly entangled with concern about depletion of timber supplies. Many of the people who worried publicly about prospective timber shortages also worried about how to remedy the situation. Carl Schurz came pretty close to recommending public controls in his annual report as secretary of Interior in 1877.<sup>16</sup> He urged a national policy and legislation but didn't go into details.

ERM: Let me interrupt. Wasn't Gifford Pinchot the first forester to propose regulation when he was chief of the Forest Service?

McA: He is widely thought to have been the first to propose regulation. In his Report of the Forester for 1909, there is mention of regulation but no specific proposal.<sup>17</sup> This reference is often quoted. You may be thinking of a statement by Pinchot in 1909 when he proposed state laws for timber cutting practices.<sup>18</sup> I think, however, that the origin of regulation as proposed by the Forest

<sup>15</sup> For further discussion on this subject, see Lawrence Hamilton, "The Federal Forest Regulation Issue," Forest History 9, no. 1 (April 1965): 2-11.

<sup>16</sup> U.S., Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary, 1877 (Washington, D.C.) p. 16.

<sup>17</sup> U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Report of the Forester, 1909 (Washington, D.C.) p. 35.

<sup>18</sup> Gifford Pinchot, "Forestry on Private Lands," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science 33, no. 3 (May 1909): 3-12.

Service can be attributed to Henry S. Graves in 1919.<sup>19</sup> In the first two decades of this century there were numerous studies and discussions dealing with the problem of rapid cutting of old-growth forests and possible timber shortages. There were regulation proposals of one kind or another by various individuals and organizations. Among these were the Society of American Foresters and forest industry. The Forest Service may not have been the first to suggest regulation but the question really is immaterial because every forester I've ever met firmly believes that the Forest Service originated the proposal and has been the only one to push it.

ERM: Before we go further with this subject I think we should discuss the reasons why regulation was suggested.

McA: The regulation proposal was based on concern about rapidly diminishing timber supplies, the obvious fact that old-growth forests were being devastated and that cutover lands were not being restocked. This concern goes back at least half a century before the Forest Service made a regulation proposal. You can find warnings of timber shortages being made before 1850. I mentioned Carl Schurz's report for 1877. In this, he predicts that the United States will be desperately short of timber in less than twenty years. At the White House Conference of Governors in 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt said that we were already on the verge of a timber famine. He probably had this statement from Pinchot. Pinchot had used the term "timber famine" at the American Forestry Congress in 1905.<sup>20</sup>

ERM: One moment. Do you think this concern was justified?

McA: I do. There was plenty of basis for this concern. My own early experiences helped me to understand why there were fears of a timber shortage. When I got out of the army after World War I, I found a job with the Roper Lumber Company. When I left this company in 1920 and went to Ann Arbor to enter the forestry school, I rode the Roper log train sixty-five or seventy miles across some of the most gosh-awful cut-and-burned country you ever saw. This was in eastern North Carolina. At that time, the forests of the Northeast had been logged over. So had the Lake States pineries.

<sup>19</sup> Speech to Massachusetts Forestry Association and Boston Chamber of Commerce, February 1919. See also, Henry S. Graves, "Private Forestry," *Journal of Forestry* 17, no. 2 (February 1919): 113-21.

<sup>20</sup> *Proceedings of American Forestry Congress, 1905*, (Washington, D. C.: American Forestry Association) p. 394.

The South was pretty much cut out and heavy cutting was picking up speed on the West Coast. I hadn't seen the Northeast then but I had seen much of the South where logged-off lands were burned and reburned until you could see nothing but stumps for long distances. In the early 1920s, I saw the northern part of Michigan's lower peninsula and this was pretty much the same picture as the South. A few years later I saw the same thing in Minnesota and Wisconsin. My first trip West was in 1922 and I still have a vivid mental picture of what seemed like hundreds of sawmill refuse burners flaring beside the railroad. I spent that summer in western Oregon and Washington.

In 1924, I moved to Portland, Oregon to live. In the 1920s, anyone who went from Aberdeen-Hoquiam, Washington northward toward Lake Quinault saw a strip of country perhaps fifty miles wide and about as long completely stripped of the dense old-growth forest which had been there. Anyone making any of another hundred similar trips might well understand why thoughtful people were concerned about forest depletion. Yes, there was genuine reason for concern. I am glad you asked this question because even now, after so short a time, I hear statements that there never was any real basis for making regulation proposals. There was plenty of basis.

ERM: I want to digress just a moment. How did regulation get its name? There are all kinds of regulations. But when you say "regulation" many foresters immediately identify it with public control of timber cutting on private lands.

McA: The term is simply a shortening of "regulations to control cutting practices on privately owned forest lands." Very likely by common consent we began to substitute regulation for the longer phrase.

In the very early days of professional forestry in this country regulation meant something quite different. We borrowed the term from German usage just as we borrowed much of our early professional forestry instruction from the German. A literal translation of the German term would be "forest arrangement." It was concerned with methods for organizing a forest property for sustained-yield management with proper distribution of age classes, location of roads, and so on. One of my textbooks when I was in forestry school was Forest Regulation.<sup>21</sup> The original meaning of regulation has now been replaced in this country by forest management plan,

<sup>21</sup> Filibert Roth, Forest Regulation, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Filibert Roth, 1914).

working plan, and other terms. I don't think we have any one word that exactly corresponds with what the German forester means when he says regulation.

ERM: Let's get back to the reasons for proposing regulation, and I mean regulation in the current American sense of the word. Do I understand you correctly that regulation was proposed because there was great fear of a timber shortage?

McA: That is the reason usually given. I think perhaps the reason originally may have been to prevent complete devastation of forest lands when cutting old-growth timber. These old forests were being slashed over, burned and re-burned, and had no new crops of trees. So if this condition could be prevented it would go far to assure future timber supplies. But fear of a future timber shortage was the main reason.

Colonel (William B.) Greeley, when he was chairman of the board of AFPI (American Forest Products Industry), told me specifically that this is why AFPI was started. He said that if Earle Clapp was going to base his arguments for regulatory legislation on the danger of a timber shortage, then organized forest industry was going to do all it could to convince the American public that no such shortage was at all likely, that there was plenty of timber, growth exceeds drain, and so on. Chapin Collins, the first executive head of AFPI, told me the same thing. In recent years this course of action has placed forest industry in an awkward position by being obliged to say simultaneously that we have more timber than we need and not enough. The issue of public control of timber cutting is not dead but if it is revived it will be proposed by organizations like the Sierra Club and will be based not on timber supplies but on preservation of scenery, need to provide public recreation, protection of water supplies, wildlife and the like. This is why I think some of the large amount of money spent on this forest industry project might better have been spent in showing the multiple uses of forest lands in industry ownership.

My point is, the next time around on proposals for regulation the basis is not likely to be timber shortages but something different.

ERM: I believe I understood you to say that the first specific Forest Service proposal for regulation was by Graves in 1919. Can we also say that the Forest Service has pushed regulation continuously since 1919?

McA: No, I don't think that would be true. After Graves made his proposal there was a period of twelve or thirteen years when the Forest Service had very little to say about regulation. Graves left the Forest Service in 1920 to become dean of the Yale Forest School and Bill Greeley became chief. There were discussions, surveys, and congressional committee investigations of the timber situation but no specific proposals by Greeley for regulatory legislation.

I assume from what I've read over the years and from what Greeley told me when I talked with him about the Clarke-McNary Act, that he decided to work for legislation covering those items on which he could get agreement. This decision resulted in the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924.<sup>22</sup> This law provides for cooperation in fire control, tree planting, and forestry extension work. It also provides for land acquisition and for studies of forest taxation. Greeley is generally thought to have been anti-regulation. Bob (Robert Y.) Stuart, who followed Greeley as chief, never made any proposals for regulation. I don't know what his attitude toward regulation was.

When (Ferdinand A.) Silcox became chief in 1933 regulation was revived. He may have been urged toward this policy by Earle Clapp but I think Silcox was a firm believer in regulation on his own account. Franklin D. Roosevelt was president and we had NRA (National Recovery Administration), the Blue Eagle, and self regulation by all sorts of industries. The climate favored controls of one kind or another. The timber industry had Article X in the Lumber Code of the National Recovery Act.<sup>23</sup>

Sometime you should do some interviews on Article X. This part of the Lumber Code dealt with forest practices and these industry proposals were in general, I think, pretty good. I helped Thornton Munger write the industry cutting practice rules for the Douglas-fir region of Washington and Oregon. This was the first time, so far as I know, that patch cutting in Douglas-fir was proposed. We were trying to reduce the size of clear cut areas, not for aesthetic

<sup>22</sup> Act of 7 June 1924, 43 Stat. 653, as amended.

<sup>23</sup> National Industrial Recovery Act of 16 June 1933, 48 Stat. 195.

reasons but as a start toward forest management. Earle Clapp and Lyle Watts followed Silcox and both urged enactment of regulation laws. I believe the last regulation proposal by the Forest Service was by Watts a few months before he retired, June 30, 1952. So, in brief, during the about seventy years of Forest Service existence, activity with respect to regulation did not begin until 1919. Then there was a twelve or thirteen year interval of little or no activity followed by an active period that lasted until July 1952 when I became chief. This is an active period totaling about twenty years, or if you want to go back as far as 1909, make it thirty years. The most active period was 1933 to 1952. The Forest Service has made no proposals of this kind during the past twenty-two years.

#### The Clapp years, 1939 to 1943

ERM: I'd like to get to your own part in the regulation controversy and your position with respect to it. To be specific, did you favor regulation?

McA: My answer will have to be both yes and no and that requires some explanation. My first contact with Forest Service regulation proposals must have been when Silcox was chief in the early 1930s. I was in research at that time and I can't recall that these proposals ever touched me to any extent. It was 1938 or 1939 before I had much personal experience with our proposals for regulation. By that time I was at Asheville, North Carolina (Appalachian Forest Experiment Station), still in research but now an experiment station director. As one of the upper group of Forest Service people I felt obligated to take a position on the regulation issue. Attacks were being made on the Forest Service regulation policy. I couldn't have ignored this issue even if I had wanted to. I defended the Forest Service position on a good many occasions and did so with a completely clear conscience. I didn't seek opportunities to make speeches on the subject. As I remember those years. I didn't need to seek such opportunities because they came to me. I had some pretty hot arguments with people outside the Forest Service.

ERM: Assuming that you had been opposed to the official position of the Forest Service, would you have been prohibited from speaking against regulation?

McA: I don't think it ever occurred to me that I couldn't say what I pleased. But whether I would want to do so is something else. I remember being at one of the annual SAF (Society of American Foresters) meetings when a fairly prominent member of the Forest Service did get up to express his personal opinion in opposition to Forest Service policy on regulation. I sat in the audience and cringed, not for the Forest Service but for the man. He made an ass of himself. No, I wasn't forbidden to speak in opposition to Forest Service policy but I doubt if I would have done so even if I had been opposed to the policy. I would have tried to change the policy internally in ways open to everyone in the Service. If this failed I would then have decided whether to stay in the organization or get out.

ERM: What happened to the man who made the SAF speech?

McA: Nothing. The then chief of the Forest Service promptly stated publicly that anyone in the Service was completely free to give his personal opinions in meetings of this kind. I thought that further embellished the foolish picture the man had painted of himself.

ERM: Who did oppose regulation?

McA: I wasn't personally acquainted with the discussion during the first two decades of this century. So I could be wrong when I say that the biggest part of the regulation controversy was a fifteen to twenty year period from the mid-thirties until the early fifties. During that period it is generally recognized that organized forest industry was the major opponent. I can understand the industry attitude. I don't blame forest industry, or any industry, for preferring not to be regulated. Preference, however, was not the basic issue.

ERM: Does this mean that you think forest industry had no real arguments in opposition to regulation?

McA: No, I don't think I said quite that. There were some very good reasons why regulation was not wanted. A cutting practice law would have required some substantial changes in prevailing cutting practices. The prevailing practice was to get every possible value from the forest area being cut and then move on to some new area. Public controls would have required leaving some of the obtainable values. Public controls would have favored a permanent, not a migrant, industry. At that time, forest industry, large or small, wasn't geared to those concepts. A good many high-flown objections to regulation have been put forth but it always seemed to me that industry objections really were based on two things:

they figured it would foul up their customary operating practices and they just didn't want government controls anyway.

ERM: When you speak of government controls do you mean state or federal?

McA: Both. There were three schools of thought on the regulation issue. One group favored federal controls and opposed all others. Another group wanted state controls and opposed federal. The third group was opposed to controls of any kind. The frequently acrimonious arguments about regulation touched all three of these philosophies. The Forest Service proposal was for state regulatory laws within a basic federal framework and federal intervention only if a state did not act within a certain number of years.

ERM: How do you account for the opposition of industry foresters?

McA: When I spoke of forest industry oppositional was thinking of opposition by trade associations. In addition to the point I made about not wanting regulation anyway I think trade association executives saw in the Forest Service proposals a chance to demonstrate to their members the value of having an association. Some of these associations were having a hard time financially and the regulation controversy helped to get them back on their feet. You can see the same kind of reasoning in any trade association.

ERM: But industry foresters generally were opposed to regulation. Isn't that right?

McA: At the time we are talking about industry foresters didn't rate very high on forest industry organization charts. They were pretty low on the totem pole if they were on at all. Few of these men were given opportunities to show what they could do and I thought they were looked down on by their bosses. I know I talked with a good many of these bosses trying to get them to give their foresters a better chance to demonstrate their worth but as a rule the bosses said quite frankly that their foresters weren't of much use except for window dressing or for non-forestry work. I don't mean every company forester but I do mean most of them. Perhaps these foresters saw a chance to better their positions by protecting their bosses from a wicked government agency. I am not trying to be amusing. Neither do I want to be unfairly critical. I am telling you how many people did view the attitude of industry foresters. I think many of these foresters honestly believed regulation was bad medicine. I know, from visits sought of me by company foresters, that some recognized how much their lot might be improved if

their companies were required to practice even the rather low order of forest management envisioned in the regulation proposals. But they didn't feel that they could safely promote such radical views. I don't believe that industry foresters were as free to express personal opinions in public as Forest Service foresters were. Industry foresters frequently talked to me about company policies in ways we both knew they wouldn't care to risk saying more openly.

ERM: You didn't urge regulation when you were chief. Why? Does this mean that at some point you began to doubt the wisdom of this kind of legislation?

McA: I don't think I fully answered one of your questions a little while back. You asked if I personally favored regulation and I said my answer would have to be yes and no. I don't think I covered the no part.

About 1941, or thereabouts, I began to wonder if the Forest Service proposal for regulation was aimed at the real problem of getting an adequate timber supply. By this time, I had spent ten years in the Pacific Northwest with frequent trips to other parts of the West and I had started the regional forest and range experiment station at Fort Collins, Colorado. I was now at Asheville, North Carolina and had traveled over much of the South, the Midwest, and the Northeast. This was about the middle of the second world war and timber cutting was going great guns everywhere. Earle Clapp was chief of the Forest Service and was strongly urging legislation to regulate timber cutting on privately owned lands. Clapp also was urging land acquisition and various forms of assistance to private land owners. It seemed to me that too much emphasis was on regulation. I think now I was mistaken about the major emphasis. I don't think it was as much as I thought at the time. But this apparent emphasis did get me thinking along other lines. I began to feel that our insistence on regulation was losing us support that we urgently needed for other forestry measures such as fire control, tree planting, and forest management assistance. Industry people told us we had to drop regulation if we wanted their help on these other things. I think regulation was diverting their attention from necessary activities.

ERM: Perhaps you should clarify your statement that the Forest Service was giving too much emphasis to regulation to the detriment of other programs. Surely the Service was doing something else than just promote regulation?

McA: Well, some people seemed to think that was about all we were doing. In reality, regulation activity was only a very small part of the total Forest Service effort. But it got attention out of all proportion to its place in the total Forest Service program. The fact that most of this attention was created outside the Forest Service is beside the point. There was a definite impression that regulation was the most important feature of Forest Service work, or that the Forest Service thought it was. This was not true. Regular Forest Service work was not being neglected. The national forests were being increasingly better managed. Fires, insects, and disease were being controlled better than at any time in the past. Grazing, recreation, and wildlife activities were getting more attention. Timber sales were increasing in number and in volume cut. So, too, with all the other jobs that go with managing 181 million acres of land. Research was steadily increasing in scope, accuracy, and usefulness. Cooperative activities with the states and with private landowners were at a high level. I never saw any Forest Service work anywhere being given short shrift in favor of pushing regulation. I said the impression of over-emphasis was more apparent than real but it did seem to me that regulation was a controversial issue that was distorting the public view of the Forest Service and, I thought, to our disadvantage.

ERM: I guess most people thought all Earle Clapp ever did was to push regulation.

McA: Hold up a minute. Let's talk about that. At one time or another, people outside the Forest Service have asked me if Clapp did anything except promote regulation. Clapp did spend more time on regulation than anyone else in the Forest Service, maybe more time than all the rest of us together. But if you will look to see what else he did during the period when he was most active on regulation you will wonder how the man ever found time to do anything on regulation. I think of his monumental National Plan for American Forestry, the preparation of which he supervised in addition to doing much of the writing himself.<sup>24</sup> He got out the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> U.S., Congress, Senate, A National Plan for American Forestry, 2 vols., S. Doc. 12, 73d Cong., 1st sess., 1933. Also known as the Copeland Report.

<sup>25</sup> Concurrent Resolution of 14 June 1938, 52 Stat. 1452, created the Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry; Forest Lands of the United States, Report of the Joint Committee, S. Doc. 32, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 24 March 1941.

I was one of about fifty people working under Clapp's direction on what became Senate Document 199, the "Green Book," more formally called The Western Range: A Great but Neglected Resource.<sup>26</sup> After months of overseeing every word written for this document, Clapp himself wrote the masterly summary. Clapp, unknown to most, was the guiding force behind the shelterbelt project of the mid-thirties. He personally arranged the congressional tours and follow-up, which resulted in the Norris-Doxey Farm Forestry Act of 1937.<sup>27</sup> He was active in obtaining the Flood Control Act of 1936.<sup>28</sup> It was Eerie Clapp's idea to have the nationwide Forest Survey, which has been so useful.<sup>29</sup> He got the legislation authorizing it in the late 1920s but the critical administrative period for the Survey was in the 1930s at the same time Clapp was most strongly pushing regulation. No one can say that he neglected the Forest Survey. He was the one man most responsible for expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wisconsin. The whole Forest Service research effort was built up by Earle Clapp. He was chief during the frantic activity of World War II years and I can testify from personal experience that his fertile mind was working on all kinds of activities. He either originated or was the main promoter of the guayule rubber project, the Aircraft Warning Service, the Timber Production War Project (popularly known as TeePeeWeePee), and many other activities having to do with lumber production during the war years. After the war, he personally wrote the working plan for what later became the Timber Resource Review.<sup>30</sup> By this time, I was on the chief's staff and I well remember the long discussions of this plan, which was so comprehensive that we couldn't possibly afford to do it all. I always thought that Clapp retired because Watts and the rest of us wouldn't adopt his plan in its entirety.

<sup>26</sup> The Western Range: A Great but Neglected Resource, S. Doc. 199, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 1936.

<sup>27</sup> Cooperative Farm Forestry Act of 18 May 1937 (Norris-Doxey Act), 50 Stat. 188.

<sup>28</sup> Flood Control Act of 22 June 1936, 49 Stat. 1570.

<sup>29</sup> Authorized by the McSweeney-McNary Act of 22 May 1928, 45 Stat. 699, as amended.

<sup>30</sup> USDA, FS, Timber Resources for America's Future, Forest Resource Report no. 14, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, January 1958).

ERM: I'd like a little more discussion of what you call "over-emphasis" because it seems to be the key to a change in your attitude toward regulation.

McA: Perhaps I used the wrong word when I spoke of over-emphasis. When you get right down to it, the elaborately organized opposition to regulation was not on emphasis or to its relative place in the Forest Service program. It was on having regulation in the program at all. I should explain that the Forest Service program was a three-part affair. At that time, it was called the three-legged stool. One leg of the stool was public aids and services to private forest owners. A second leg was public control of forest practices on privately owned forest lands. The third leg was expansion and intensified management of the national forests. The part on public aids and services included technical assistance, cooperative marketing, cooperation in protection from fire, insects and disease, credit, insurance, and research. Land acquisition was included in the part dealing with expansion and intensified management of the national forests.

At the time this three-part program was made public, research and national forest management were the biggest jobs the Forest Service had. The research was for private lands as well as for public forests. Except for the relatively small amount of money appropriated for cooperative work these two jobs had all the money. I don't mean to say that there was adequate funding of national forest work or research. My point is that our cooperative work was getting scarcely any money or publicity. Publicity on regulation was hogging the whole show.

Looking back after all these years, it is evident that the publicity and emphasis on regulation was coming more from outside the Forest Service than from inside. This opposition to regulation was vociferous and continuous. It may be impossible for younger foresters today to fully appreciate how bitter, heated, and often very personal the statements against regulation were in those days. Nor, I might add, were they always truthful.

I can't help but feel that a good deal of the bad feeling that resulted was deliberately engineered to create the impression that regulation was about all the Forest Service was really interested in. I don't think I am over-stressing what I saw and felt at the time. Anyway, the net effect of both Forest Service and opposing efforts was to put regulation in too prominent a place. This downgraded

our other activities. This was no reason to question the value of regulation as a desirable forestry measure. But it was something I had to consider.

ERM: A moment ago you said you began to wonder if the regulation proposal was aimed at the real problem of an adequate timber supply.

McA: I began to feel that regulation might be aimed at stopping something that had already happened. For one thing, you will remember that the original concern was about denudation of extensive old-growth forests. It seemed to me that most of the privately owned old-growth forests had been cut. I suppose some people are sure to point out that there was still quite a bit of uncut old-growth timber but if these people will stop to think carefully, I believe they will recognize that most of this uncut timber was on the national forests. Even if a substantial acreage of privately owned old growth was still standing, the great bulk of it across the country definitely had been cut. Had effective regulation procedures been adopted in the early days, it might have prevented nearly complete denudation of these old forests. But they weren't and by 1941 I thought the big need was not so much prevention as it was rehabilitation, that is, restoration of forest growth on logged over lands. Regulation, if adequate and if effectively enforced, would be useful in preventing further devastation of remaining old-growth stands and it would stop the same thing happening all over again in the young, new forests. It seemed to me that the first order of business should be to get the new, young forests. We had a tremendous acreage of unproductive cutover lands and if the country was to have an adequate future supply of timber these lands must be made productive again.

It was somewhere along about this time that I began to think that too much of our attention was being directed toward the larger landowners. These larger landowners, with their sawmills, were the conspicuous people and their extensive cutover lands were conspicuous, too. But our Forest Survey project at Asheville, North Carolina, where I was stationed at this time, was showing strong evidence that a great deal of the forest land in the station's territory was owned not in large tracts but in small bits and pieces. As most regulation proposals did not include farmers and might not include other small forest holdings, I thought it might be possible that we were aiming at only a small part of the total problem—only about one-fourth of it if no small owners were to be included.

ERM: Did you have any other doubts?

McA: I wonder if doubts isn't too strong a word to use in describing the somewhat nebulous, uneasy feelings I had at that time. I was not yet ready to throw regulation out of the window. In my travels about the country it seemed to me that many of the larger landowners were beginning to practice some fairly good forestry. They had to do it if they were to stay in business. There were no new, large, uncut old-growth forest frontiers to move to. I was surprised to see this early in the 1940s and only about ten years after I had made a trip with Robert Poison, one of the owners of an immense acreage in the Grays Harbor country of western Washington. He showed me mile after dreary mile of logged-off land with nothing on it but bracken fern and blackberry bushes. I asked why he didn't sell this land and he said it would cost more to survey it than he could get for it.

This attitude toward cutover lands was rather prevalent in many parts of the West at that time and was reflected in administration of the Clarke-McNary Act. When this act became effective in 1924, the financial arrangements for fire control were based largely on Pacific Coast conditions where five states had compulsory fire patrol laws. Each forest landowner had to pay for the cost of fire control on his land, either directly or through an association. It was assumed that compulsory fire patrol would spread to all other states. It was agreed that private landowners would pay half the cost of fire control and the state and federal governments would split the other half. The total cost of fire prevention and control on nonfederal forest lands at that time was estimated at ten million dollars.<sup>31</sup> I don't know the present estimated cost; it's probably more than a hundred million dollars.

In 1924 the plan was for the private landowners, mostly the big ones, to spend their half of total costs in controlling fires in their own uncut old-growth timber and on cutting areas where they had machinery working. The states and the federal government would control fires on the logged-over lands. Most logging operators had little interest in retaining cutover lands but they knew that fires would start and spread from cutover lands into their green timber and logging works. The argument at the time was that if the state and federal governments were interested in reforesting the cutover lands they should pay for fire control on the cutover lands.

<sup>31</sup> Clarke-McNary Act of 7 June 1924, 43 Stat. 653, authorized total federal expenditures of \$2 1/2 million. This authorization was based on one-fourth of the total \$10 million costs. Present policy is for federal authorization of half the total estimated costs.

My trip with Mr. Poison was made sometime around 1930. Now, ten years later, lands which had been considered worthless were beginning to have value in the eyes of their owners. This value was not for resale but to be kept and planted to trees. So while I knew of large private owners who were cutting out and getting out, I also was beginning to see a good many who were not. Some were beginning to practice a pretty good brand of forestry, sometimes better than we were doing on the national forests. As for the operators who were not continuing, the reasons for getting out were seldom because they wanted to quit business but because they had no timber to keep going. If regulation had been in effect in 1940 these people would have had to leave their lands in more productive condition. Aside from this desirable objective, I couldn't convince myself that Forest Service proposals should be aimed, as it seemed to me, exclusively at the larger landowners.

ERM: What about the smaller forest owners? Weren't some of these people also beginning to keep their forest lands productive?

McA: No, except in rare instances. In 1940 hardly any of the several millions of small forest holdings were being managed for timber production. Most were not being managed for anything. These smaller forest properties were not the main source of income for their owners. There was no incentive to keep these lands productive.

Many, probably most, of these small forest properties had been cutover but these lands were not denuded in the sense that there was no vegetation of any kind on them. But what vegetation was present usually was worthless and stood in the way of getting valuable growth started. As I understood it, regulation would not have been applied to these smaller holdings. But even if applicable I couldn't see how it could be of much help. The damage already had been done. And half the nation's forest land was in small holdings. It seemed obvious to me that rehabilitation, not prevention, was the compelling need. I began to wonder if education and technical assistance might not do this particular job better.

ERM: I'd like to continue exploring your mental reservations about the effectiveness of regulation. Can you think of anything else that tended to influence your feelings? You spoke of vast areas of cutover land. Was any of this land coming back to forest? If so, would this have influenced your thinking about regulation?

McA: Yes, some cutover land was restocking naturally. The increasing effectiveness of fire prevention and control was in large part responsible. In the South, for example, an aggressive protection campaign was instigated by the American Forestry Association in the mid-twenties but it was at least ten years before results began to show up. The Clarke-McNary Act fire cooperation provisions were responsible for much of this increase in fire control but this effort didn't begin until the late twenties and at least ten or fifteen years had to pass before results became evident. By the early 1940s good results were showing up in other parts of the country, too. The state foresters also had started tree nurseries and were offering low-cost planting stock to forest owners.

The return of forests on cutover land is much more complex than I make it here. Fire control is not the whole story but in many places it is where the story starts. Even though a good deal of cutover land was coming back to trees, the bulk of it was not restocking and some of it never would reforest itself naturally to desirable trees.

Progress was enough to justify some optimism and I was one of the optimistic ones, but did all of this mean that regulation was no longer necessary? The regulation proposals would have been of no great value on these gradually restocking lands at that particular time. They would have been of considerable value later when these young trees approached maturity. Certainly, something would be needed to prevent another round of denudation. I was by no means ready to abandon the idea of regulation.

ERM: I see that you were doing some hard thinking about regulation and its probable effectiveness. Was your feeling on this point known to others?

McA: I don't think so, certainly not widely. I must have talked to some Forest Service people but if I did they would have been in positions comparable to mine. I am quite sure I didn't go about talking to Forest Service people generally. I hadn't actually come to definite conclusions in 1940. I would have been careful not to say anything that would undercut my bosses in the Service.

But my concerns were coming to a head and this process was accelerated when Chief Clapp began a determined effort to get his regulation proposals enacted into law. In late summer of 1942 I met with Clapp, Regional Forester (Joseph C.) Kircher, Dana Parkinson who was then head of Forest Service information and education, and a number of others in our Atlanta offices. This

meeting, one of a series of regional meetings, was followed by one in Washington in November. I had discussed my feelings about regulation with Mr. Clapp. I don't think I asked him to abandon his regulation efforts because I didn't think it would be good strategy to abandon them. I probably did ask him not to push regulation so hard. I liked and admired Earle Clapp and wanted to support his policies. Clapp let me talk, listened attentively, and agreed to nothing.

Shortly after this, in January of 1943, Clapp was replaced by Lyle Watts. At that time Watts was regional forester in Portland, Oregon. He had been assigned to do some special jobs for Agriculture Secretary Claude Wickard. I believe this assignment had to do with labor relationships. The two men became rather fond of each other, the Indiana farmer and the Iowa farm boy. Lyle used to talk to me about his admiration for Wickard. Clapp had never actually been appointed chief and I guess Wickard simply took this opportunity to promote the man he liked. If there is more to Clapp's replacement than this I never heard of it.

#### The Watts years, 1943 to 1952

Watts had not been a particularly strong supporter of Clapp's regulation proposals but he did continue the Forest Service pro-regulation policy. It was not until Watts returned from a meeting with the board of directors of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association that he began to push regulation. I know no more about this than I am telling you.

ERM: You told Clapp how you felt about regulation. Did Watts know of your growing doubts?

McA: Yes. In the summer of the next year, 1944, when Watts asked me to become assistant chief for State and Private Forestry Cooperation, I told him quite frankly of my feelings about regulation. In research I had been somewhat out of the mainstream of the regulation controversy but in State and Private I would be in the midst of it. Watts reminded me that the Forest Service was promoting a three-part program of which regulation was only one part. I said I knew that regulation was not the whole of the Forest Service program but if I took the State and Private job I would want to

spend my time on the cooperative parts of the whole program. I said I would not talk against regulation but if I continued to feel as I did I couldn't effectively do much toward promoting it at the expense of what I considered to be more urgent needs.

Watts said he would accept my position on regulation and would try to help me do what I thought was needed on cooperative programs. I did have Watts' strong help and I never consciously undercut his position on regulation. Just being on the top staff kept me tied to the Forest Service position favoring regulation and I never found that I could, or even tried, to separate myself completely from Service policy and activity on regulation.

ERM: I am curious to know the attitude of other members of the chief's top staff. Do you feel free to say how these other deputy chiefs felt about regulation?

McA: I will say how I think these others felt on regulation provided you accept my stipulation that I am not speaking for them but only giving an opinion.

Irrespective of how they felt, not all the assistant chiefs, as they were then designated, actually were active in promoting regulation. (Earl W.) Loveridge talked big about regulation in staff meetings and was active in trying to get others to make speeches favoring regulation but to my knowledge never made any public statements himself. His attitude was pretty much "Here, let me hold your coat while you fight the guy." I never knew whether (Howard) Hopkins approved or disapproved of regulation. He was one of the most loyal men I ever knew and would support the chief wholeheartedly even if he did not entirely approve of the chief's policy. He was that way with me when I was chief. In staff discussions Hopkins favored regulation and my guess is that he did believe in it. (Edward I.) Kotok was an assistant chief in the early years of Watts' term as chief and I never knew his true feelings about regulation. While he was head of State and Private, just before I came to Washington, he made some public statements favoring regulation but after he was moved to head up Research, I never knew him to make a public statement on regulation one way or the other. When Kotok retired (Verne L.) Harper took over research. I doubt if Harper favored regulation. I can't recall any specific public statements by Harper favoring regulation. When talking to me, he did not appear to be in favor of it. (Christopher M.) Granger was not in favor of regulation, said so and did nothing to promote it. He was succeeded by (Edward P.) Cliff who so far as

I can remember never made any statement one way or another on regulation. I thought he probably was opposed to it.

In the forepart of Watts' administration, (Raymond E.) Marsh was one of the assistant chiefs. Within the sacred precincts of the chief's staff meetings, he favored regulation and I think he really did favor it. I can't recall any public arguments that he made for it. No, that isn't accurate; he prepared some written statements and I seem to dimly remember a speech. Marsh was followed by (Edward C.) Crafts who, aside from Watts himself, made more public statements, written and oral, favoring regulation than any other member of the top staff. I always thought he meant what he said. Crafts was never one to be evasive; you always knew where he stood. When the chief's staff was considering a successor to Marsh, Watts said he was going to make it a requirement of the job that the person selected must favor and actively promote regulation. For a while our discussions centered on moving me to the Marsh position. Watts stopped this discussion without giving a reason but told me privately that my negative attitude toward regulation would not be acceptable in the Programs and Legislation position. I think Watts realized that at least half of his top staff did not fully agree with his policy on regulation and he wanted to strengthen the staff with more members in favor of his policies. Watts said he did not hold my attitude against me but wanted to have someone in the Programs and Legislation slot who strongly favored regulation. I suggested Crafts but said this was on the basis of his competence and without knowledge of his attitude toward regulation.

I believe I have covered all the top staff. At the time Watts retired; the assistant chiefs who I thought were in favor of regulation were Loveridge, Hopkins, and Crafts. Those opposed, or neutral, or unwilling to promote regulation, were Harper, Cliff, and McArdle. After I became chief (William S.) Swingler replaced me in State and Private. He was opposed to regulation.

ERM: How about the top field people, the regional foresters and station directors?

McA: Offhand, I can think of none of the ten regional foresters and none of the nine station directors who really favored regulation or did much to promote acceptance of it. So far as I know, none worked against regulation. All I am saying is that I can't remember any working actively for it.

All of this is purely personal opinion. No vote was ever taken inside the top Washington or top field staffs. I doubt if anyone

ever tried to make a pro and con list. I am trying only to reflect the sentiment as I knew it at the time Watts retired. I don't know if your question was aimed at discovering if I stood alone in not strongly favoring regulation but I suppose it is evident, whether I am fully accurate in my assumptions or not, that a considerable number of the top Forest Service people did not strongly favor regulation.

ERM: Did your position as head of State and Private Forestry change your feelings about regulation?

McA: My eight years in that position confirmed my feeling that the major problems in getting all privately owned forest land productive could not be solved by too much concentration on proposals for regulation. I favored giving most attention to other measures. I thought regulation could be effective and was needed for some lands and that someday it might be useful for all lands, public as well as private. This opinion was strengthened by what I later saw in European countries. Please understand, I was not completely anti-regulation. But the time, the money, and the manpower available to me in State and Private were not enough to do half the urgent jobs. I had to set priorities. I couldn't possibly promote every desirable effort. My decision was to give regulation low priority.

The McArdle years, 1952 to 1962

ERM: What did you do when you became chief?

McA: Watts retired June 30, 1952. I was soon asked where I stood on the regulation issue. I said we'd let the matter ride for the present. It began to look as if we might have a new national administration coming in and it would be well to see how that administration felt on this issue. In any event, I thought we would find our hands full with other, more pressing problems. As it turned out, we did. I thought the regulation controversy had caused a great deal of ill feeling among foresters. The existence of ill feeling was a point to consider when we needed all the help we could get. There was a real question in my mind whether we could get a regulation law through Congress. I didn't want to waste effort when we urgently needed other legislation. We needed legislation to help us clear

up a troublesome mining claim situation. We needed a legislative directive to practice sustained yield and to give us solid legislative authority for recreational use and a couple of other national forest uses. I considered these needs more urgent than regulation. A few years earlier we had gotten some rather significant legislation in the Cooperative Forest Management Act and the Forest Pest Control Act.<sup>32</sup> I thought it would be better to consolidate these and other recent gains before getting too much involved in controversial things like regulation.

ERM: You said just now that you thought perhaps there might be a new administration soon after you took over as chief. This did happen. The Eisenhower administration came into office in January 1953. Did any member of this new administration discuss regulation with you? Were you asked to discontinue promoting this controversial subject? Did you ask how the new administration people felt about regulation?

McA: None of my new political bosses ever talked to me about regulation and I never discussed regulation with any of them. I made my decisions on regulation months before the new administration came into office. As a matter of fact, I knew what I wanted to do months before Eisenhower was proposed as a presidential candidate. After the new regime came in, I wasn't much interested in what my new bosses thought of regulation. I was fully occupied with other things that I thought were of more urgent importance. No, the regulation issue just never came up.

ERM: Do you think it would have been better if the Forest Service had never proposed regulation?

McA: Your guess would be as good as mine. On the whole, the effort to promote regulation probably was a good thing. I can think of some results directly traceable to the regulation effort that would be called quite useful. As one example, I think most would agree that nearly every state forest practice law resulted directly from what some people have called the threat of federal regulation. I don't know of any new state law of this kind since the Forest Service slacked off on urging regulation. The Clarke-McNary Act came directly from Forest Service regulation proposals. I think it fair to say that so, too, did the McSweeney-McNary Act for forestry research.<sup>33</sup> I can think of some other laws that we might not have

<sup>32</sup> Cooperative Forest Management Act of 25 August 1950, 64 Stat. 473; Forest Pest Control Act of 25 June 1947 61 Stat. 177.

<sup>33</sup> McSweeney-McNary Act of 22 May 1928, 45 Stat. 699.

had if there had been no regulation proposals.

Forest Service proposals for regulation did a great deal for forestry on both public and private forest lands. These proposals did a lot for foresters in private employ whether they will admit it or not. Maybe some harm resulted from temporary ill feeling among foresters but all told I think the good considerably outweighs the bad. If the Forest Service had not pushed for regulation, I doubt if forestry would be as far along as it is today.

ERM: You are generally credited with killing regulation. Did you do this?

McA: There are some people who would object to your use of credited. Regulation isn't dead; it may sometime become very much alive. But I assume your question concerns Forest Service proposals for regulation. There have been no Forest Service proposals for regulation during the past twenty-two years. When I took over as chief, my thoughts on regulation ran about like this: What the Forest Service had proposed was better suited to earlier conditions than to the conditions I had to face. I thought regulation as we had proposed it was aimed at the wrong group of forest owners. I thought it was aimed at the wrong problem in the sense that prevention was less urgent than rehabilitation. I was not anti-regulation and I recognized the gains that had been made as a result of our regulation proposals but it was more essential now to consolidate these gains. A rest from many years of bitter controversy might accomplish more in the years immediately ahead than further vigorous pushing of this proposition. I recognized that a majority of my top people were not in favor of regulation or at best lukewarm. I doubted if we could get a regulation law through Congress and trying to do so would hinder our efforts to get more urgently needed legislation. It just seemed more sensible to move ahead on those things on which we could expect to reach agreement. I never formally dropped regulation as a Forest Service proposal; I just let it wither on the vine for lack of support.

ERM: What I don't understand is why you didn't simply announce that the Forest Service would no longer try to push this controversial proposal.

McA: I could have done this. Perhaps I should have. I thought about doing it. The question was asked at one of our first regional forester-director meetings and I doubt if I handled it very well. But good God! I couldn't right off the bat repudiate a major, perhaps the major, publicly expressed policy of the three past chiefs. I just could not do this to my former bosses and my

friends. I acted on impulse, without stopping to think the thing through, but I believe it was the right thing to do after all. I think it would have lost respect for the Forest Service to have suddenly reversed direction. I think it would have upset us inside the Forest Service because this had been a major policy for a considerable number of years. Regardless of possible lukewarm feelings in favor of that policy, I think Forest Service people would not have liked me to make an announcement of that kind. Moreover, when there is a change of command, the rank and file of an organization often are fearful of radical changes. One of my first efforts after becoming chief was to try to create a feeling of confidence that there would be no big upsets. Looking back over twenty-two years, I think I did the right thing.

### The present and the future

ERM: A moment ago you said regulation isn't dead. Do you think regulation will be proposed again?

McA: I think it will but not by the Forest Service. Early in our interview I said that there have been significant changes in public opinion with respect to conservation of natural resources. This is especially true for forest resources. A regulation proposal now would interest people who would have had no interest in it twenty or thirty years ago. More and more people don't like the looks of cutover forest lands, public or private.

ERM: To what extent do you think that the regulation issue has quieted down or has had a resurgence in the last ten years?

McA: I think that increasingly there will be more and more proposals for control of forest practices on both public and private land. The rules could be a lot tougher than those proposed by Earle Clapp. These will not come from the U.S. Forest Service, they'll come from organizations such as the Sierra Club, and they'll be aimed not at timber shortages but at preservation of the scenery and prevention of pollution. I look for an increase in proposals for public controls on the management of all natural resources. There is a bill on strip mining in Congress now being considered by Senator (Henry M.) Jackson's committee. There will be other such

legislation proposed. So maybe Henry Graves, Earle Clapp, Lyle Watts, and some of those early day chiefs of the Forest Service were ahead of their time in proposing controls of this sort for forest land. This would have put landowners in a much more favorable position today in dealing with land-use planners and zoners. It would have given them some trading stock. I don't regret letting regulation die during my term as chief, and for the reasons that I have given you. But maybe, as you point out, times are changing and we'll see more and more proposals of this type in the future.

ERM: You say that regulation may again be proposed. It may be proposed but do you think it is needed? Is there any longer danger of a timber shortage. I'd like your opinion, not of the possibility that regulation might be urged but of the real need for such controls under present and probable future conditions.

McA: We're beginning to beat this subject to death. I have an opinion as to whether regulation is genuinely needed or likely to be needed in the near future. I don't think I'll give that opinion because to be of any value my thinking on this point would have to cover more background information than we can get into here or that I am prepared to get into. Just saying yes, no, or maybe, would be worse than saying nothing. Let's move to something else.

ERM: Have you any intentions of taking that subject up and writing something of longer length that might deal with this particular matter because it's a matter of very great importance?

McA: My answer to that would have to be that I simply don't know. It's something that I would like to do but whether I will, I couldn't tell you now. My interests are off on other things and I hope you'll appreciate that the reason why I'm reluctant to go into details on this is that I'm not prepared at this time to cover the ground as thoroughly as it should be covered to make my answer really worthwhile.

And the small landowner

ERM: Do you see any relationship between regulation and something you said earlier, that this country was colonized and settled by people who came over from the old country seeking something? They were

seeking free land. They were people who for many generations had been compacted into the cities under the industrial revolution and had lost their hold on the land, lost a lot of their freedoms that they cherished as yeomen, and so on. I wonder if there is any historical parallel to be drawn between what happened in Europe which provoked that migration to this country and what's been happening in the last forty or fifty years at a helter-skelter rate here where people are again being pulled off the land. They no longer can operate small farms, they are coming off the rural lands and into the cities, land is becoming more and more the province of large, corporate ownerships. Is what is happening working toward reviving regulation? Are we back again to the position where masses of people are again stretching out trying to retain some greater control or use of the land? There is no new continent to be exploited, now.

McA: No, there are no new frontiers to go to, at least in this country. We'll have to patch up some of the old frontiers and make them do. You know, there is a movement today of people buying small properties outside of the cities for various reasons. These people, too, will find themselves becoming involved in land-use planning and regulations. For example, in sewage disposal. I think we should explore what you said about land being concentrated in large ownerships. There is an attempt to build up large holdings for real estate developments or for other purposes, but the bulk of the privately owned forest land in this country is still in small holdings, it's not in large holdings.

I've just come from a board meeting of the pulp and paper company I work for now. One of our problems is to get an adequate land base so that we can expand, make more paper and other things that people need. It is almost impossible where we are to find any large holdings of land that we can acquire. The forest land is almost all in very small holdings. As you might expect, people don't want to relinquish these holdings. It is a complex problem to try to put together manageable large properties with small units.

ERM: Do you seek to block up an area that would be efficiently managed and which would provide an adequate raw material source for major capital investments that the company may elect to make?

McA: That's correct. To use resources for the benefit of the people takes a tremendous investment of money. During my term as chief of the Forest Service, Japanese and American capital built a pulp mill at Sitka, Alaska. I attended the dedication, and I figured that I flew only 150 miles further from Washington, D.C. to Sitka than the Japanese businessmen who attended from Tokyo. The people who

put their money into this venture spent nine times more than the United States paid for the entire territory of Alaska, and they spent all of this money before one wheel turned, before they got a penny back. It takes enormous investments to make use of resources.

This also has a bearing on regulation. Those who are putting money into such ventures (and it's not their own money, they are representing a group of stockholders) have a responsibility to honestly and efficiently manage these funds. So they are going to need some assurance that the resources will continue to be available.

ERM: If that is the case and if a very considerable part of the forest land of this country is owned by small individual ownership, how is the regulation factor going to impose itself upon the small landowner?

McA: I don't know. As I pointed out when we were discussing Forest Service proposals for regulation, most of these proposals did not include the small landowner. At that time, we in the Forest Service didn't fully appreciate the large place in the forest land picture occupied by small holdings in forestry. I think any new regulation proposals for control of cutting practices on forest land will have to apply to small owners as well as to large owners. They will be more easily applied and in the future more readily accepted on the large holdings than on the small holdings. It should be possible to devise ways in which timber cutting on these small properties can be handled so as to keep them reasonably productive.

## SMALL FOREST LANDOWNERS

ERM: I'd like to know a little more about this small forest owner situation. Let's discuss that.

McA: My first recognition of the large amount of land held by small owners was when I was stationed at Asheville, North Carolina as director of the regional forest experiment station there. I think the first talks I had on this subject were with one of my classmates, a man who had been with me at Ann Arbor, Leonard Barrett. He was a disciplined observer and he mentioned to me that we didn't seem to realize how many small owners there were and how large a proportion of the forest land these people controlled. I looked into this matter further and made it the subject of the experiment station annual report in 1939. I wrote a letter to Earle Clapp around 1941 when he was seeking suggestions for the Forest Service Annual Report. At that time he was acting chief. In this letter I pointed out as forcefully as I could the fact that consideration was going to have to be given in the future to these small forest properties.

We didn't have any reliable information on small forest holdings until the Forest Service Reappraisal Report came along.<sup>34</sup> We found that three-fourths of the privately owned commercial forest land was in the hands of owners who had relatively small properties. Only about one-fourth of the privately owned forest land was owned by forest industries. Of all the commercial forest land in the country, public and private, forest industry held only 13 percent whereas small owners had 60 percent. There were more than 4 million of these people who had small forest holdings but only a few thousand large owners. I think it is important to realize that about half of the acreage held in small ownerships was in farms and half was not. The non-farm, non-industry forests were owned by bankers, lawyers, city people of many occupations. They didn't make their living growing timber. Neither did the farmers for that matter. Not being dependent on timber for a living made these small owners rather different from forest industry owners. My point is, the future timber supply of this country will depend to a very large extent on what happens on these small forest properties. All the public timberland and all the forest industry land put together will not be enough to meet our needs in the future.

<sup>34</sup> USDA, FS, Forests and National Prosperity, Miscellaneous Publication 688, (1945) (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1948).

ERM: Since that time has there not been a substantial change in the ownership of that land? Hasn't the small farmer been obliged to give up because of the high cost of mechanizing his operation in order to compete in the market?

McA: Near the cities there is pressure on farmers to sell their properties to land developers, and in some places farms are taxed on the basis that they are actually development properties. I talked with a man the other day who has had to sell 100 acres of forest land in Connecticut because his taxes are more than \$8,000 a year, about what he would pay if he were developing this land as a real estate venture. This is forest land and he wants to grow timber as a crop, but obviously he cannot afford to remain at those tax rates. So he has sold to a developer who will put fifty or seventy-five houses on the property. There goes a hundred acres out of forest production. And there are many others like this one.

ERM: I wonder to what extent the rapid urbanization of the country – the movement of the people off of the farm into the cities, resulting in nostalgia and regret about their loss of control of the land – might be influential in the present debate over regulation. It would seem to me that some of the preservationist groups trade upon these notions, perhaps, in order to mobilize greater muscle for their own appeals to legislative bodies.

McA: I suspect that you may be right although I have no way of knowing what the answer may be. What I am trying to emphasize now is that when we are thinking about the future of forestry in this country we simply must give increasing attention to the very large number of people who in total own so much of the nation's forest land.

The foresters in the eleven southern states recently completed a study of their future wood requirements.<sup>35</sup> Their conclusion was that unless the small forest holdings could be made productive soon, the tremendous investment in pulp mills and other forest industry in the South would be in trouble.

ERM: I have read the report, we have copies of it.

<sup>35</sup> The South's Third Forest. . .How it can meet future demands, A Report of the Southern Forest Resource Committee, John W. Squires, chairman, 1969. A copy of this report is retained by the Forest History Society.

## FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS FOR TREE REGENERATION AND TIMBER SALES

ERM: I had an inquiry from a man in industry relative to this interview. He wrote me that during the time you were chief of the Forest Service he had a ten-minute conversation with you that made a deep impression on him. He says in his letter:

I felt very strongly at that time that the Forest Service was underfinanced for purposes of creating timber sales. I can't remember whether I also felt that the foresters on the ground should have larger budgets for regeneration and other management projects, or not, but I do remember that I was concerned about timber sales. Dr. McArdle stated that the Forest Service received from Congress a very generous budget, in fact, usually the budget the Forest Service asked for. This was in response specifically to my feeling that perhaps Congress had been niggardly with the Forest Service. I remember being somewhat shocked at the complacency Dr. McArdle exhibited at that time, but I had no idea what really was going through his mind. I was a person totally unknown to him, and why he as the chief, should discuss any of his problems with me would seem a reasonable question. At any rate, today it seems quite obvious that the Forest Service has not been sufficiently aggressive in pushing its regeneration program, its programs for greater timber sales, etc. It would be interesting to find some sort of base on which the Forest Service policy has persisted up to this time where that policy is being brought into question.

This business of the capacity of the land to provide us with all the things that we now need, and what efforts have been made to establish – through new plantings – what we are going to need in the future, is related to this. Has the Forest Service pushed hard enough for monies from the Congress to do this particular thing?

McA: I can't speak for the Forest Service of today, but I can speak for the Forest Service at the time this gentleman talks about. The final

budget decisions are made, of course, in the president's office. They are usually made for him by what was then called the Bureau of the Budget. The budget process starts with a directive from the budget people as to how much appropriation may be requested. In a word, the Forest Service total budget was fixed before we began working on it. There is a whale of a difference between these budget allowances and actual needs. I was not aware at any time while I was chief that we were getting more appropriations than the Forest Service could effectively use, or more appropriations than we wanted, asked for, or felt we should have. I am more than a little astounded at the impression this gentleman got that I felt we had enough or too much money. To the best of my recollection, I never felt that way at any time while I was chief and never said so at any time. He must have misunderstood me. I was always considerably irked that we were allowed so little money. I recognized the need of the president to apportion available funds fairly and that it was his judgment and that of the people acting for him that we were given a fair share. It is important to know that we were never allowed to disclose how much money we asked for. I was allowed to tell only how much money the president requested. This is where the gentleman's misunderstanding may arise. I may have felt I had to conceal our original budget requests. Congress acts on the president's requests and may give us more or may give us less.

There is another aspect to this letter, which deserves some comment. Your friend seems to be interested only in timber sales. The letter might have been written in completely different terms by the executive secretary of the Wilderness Society or the Sierra Club feeling that I was giving insufficient attention to their primary interests. I don't think I ever fully satisfied any group of national forest users. I did not object to their feelings of dissatisfaction. These conflicting pressures for use of the resources on the national forests helped to keep me standing up straight. If one group was silent, it made me feel that perhaps they were getting more than they should get. The timber people were never silent. The pressures on the Forest Service for more timber cutting on the national forests have been insistent, persistent, relentless, and never ending. There was never a week that I wasn't being beat upon to raise the amount of timber, which could be cut. We called it the "allowable cut," and a more disastrous term was never invented. We should have talked about sustained yield instead.

The allowable cut figure these people wanted to establish included timber that could be easily reached and timber that was entirely inaccessible, timber that was useable under present-day conditions

and timber that was not useable, small trees and large trees, good species and poor species, trees that would probably never be cut under any timber sales practice, and so on. In brief, they wanted the allowable cut figure to be based on everything. This led to misunderstandings because the timber they wanted to cut was the best timber and only the best.

There is still relentless pressure for increasing the cut on the national forests. I think the present cut is around 11 billion board feet. During my term we aimed at eventually increasing the annual cut to 21 billion board feet. I think you can see that I was not opposed to increasing the cut. But to increase the cut to such a large figure would require prompt and vigorous attention to improvement of the one-third of the national forest acreage that was in immature stands. Yet little or no money of this kind was being spent on these forests that would have to provide the 21 billion feet we were aiming at. Such funds requests were consistently cut out by the Budget Bureau.

ERM: Was this because the Congress is more oriented to thinking in terms of the national forests providing income for the national treasury than it is in building up the resource?

McA: This is one answer. Perhaps we didn't make our arguments forcefully enough. Looking back on it I can't see how we could have argued much better than we did. At this point I might suggest that the forest industry people who were continually pressuring us to increase the cut on the national forests, never once went to Congress during my time to ask them to appropriate money for building up the forest resource – only for money to make timber sales. The same thing is true of the 5 million acres of national forests which are lying nonproductive right now because they need plantings. These are burned areas that are not going to restock naturally. You understand that the Forest Service has a provision under the so-called KV Act (Knutson-Vandenburg Act), which deducts from the price at which timber is sold enough money to reestablish forests on logged over areas.<sup>36</sup> This has been effective, but it isn't taking care of the enormous backlog. It isn't taking care of these 5 million acres. Never once during my term as chief did any member of forest industry come to my aid in asking Congress to appropriate more money for planting up these nonproductive areas.

<sup>36</sup> Knutson-Vandenburg Act of 9 June 1930, 46 Stat. 527.

Despite the fact that the Forest Service already has sold enough timber to keep all current purchasers going for three years, there still is pressure to put more timber on the market. You could say that one purpose is to force the price down.

Another aspect, which has to do with money is the increasing difficulty in making timber sales. It will take more time in the future because more provision will have to be made for environmental factors. So the answers to this gentleman's question are only partly money. It is, however, a matter of more money to do all the other things that need to be done along with timber sales. The trees to be harvested sixty years from today should already have been planted and they haven't. If all national forest users, including your friend, would present this picture to Congress they could do themselves and the Forest Service a big favor.

ERM: I fail to understand how in present circumstances the president can recommend a much larger allowable cut, but hasn't this been recommended recently?

McA: You're thinking of the so-called Seaton Panel Report, which has just come out.<sup>37</sup> Yes, this is one of the recommendations. There are some well-known names as consultants in the report. I think the Forest Service very likely could agree with most of the recommendations. They are along the lines we have been talking about. Most of the recommendations are like saying we should respect motherhood, and I'm sure there'd be no objections to those. There are two recommendations that require careful attention. One of these is the proposal to greatly increase the cut of timber. I would be violently opposed to this if I were chief unless simultaneously we would do these other things such as planting nonproductive areas and giving attention to immature stands. In the past, what has happened is just what you said; the Congress has appropriated money to make timber sales and it has not appropriated money to do things that we need to insure our future crop of timber. In fairness to Congress the Bureau of the Budget has seldom allowed us to recommend them. Incidentally, the recommendation in the Seaton report to increase timber cut is based on analysis of only four national forests. That is ridiculous.

<sup>37</sup> Report of the President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment, Fred A. Seaton, chairman, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1973).

ERM: Hasn't it also been true in recent times that even those monies which had been appropriated for these purposes have been withheld from the Forest Service by executive order?

McA: I doubt if timber sales appropriations have been impounded.

ERM: There needs to be a radical turnaround, from your view, in the whole matter of appropriations of public monies to take care of regenerating the forest and to replanting areas that have been long neglected, if we are going to maintain any kind of balance of growth on the national forests?

McA: I am not opposed to timber cutting on the national forests. Let me speak plainly: I am on record time and again favoring increasing the total cut on national forest lands to more than double what it was at the time I was chief. I still favor that. But I do not favor it at the expense of the other users of the national forests. And I do not favor increasing the cut unless we do the things that must be done to make this larger yield possible. It is one thing to say that it should be done, but it is absolutely wrong to assume that saying it should be done means that it will be done – or can be done immediately. Even if the Forest Service had all of the money that it wanted today, it could not increase the cut from 10 billion feet to 21 billion feet overnight. There isn't the manpower, and there are hundreds of other requirements that would have to be met. What particularly worries me is trying to increase the cut on the national forests without making provisions for a crop that needs to be coming along to provide a harvest fifty or a hundred years hence. We're not doing this in any adequate measure. All the shouting has been, "Cut more, cut more!" The letter which you just read me is an example of that.

I don't know whether I've been fair to this gentleman in my answer. I'm curious as to how he would remember a point that I don't think I could ever have made without also touching on these related considerations.

## FRED A. SEATON AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION 1958

McA: Our mention of the Seaton Panel Report makes me think of an experience I had with Mr. Seaton when he was secretary of the Interior. Congress either had passed, or was about to pass, the law establishing the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.<sup>38</sup> I think this was in the summer of 1958.

The commission would have eight members from Congress and seven members, including the chairman, appointed by the president. Naturally, the government agencies concerned with outdoor recreation were much interested in selection of the presidential appointees. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior probably were the agencies most concerned. If the commission were competent, the recommendations and report of this study would be more valuable than if this should turn out to be another run of the mill project. The Forest Service wanted the effort to be successful. We had considerable discussion among top Forest Service people as to who might be effective members of this commission.

We knew the president wanted Laurance Rockefeller to be chairman. We thought Joe (Joseph W.) Penfold of the Izaak Walton League who had suggested the establishment of this commission should be a member. We thought the states should be represented and agreed that if asked for suggestions we would nominate Chester Wilson, State Commissioner of Conservation for Minnesota. We thought forest industry should be represented and after some discussion settled on Bernie (Bernard L.) Orell, a vice president of Weyerhaeuser. We thought Sam Dana would make a fine member of the commission, not only because of his ability but because his School of Natural Resources (University of Michigan) had almost the only courses in outdoor recreation being taught in the country. We were in unanimous agreement that Katherine Jackson Lee of New Hampshire would be an effective commission member. Mrs. Lee was also a member of the board of directors of the American Forestry Association. We had one other suggestion but I've forgotten who it was.

<sup>38</sup> Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Act of 28 June 1958, 72 Stat. 238.

One afternoon I had a telephone call from Sherman Adams at the White House. Adams never wasted any time on preliminaries although usually he started his telephone talks with me by asking brusquely, "You all right?" This time he didn't bother even with that. All he said was, "I've got Fred Seaton sitting here beside me. I've told him I am not going to pass along to the president any recommendations for members of this recreation review commission that don't have your (meaning my) approval. I want you to go over to Fred's office right away and you two sit down and reach agreement on who the president should appoint to this commission."

I went to Secretary Seaton's office where the opening greeting was, I thought, a bit on the querulous side. Seaton said, "Come on in. I think I should be allowed to name at least one person to this review commission." I said that was fine with me and who did he want? He said Fred (M. Frederik) Smith. I said I would agree but thought we should let Mr. Adams know that Smith was a registered lobbyist. I had seen his name on an unpublished list of lobbyists at the House of Representatives. This greatly surprised Seaton but he said he would get Smith's name off the lobbyist list before the appointment was made.

I said I thought the president intended to appoint Rockefeller chairman so we passed that up. I suggested Penfold, explained why, and Seaton agreed. From that point on Mr. Seaton was in difficulty because he hadn't done his homework. The few names he had in hand obviously were not in the same class with those I had. So we wound up agreeing with the Forest Service names. I thought this was a pretty fair split with five members nominated by us and one by Seaton but I didn't say so.

Mrs. Lee died before the commission's work was quite completed and was replaced by Mrs. Marian Dryfoos of the New York Times. There were many replacements among the congressional members.

After our phone call to Mr. Adams, Secretary Seaton suggested that we pick an executive director to head up the staff work of the commission. I said this was something for the commission to do. Seaton brushed this comment aside and said he could get anyone we picked appointed to the job. He said, "I have a splendid choice right here. This man is suggested by John Higgins who pretty much runs the Republican Party in Oregon. Take a look." He handed me a folder and I leafed through it. "Don't you agree with me" asked Seaton, "that this man would be a fine choice for the executive director position?" I replied, "Yes, I do think he would be a good choice but I should tell you that he is my brother-in-law."

“Oh,” said Seaton, “we don’t want him!” and threw the folder aside. My brother-in-law at that time was working for Higgins who, in the opinion of many people, was a long way from running the Republican Party in Oregon.

There is a sequel to this story. I said nothing to my brother-in-law about this Seaton incident. In the fall of 1959 I passed through Portland, Oregon en route to a meeting in San Francisco. While visiting with my brother-in-law, he told me that Seaton had announced in front of a rather large group that if it had not been for my strong objections my brother-in-law would have been selected as executive director of ORRRC.

## NATIONAL FOREST DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, 1959

An effort at balanced use

ERM: How does all this relate to the great emphasis today on planning? Planning has been with us a long time. You have certainly seen it as a factor of great importance in the whole scheme of things in the Forest Service. The National Forest Development Program that you consider one of the important achievements while you were chief has this in evidence.

McA: If we are to increase the use of the national forests for wood production, recreation, watershed, grazing, and wildlife, to meet increasing demands for all these products and services, we're not going to do it without some effective planning. The National Forest Development Program was an attempt during my administration to do exactly this for the national forests. We felt that we needed to plan ahead so that all of these activities would go forward and that one would not get out of balance with another. This is what I've been saying about tree planting and timber stand improvement being out of balance with timber sales. You mentioned earlier that perhaps someone activity on the national forests was getting out of balance with other activities. The National Forest Development Program was an effort to get all activities in balance and to do more precise and more integrated planning.

ERM: Was one of your purposes in formulating the National Forest Development Program to aid in multiple-use management of the national forests?

McA: Yes.

ERM: When you speak of balance you mean all the resource management activities get equal weight?

McA: No, I don't mean they all get equal weight. I mean that all of these activities shall be given equal consideration. You will probably end up giving certain activities more weight than others.

ERM: Because they have higher importance to the nation's commonwealth?

McA: There might be a variety of reasons why any activity in a particular place would get more weight than another, while in some other place it would get less weight. This is what we had in mind in developing this program. We were trying to get the fullest possible use of all national forest resources.

#### Comparing the 1959 program with previous projects

ERM: Would you rate the National Forest Development Program as one of the major accomplishments during your term as chief?

McA: Yes, I would. I think it was one of the most useful projects during that period. But I must point out that it was not my personal accomplishment. A great many Forest Service people worked on it.

ERM: Specifically, what was this program? And let's put a date in here so we will have both what and when.

McA: This was really two programs, short range and long range, for full development of national forest resources. The combined program was sent to the Senate by Secretary of Agriculture (Ezra Taft) Benson on March 24, 1959. A summary was published in April 1959. Assistant Secretary (Ervin L.) Peterson and I presented the program to the House Subcommittee on Agriculture on May 14, 1959. A revised program was sent to Congress by President (John F.) Kennedy on September 21, 1961.

ERM: This program was for national forests. I seem to recall somewhat similar programs for other Forest Service activities. Wasn't there also a program for research?

McA: Yes, a comparable program for research was started before I retired. Later, I believe, a program for cooperation in state and private forestry was prepared but I have no information on that one. These three programs, for national forests, for research, and for state and private cooperation, cover the three major activities of the Forest Service.

ERM: I think we should make it clear that this was not the first time that the Forest Service had done any comprehensive advance planning or analysis of future requirements.

McA: There was one previous activity that was really basic to the 1959 program. Back in the 1930s the Forest Service developed and maintained a list of public works projects for the national forests. You may remember the splurge of works projects when Franklin D. Roosevelt became president. We used to get telegrams asking not what we needed money for but how much money we could spend by a certain date. The Forest Service had always been pretty careful about spending money and because we wanted whatever money we spent to buy full value we began making plans to have in hand when we got such urgent requests. At the start, I think these plans were rather rough and ready estimates of needs but frequent revision made them more reliable. They became useful plans for national forest development.

A good many of our people looked on the preparation and revision of these project plans as an exercise in futility. They called it the “Amos and Andy” project, after the popular radio program of those days in which one of the characters habitually developed grandiose schemes. I was one of the early doubters and I was wrong. Just putting these estimates together and having them subjected to critical review made us look more carefully at our needs and trained us to estimate what it would take to meet those needs. Then too, we had a check on our estimates as more and more of these projects were put into operation.

ERM: So when the various emergency programs such as WPA and the CCC came along, the Forest Service was prepared to take them on.

McA: That’s right. The Forest Service was one of the few government agencies that could quickly and, I should add, efficiently take on these emergency public works programs. I know money was wasted in these programs, but I saw very little waste in the projects carried out on the national forests. I attribute this to knowing what and how and where we wanted to use the money.

ERM: Somewhere along in the thirties and forties the Forest Service began moving from a custodial to a management stage of development for the national forests. I may have the dates wrong but I know there began to be a change in the kind of management accorded to these public lands. Did this change have anything to do with advance planning?

McA: It did. Greatly increased use of national forest resources forced us to plan ahead more carefully than we needed to do in the custodial stage. We needed to know what to do, where to do it, how big a job we faced, and what it would cost. We were constantly being

asked to come up with programs for specific activities. I remember discussions at the RF&D (Regional Forester and Director) meetings concerning the need to bring all these programs together and to have specific goals for all activities so we'd know what we were shooting at. The point of what I'm saying is that the need for a national forest development program did not suddenly materialize. This need came along over a period of several decades. And our preparation for making this 1959 program, you might say our training period, also covered a good many years.

ERM: Was the 1959 program the first to take account of the need for multiple-use development of national forest resources? Was that one of your objectives?

McA: This was not the first program with multiple-use objectives in mind although most previous studies and programs had been aimed at a single resource or pretty largely so. We had timber programs, recreational use programs, road programs, range improvement programs, watershed programs, and so on. The 1959 program not only was a fresh look at each individual activity but just as important it put all these individual programs together as one unified whole. This approach took a lot of adjustment in goals and allocations of manpower and dollars. Let me give an example. Many of our early roads in western national forests were constructed primarily for fire control. They were put along ridge tops so fire fighters would have a downward haul to fires and also to serve for fire patrol. In the thirties, the need for timber management began to grow and the fire control people put up quite a howl when the decision was made to put most of the roads in the valley bottoms. It was about that time when we began to realize that national forest roads should serve more than one purpose. This should be even more obvious today.

ERM: Are there other ways in which the 1959 program or its development differs from previous efforts?

McA: I don't think absolutely positive answers can be given to that question. In previous efforts, for example, we had used estimates of population growth. We also used population figures in the 1959 program. The difference might be in the way we used these estimates. Previously, we were content with national figures. This time we tried to make regional and state estimates. Or take another example. We'd made previous plans with both long-range objectives and short-range plans. But in 1959 both long-range goals and short-range plans were more specific, more localized, more intensively refined. I think one of the major differences between the 1959 program and all previous ones is that in 1959 we made our planning

much more localized, not only by national forests but often by ranger districts. And, as I say, I'm sure the 1959 job was far more accurately done.

### Long-range and short-range goals

ERM: You've mentioned long-range objectives and short-term plans several times. Maybe we'd best clear that up. I want to be sure I understand what you mean.

McA: Let's take the long-range goals first. We were trying to take a long look ahead. Arbitrarily we chose the year 2,000 which was forty years away at that time. The figures for that distant date were not pulled out of a hat but were based on population trends in specific areas, on forecasts of social and economic growth, and other factors. If events went as predicted for a particular national forest; we would need so many miles of roads to serve certain purposes, so many family camp and picnic areas, so much building construction, and so on. These were, in effect, job estimates for the next forty years. Then to get down to brass tacks, to get something to chew on for a shorter space of time, we estimated how much of each long-range need could and should be done in the immediate future and for that period we used ten years, occasionally fifteen. The long-range objectives were not shown in as much detail as the short-range plans. For most purposes the short-term program is the significant one.

ERM: I suppose a great many people worked on these programs at one time or another. How did you prevent these people going off in all directions, making their own forecasts of population growth, for example?

McA: We had guidelines so that all participants did their work in the same way and to the same standards. Our Washington Office made the basic assumptions on such factors as population growth. We made the basic estimates for the long-range objectives on water, timber, range, wildlife, and recreation, although in much of this we had full participation by regional and local Forest Service people. Dollar values were assigned to estimates of physical needs according to a standard system. The Washington Office and the regional offices worked together coordinating the work on

ranger districts and individual national forests. We also had to coordinate between regions.

ERM: Tell me about the short-range program. I believe this is the significant one?

McA: For most purposes, yes. For the short-range program, we developed a series of sixty-five major actions each with many sub-items. These sixty-five actions were organized in six groups covering resource development and management, protection, roads and trails, land adjustments and uses, administrative structures and equipment, and research. We said that all of these actions should be accomplished in ten to fifteen years to meet current needs and to prepare for the long-range objectives. Our plans were made by ranger districts or other parts of a national forest but we also derived state and national totals.

ERM: Can you give me a few figures to show something of the magnitude of the program?

McA: I don't think I can. It's been too long ago. I remember a few but even here I can't be sure of the exact figures. I do remember that the total short-term program was big enough to make a few eyes pop. I remember a total of 90,000 miles of road, enough to cross the country thirty times. I remember 18,000 miles of range fence and 10,000 miles of gully and stream stabilization. Don't take this as gospel but I think there was a total of about 100,000 family camping and picnicking units. I remember a need for something like 5,000 dwellings and service buildings. I'm sorry I can't give you a long list of stupendous figures because I think you'd find them impressive.

ERM: You must have had some rather definite purposes in mind when you made this plan. Tell me what they were.

McA: Well, for one thing we knew that we were not meeting even current needs for national forest resources. And we knew that needs for these resources were increasing at a rapid rate. So one purpose was to find out what had to be done to make national forests fully useful now and in the future. Another purpose concerned the increasing conflicts among national forest user groups. Each of these many groups wanted exclusive or at least priority use of timber, grazing, watershed, wilderness, or some other resource. Big as the national forests are, they aren't big enough to let every user group have all it wants. So we knew we'd have to coordinate

and integrate all these various uses. As I think I said before, this was one difference between the 1959 program and all previous programs. We made definite plans for multiple use and this means balancing needs and harmonizing uses by amount of use allowed and by locality. Still another purpose was to restore balance in development and use of national forest resources. Timber management, for example, had gotten out of hand with respect to management of other resources. And within timber management timber sales were clearly out of line with reforestation and timber stand improvement. Formulating a program wouldn't automatically restore balance but it would show what must be done to achieve balance and having a program would help to focus attention on the need to do so.

#### Balanced use objective and a budget

ERM: How much of a role did budgeting play in achieving this balanced use? I don't mean budgeting by the Forest Service but by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget.

McA: Most of the imbalance in national forest resource development can be attributed to policies and attitudes of budget people in the Department and nationally. These budget people had no real understanding of the need for orderly development of public land resources and seemed uninterested in learning anything about it. That was one difficulty. It was like talking to a stone wall. These people were prone to allocate money to activities that brought in money, timber sales being the outstanding example. They would save money by cutting our requests for activities such as recreation and wildlife. Their argument, at least as I heard it, was that we'd go to Congress and get these cuts restored and the budget people would not be charged with being a party to a big spending program. Most people outside of government don't know how the budget and appropriation process works. They see the finished product in the president's budget message to Congress but they don't see the preliminary steps. So they assume that whatever is in the budget presented to Congress by the president is what the Forest Service asked for. The Forest Service is not allowed to disclose its budget requests. More than that, when Forest Service people appear before congressional appropriation committees they are required to defend the administration budget requests and usually

someone from the budget office goes along to see that this is done. Members of Congress know this and in recent years the appropriations committees have insisted on knowing what requests were made of the Department and the Bureau of the Budget. This gives them a better guide to their own appropriation recommendations.

ERM: How did having a program such as we've been talking about help to cure this unsatisfactory situation?

McA: The only accurate answer is that having a program doesn't cure this budget disease. It does make it a bit more difficult for the budget people to deliberately promote imbalance. Let me see if I can explain. When the president sent this National Forest Development Program to Congress it was done with the approval of the budget people and was a clearcut indication that the program had the approval of the president and his top people. Radical deviation from the program logically would call for something more than casual excuses. The president had not recalled or materially changed the program so it must still be in effect. It was plainly desirable to get full use of these public resources and to avoid so far as possible conflict in getting this use. In a word, to get balanced use as well as full use. The program had a definite schedule, so much to be done in each activity each year. After we got the program approved and sent to the Hill I presented a budget request in strict accordance with the program. When I was asked to justify these requests, I said the requests already had been justified. I pointed out that to get tree planting back on schedule and in balance with other activities would take a certain amount of money. To get recreational use in line with other uses and on schedule would require a certain amount of money. I'd be willing to argue about whether a certain amount of work might or might not be done for less money but I wouldn't argue about the amount of work that was needed to get full use of the national forests or what must be done to see that one group of resource users didn't get more of available funds than their fair share. All of this had been worked out as carefully as it could be done and I saw no point in starting over again in a half-baked way, which is what we'd have to do if we were to revise all our figures in half an hour.

ERM: How did it work?

McA: It worked fine the first year after we finished the program. It worked fairly well the second year. After that, the budget people simply ignored the whole business and we were back where we started.

McA: Then the development of this program was wasted effort?

McA: By no means. In the first place the Service still has the program to use as a guide. I'm sure it has been helpful and will continue to be a useful tool. The program can always be tossed out in front of budget people and more especially congressional appropriations committees to show how far ahead or behind schedule various activities are with respect to current levels of expenditure. I retired a year after President Kennedy sent up the revised program so I have no first-hand knowledge of how the budget requests and the congressional hearings are going. The program estimates can still be very useful. Think a moment. Fifteen years have gone by since we finished the program in 1959. We allowed ourselves only forty years to do a tremendously big job. Only twenty-five years are left – almost half the time has slipped by. Where are we now with respect to where we thought we'd have to be at the halfway mark? The short-range period has passed. I don't know if the Forest Service has devised a new short-term program or not. I hope they have. One thing is certain, this program has been worth all the time and effort we devoted to it.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974, Pub. L. 93-378, 93d Cong., 2d sess. McArdle's note: The new law goes much further than our 1959 National Forest Development Program. It applies not only to national forests but to state and private and research. It calls for assessment of needs, a program and budgets to match. If the president can't send up a budget to fit the needed program he must explain why not.

## THE STEARNS LUMBER AND COAL COMPANY STRIP MINING ISSUE, 1955

ERM: I am looking at the list of topics we set out to cover in this interview. We have discussed regulation and some of the other topics on this list. I am beginning to think that we will not be able to include every subject. Some of those still to be discussed will take quite a bit of time.

There are a couple of subjects listed here that I don't know anything about. One of these is strip mining and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture (James Earl) Coke.

McA: Yes. This concerns refusal of the Forest Service to grant permission to strip mine for coal in the Cumberland National Forest in Kentucky, I was chief at the time and turned down this request. My decision was appealed to the secretary of agriculture and Assistant Secretary Coke handled the appeal. I'm not sure I remember all the details.

ERM: Why don't you just tell me about it and when you finish I may have some questions.

McA: The Stearns Lumber and Coal Company sold a large area of cutover mountain land to the Forest Service in 1937. I remember the date and I remember that it was 47,000 acres because I was in Washington when (F.A.) Silcox was pressured by the Stearns people to buy this land. Silcox had not intended acquiring the Stearns property as an addition to the Cumberland National Forest. The Stearns company had cut off all the merchantable timber and, except for subsurface minerals, these lands were worthless to the Stearns company. In effect, except for whatever mineral there might be, the lands had been abandoned. The Stearns people wanted to reserve the mineral rights and to have the government take the lands off their hands. We did purchase these lands and incorporated them in the national forest.

About a year after I became chief, I think in August 1953, the Stearns company made a formal request to strip mine for coal. This request had previously been made of the regional forester who denied it. The company then appealed the request to the chief.

At the time Stearns sold the land to the government he was not strip mining. He was mining coal by deep mining methods in which the land surface was not disturbed except at the entrance to the mine. I don't believe strip mining was being done in the Appalachians at that time. The coal on the land Stearns sold us was low-grade and couldn't be mined profitably by then prevailing methods. The request to be allowed to strip mine was prompted by construction of a steam plant to generate electricity by the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority). This plant could use low-grade coal. The lands Stearns had sold the government were near the Kentucky-Tennessee border and handy to the TVA coal-using plant.

Stearns said he wanted to mine only a small part of the 47,000 acres, I think only about 1,000 acres. The request might seem reasonable until you find out that the 1,000 acres is spread in narrow strips all over the larger area. The strip mining machines would travel up one side of a steep, narrow valley and come back down the other side. The overburden, the soil above the coal, would be dumped down on the land below. As I remember the situation, there were two main seams of coal, one somewhat above the other. If the overburden removed from one strip didn't cover up all the land below, that from the other strip would. In the steep, narrow valleys of those mountains strip mining leaves a high wall which makes management of the lands for timber production and for recreation exceedingly difficult after the mining is completed. Regrowth of trees and other vegetation on the sterile soils thrown down by the mining process is difficult and costly because about the only way to get anything to grow after strip mining is to plant by hand. If the coal is acid, and in this area much of it is, the leaching resulting from mining adds to the difficulties.

If Stearns had had a clear-cut, legal right to strip mine I would have had no alternative to granting his request. But there was a clause in the deed of sale requiring the Stearns company or any subsequent owner of the mineral rights to do their mining subject to provisions laid down by the Forest Service if the surface of the land would be disturbed during mining. My understanding of the terms Stearns agreed to when he sold us these lands did not make me think Stearns had a clear-cut, legal right to strip mine. Nor did our lawyers in the secretary's office think so. I saw no reason to let Stearns wreck 47,000 acres of public land unless I had to do so. Moreover, if the Stearns company were ruled to have the right to strip mine simply because they owned the subsurface minerals, this decision could have possible harmful effect on other public land purchased for national forests and national parks in eastern states.

After getting a formal opinion from our lawyers and after further talks with Stearns I denied his request. Stearns then appealed to the secretary of agriculture. Assistant Secretary Earl Coke handled the appeal.

I make no apology for my denial of the Stearns request. The government had not forced Stearns to sell this land; it was quite the other way around. The government had spent considerable money getting these logged-over lands back into production for timber and wildlife. Recreation was mostly unthought of in 1937 when the lands were purchased but now was becoming more and more a major use of these lands. I considered that I was obligated to protect the public's interest in its investment. Stearns had agreed to the mining restriction when he sold the land. If the situation had been reversed Stearns would want the government to live up to its agreement. I saw no reason why Stearns shouldn't live up to his.

I was happy to have what I thought was a sound legal basis for denying the Stearns request. Strip mining is a crime against man and nature and I wanted none of it. I suggested several times that Mr. Stearns take his case to court and test his agreement. He said he didn't want to do this, giving as his reason the length of time required. I was certain he felt he had no chance in court and was using the opportunity presented by a new administration just coming in to put over a fast one.

Naturally, I was much concerned about Mr. Coke's decision on the Stearns appeal. When Mr. Coke seemed uncertain of his course – we suggested that he might like to get the independent judgment of people not in the Department. He asked for suggestions and I said he might let us choose one member of a three-man committee, let Stearns pick a second member and ask these two to agree on a third. The advice of the committee would not be a decision because they would have no arbitration authority but the advice should be useful and in any event would help to avoid criticism that Coke had been biased in favor of the Forest Service or of Stearns. Coke consulted Stearns who agreed to this procedure.

The Forest Service selected Samuel T. Dana, retired Dean of the School of Natural Resources at the University of Michigan. Stearns picked Robert L. Wilhelm of St. Clairsville, Ohio, an owner of strip mines in Ohio. These two selected Charles P. Taft, son of President (William H.) Taft, a lawyer from Cincinnati, Ohio.

The committee visited the area, saw the lands proposed for strip mining and other lands where strip mining had been done or was in progress by the Stearns Company. The committee also held a public hearing at Stearns, Kentucky, January 27, 1955. The main argument of the Stearns Company was the loss of jobs. The state of West Virginia sent an assistant attorney general to protest granting the Stearns request for fear of what might happen on the Monongahela National Forest if strip mining were allowed in the adjoining state.

The committee spent a lot of time discussing the question among themselves and with local people. The weather was bad and this, with the dirty company town, wasn't lightened when the committee drove around looking at areas already strip mined. The overburden tossed down over the sides of the cuts made by the giant strip mining machines covered practically everything below. The streams were clogged with debris and the persistent rain washed more soil down to keep the water loaded with silt. In many places only the highest part of a hill had been left undisturbed, maybe with a tuft of scraggly trees. It was a depressing picture. Strip mining makes a depressing picture even in good weather.

Mr. Taft pretty much took the lead but the other two committee members were active partners. Mr. Taft kept after Mr. Stearns for his unwillingness to put his case to a court trial. The committee report advised against granting the Stearns request but as I remember it, the recommendation was Taft and Dana against the appeal and Wilhelm for it.

By this time Mr. Coke had left the Department. Ervin L. Peterson replaced Coke as assistant secretary. Mr. Peterson denied the Stearns request but pointed out that the company was free to appeal through the courts.<sup>40</sup>

ERM: To your knowledge has the Forest Service ever before the Stearns Case or since followed any different policy regarding strip mining than you did in 1953?

<sup>40</sup> For further information see Samuel T. Dana, "The Stearns Case. . .an Analysis," American Forests 61, no. 9 (September 1955): 18-9, 44-9; Tom Wallace, "The Stearns Case," American Forests 61, no. 4 (April 1955): 24-7, 56-7.

McA: The easy answer to this is simply to say no. I believe the policy in the early days, the policy during my time, and the policy today is the same as I have stated it. However, I think we need to keep in mind that what the Forest Service is able to do depends not on what they would like to do but on the legalities of each individual situation. If land was purchased with mineral rights reserved and those reservations legally entitled the owner of the mineral rights to mine in any way he wants, there is very little the Forest Service can do about it. I was fortunate in the Stearns case in having a bill of sale, so to speak.

ERM: That gave up the mineral rights.

McA: They didn't give up the mineral rights. Stearns didn't give up the mineral rights but there was a proviso in the deed which required Stearns to get Forest Service approval if the surface of the land was to be disturbed. How this would operate with proposals to strip mine national forest land created from the public domain, I couldn't tell you. My personal opinion is that it would depend on what federal law was in existence at that time and this decision might not even rest with the Forest Service. More likely, it rests with the Interior Department.

ERM: In a time when the energy crisis is so much in everybody's consciousness and the talk is so great about the country's tremendous coal reserves as perhaps the ultimate and perhaps the one best solution to need in this area, do you see this as possibly emerging as an issue that will trouble the Forest Service?

McA: Yes. I could expand on it but I don't have the background information to give. I think the answer to your question is yes.

## SAMUEL TRASK DANA

ERM: What caused you to choose Sam Dana to represent you on the committee to decide the Stearns company strip mine issue?

McA: Here again the easy answer is that we thought he would be the best one that we could possibly pick but if you want to go into more details, we had great confidence in his calm judgment, his ability to make other people see his point of view. He's not one of these people who gets up and throws his weight around and bellows out his opinion, but he is very, very effective in dealing with other people and in getting them to understand and appreciate and agree with his own point of view. We couldn't think of any better negotiator than Sam Dana.

ERM: In other words, you didn't really consider any others.

McA: Yes, we did.

ERM: You did.

McA: I can't tell you now who they were but we made a list of people that might possibly serve on this committee and we had no hesitation in selecting Sam Dana as the best person that we could think of.

ERM: Would you care to comment on Sam Dana's contributions to Forest Service history, apart from his many other contributions to forest history in the larger sense?

McA: Dana left the Forest Service about the same time I entered it. He was director of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station when he left in 1927 to head up forestry education at the University of Michigan. I don't think I am competent from personal knowledge to comment on his contributions to the Forest Service prior to 1927. I can, of course, say that I consider his research contributions were significant. He wrote a minimum

requirements bulletin published in 1930.<sup>41</sup> As you know, he was the first director of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station in the twenties and in other ways contributed to research administration. I believe, however, that I'd rate his contributions to the Forest Service as considerably greater after he left it.

ERM: In what ways did Dana contribute most importantly?

McA: In part this contribution is the obvious one of raising the standards of professional forestry education. This helped not only the Forest Service but all other employers of foresters. Another part would be his contributions to the Service through acting as advisor and consultant. I know of no one on whom the Forest Service leaned more often and more heavily for sound advice. I mentioned one such instance when we were talking about strip mining in Kentucky.

ERM: Would you expand a bit more on his contributions to forestry education?

McA: Dana's contribution to professional forestry education is so well known that I don't need to go into much detail here. He was an innovator. He broadened the teaching of forestry. When Dana went to Ann Arbor in 1927, that school and all the other forestry schools of the country were focused almost entirely on wood production and wood utilization. Sam Dana charted a new course for professional forestry education by greatly broadening the forestry curriculum. He renamed the school to match the broadened outlook, School of Natural Resources. Since that time every other forestry school has followed Dana's lead. This was of benefit to the Forest Service because it broadened us, too. In early days the curriculum at most schools, probably all schools, was based pretty largely on the kind of questions asked in the U.S. Civil Service examinations. I remember the faculty meeting I attended at Ann Arbor when the decision was made to be no longer so strongly influenced by the government examinations. In those days this was close to being rank heresy.

It is important to emphasize also that Dana gave a lot of attention to the social implications of forestry. This additional kind of broadening helped forestry generally and it influenced the Forest Service.

<sup>41</sup> USDA, FS, Timber Growing and Logging Practice in the Northeast by Samuel T. Dana, Technical Bulletin 166 (Washington, D.C.: Washington, D.C., 1930).

So far as I know, Dana was the first forestry school head to do something in a big way about helping less well-developed countries to manage their own forest resources. He did this by bringing nationals of those countries to Michigan. He attracted many foreign students to Ann Arbor, particularly from Latin American countries. A number of Dana's students are now heading the forest services of their countries. I think of Constantino in Argentina, Maung Gale who is Chief Conservator of Forests for Burma, and of Thanon Presrasmi in Thailand. Until recently Juan Gonzalez ran the forest service of Mexico. I might even include myself in that list although I wasn't a foreign student.

ERM: Would you consider Dana as one of the most influential men in the history of American forestry?

McA: Yes, I'd certainly include Dana as one of the dozen or so people who have had the most influence on American forestry. I don't know where he would rank in this relatively small group but he'd surely be in it. And in another way Sam Dana ranks high in American forestry. If we ever had a forestry statesman, most knowledgeable people would say Dana is that person. He was able to see both sides of controversial questions and so could help bring opposing forces together.

ERM: Can you enumerate here other contributions Dana has made to conservation history in America?

McA: Well, as to other contributions to forestry generally I think it is hard to choose the ones to mention. There have been so many and they've been so varied. Dana has been a consultant to many state and federal agencies. He was asked to study the forestry school at Yale University and recommend reorganization. I worked with him on that study. He was a member of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. I suggest that anyone interested in Sam Dana's forestry achievements should see Henry Clepper's tribute in the Journal of Forestry and the story by Steve Spurr in American Forests.<sup>42</sup> Both of these came out last year to help mark Sam's ninetieth birthday.

<sup>42</sup> Henry Clepper, "A Salute to Samuel T. Dana," Journal of Forestry 71, no. 4 (April 1973): 200-2; Stephen H. Spurr, "Sam Dana," American Forests 79, no. 5 (May 1973): 20-2.

ERM: I have in my more than twenty years of study of North American forest history come to some conclusions about the importance of certain men who have played roles in that history. I feel from that study that Sam Dana is one of the really great men of forest history on this continent. I say that because I see in the record a whole wide range of contributions in research, in his establishing a research station in the Northeast; in education, what he did at Michigan; and in administration in the Forest Service during the time that he was in the Washington Office; in a wide range of both professional and lay groups that are a part of the forest related complex such as the American Forestry Association, where we are meeting today. But in any number of others also.

## FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS MOVED FROM AGRICULTURE TO INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES, 1956

- ERM: I'd now like to direct your attention to the matter of appropriations and I note that although the Forest Service is in the Department of Agriculture, you go to the Department of the Interior committees for appropriations. Why is this?
- McA: I was chief of the Forest Service at the time this change from Agriculture to Interior appropriations committees was made. This transfer of responsibilities started in the House of Representatives early in 1955 and was to become effective with the appropriations for the fiscal year 1956. House hearings for the Forest Service that year were held in February 1955. I think the Senate hearings were in April 1955. The first I knew of this transfer of appropriations functions was a telephone call from Congressman Jaimie Whitten of Mississippi who was at that time chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture appropriations. Mr. Whitten said that he had just discovered that this transfer had been ordered by Congressman Clarence Cannon of Missouri who was chairman of the full House Appropriations Committee. He asked me to come to his office and we had a long discussion of the matter. According to Whitten, Chairman Cannon wanted to put all public works appropriations under one subcommittee which he would head. The reasons for doing this, according to Mr. Whitten, were political.
- ERM: There was an obvious ploy there on the part of Chairman Cannon to hold sway over a very powerful political pork barrel.
- McA: In making this consolidation it was decided by Mr. Cannon to move appropriations responsibility for the Bureau of Reclamation from the subcommittee on Department of the Interior appropriations to the public works subcommittee. This move left too little appropriations in the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee to justify its continuation. I rather doubted this, but it is what Whitten told me. Whether that was the reason or whether it was that the chairman of the Interior subcommittee didn't want to lose authority over that much money, is probably not too important. What is significant is that Congressman Michael Kirwan of Ohio who was chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations demanded transfer to

his committee of something to replace the loss of the Bureau of Reclamation. According to Whitten, who had talked to Kirwan, no agency was specified, just total amount of money. I don't know if Kirwan was then chairman of the House group which controlled allocation of money for political campaigns, but apparently he did have considerable clout and he raised so much stink that Mr. Cannon told his full committee clerk to look around and find some agency with about the same amount of appropriations as the Bureau of Reclamation and to move that agency to Kirwan's committee.

ERM: That's a pretty good example of congressional horse trading.

McA: Or log rolling in the case of the Forest Service. Whitten told me that he had asked the committee clerk if Cannon had specified the Forest Service, and the clerk replied Cannon had said only to find some agency, any agency, that would make Kirwan whole again. The clerk had no knowledge of the background of previous proposals to transfer Forest Service functions from Agriculture to Interior, which had been going on for many years. Whitten assured me that it was pure happenstance that the clerk picked the Forest Service to be moved to Kirwan's committee.

I think that Whitten had been out of town when the transfer had been ordered by Cannon. I do remember that he said he had not been consulted, but had suddenly been confronted with an accomplished fact. Whitten didn't like losing so large a chunk from his committee responsibility, but the important thing to him was that Forest Service activities were agricultural in character and he felt they should be treated with other Agriculture responsibilities. He did not think that these belonged with the Interior committee.

Mr. Cannon had left town and Whitten couldn't find out where he could be reached. I never saw Jaimie Whitten so upset as he was with this transfer. He apparently talked to everyone he could get ahold of, and the longer he waited to find Cannon, the more upset he got. He telephoned me many times during the week he was trying to locate Mr. Cannon. Eventually he did reach him in Florida and I guess they had a vigorous exchange of ideas. Whitten told me that he couldn't move Cannon and would have to let the transfer stand.

Other members of Congress were also disturbed by this transfer of jurisdiction for appropriations even though this transfer concerned only appropriations. The upshot was that Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn stepped down from his chair (this is an unusual event) to assure members that this realignment of appropriations

responsibilities was in no way to be construed as indicating a possible transfer of the Forest Service from Agriculture to the Department of the Interior.

I don't remember the Congressional Record reference to this statement by Speaker Rayburn. I wrote a memorandum for Forest Service files with this reference and with the other information that I am giving you now. I suppose this memo has been long since discarded. I made a mistake in not having copies made for my personal files. My attitude was that if anything was worth recording it should go in the official files and I made no copies for myself.

Before we had our Senate appropriations hearings, I visited Senator Carl Hayden of Arizona who was chairman of the full Senate Appropriations Committee. I asked him how this unprecedented business would be handled in the Senate and said I hoped he would keep our hearings in the Agriculture subcommittee. He said that he thought they would follow the lead of the House since under the Constitution, the House had the responsibility for initiating action on appropriations. I may have looked distressed, because he smiled and said something like, "Don't worry about it, McArdle, because I'm going to be chairman of that subcommittee."

When we had our Senate hearings, Mr. Hayden started off with the statement that in order to keep the record straight the move of the Forest Service to a new Senate subcommittee was for no reason except to conform with a rearrangement of House Appropriations Committee responsibilities. This statement, at least, can be found in the Senate hearings for April 1955.

ERM: We know that for the last half a century there have been intermittent proposals to transfer the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, and I would imagine there are similar proposals now in process, and may be developed in the future. Could the fact that the appropriations were transferred to the Interior committee and processed there for a number of years be reason to press for such transfer action now?

McA: It could be. You can imagine people saying, "Many years ago Congress indicated its desire to make such a transfer by moving the all-important appropriations activities from the House and the Senate subcommittees dealing with agriculture to corresponding committees for the Department of the Interior." This statement would not be true, because as I've said, the move was made for an entirely different purpose.

ERM: If those surrounding circumstances and strongly put statements of the time are clearly identified and documented, any such claim would be discounted rather quickly, wouldn't it?

McA: I'd like to think so, but I don't know. People can twist things around to suit themselves. It is quite possible appropriations may never even be referred to. I think it is good to put it in the record here because, of the Forest Service people, I think I'm the only one who knows what I've just told you.



Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the U. S. Forest Service, 1957.

## PRESERVATION OF DOCUMENTS

### The chief's papers

ERM: I wonder whether some good purpose could be served by a confidential annual summary statement written by the chief, which could go into the archives of the Forest Service. I'm talking about the things that would be of great value to himself in future years of his administration, and for other chiefs as they follow him. Things such as what you have now recounted could be lost.

McA: I bet my memo on this has been lost. You only get one chance at bat, but if I could have another chance, I think I would do what you suggest. I made a mistake in not keeping copies of significant letters and other papers in a personal file.

ERM: I get the impression from some comments that you made in this interview that you have some feelings of distrust of the present system of preserving documentation; that many things that were created and which might have some real value to the Forest Service and to the public, may have been lost.

McA: I have this feeling but I'm not going to comment on it because I don't have up-to-date information on how material is selected from the files to go to archives or any other historical source.

ERM: Would you comment on what you think might be the best way of preserving the most important papers of the chiefs? What would you recommend be preserved and what would you throw away?

McA: I think it is difficult to know at the time what is going to be important and what is not going to be important. Some people in public office keep a copy of every letter they receive and every letter they send. This is one way of doing it. I think that we could preserve more of this correspondence without keeping all of it, like the routine day-to-day stuff. Since I started thinking about this interview I have wished many times that I could put my hands on letters or speeches or documents I can remember, but which I now can't locate and which the Forest Service seems to be having difficulty in locating for me.

ERM: Isn't that partly due to the fact that there isn't yet any really good archival hold on those records, even when they are deposited in the National Archives? They haven't been processed sufficiently so as to easily mine out what you need.

McA: I don't know how such things are handled in archives. If I could do it over I would try to find time to make a complete record of some events while the record was fresh in my mind, and while I had all the information at hand. You mentioned an annual statement. That's desirable but I would also try to make a more frequent record of some of these things, like legislation, important decisions, meetings, and then summarize these at appropriate times.

ERM: There are some logs created by the chief and staff that exist in the archives and which are tremendously valuable sources of the history of the Forest Service.

McA: I have recommended to John McGuire, the present chief, that he make a special effort to preserve certain things, such as his appointment calendar. Mine has been lost. If plans are not made to provide this kind of preservation, the preservation doesn't get done.

ERM: Wouldn't it be a proper function of any history office to perform that service for the chief, to advise the chief as to the kinds of material that should be carefully preserved? And also have such an officer regularly sit down with each of the chiefs and get down the best recollections those men have of their management of the agency.

McA: The trouble with this is that the day-to-day pressures make it virtually impossible to do it. Moreover, much of what should be recorded couldn't be done for the chief by a history office because they wouldn't have the information to prepare such a statement. The question is: Where will the chief find the time personally to put on record the things he wants to record?

### Importance of preservation

ERM: Back to what you said earlier, that some things are of such importance that you have to find the time to do them, even though it seems impossible. This kind of preservation of the best

recollections of men is a resource that should be conserved, just as the trees, a great resource to the people, have got to be conserved and wisely managed.

McA: There is no argument on that point. The only question that comes to mind is just how do we do it? I was thinking of making a record while matters are fresh in our minds, and while the necessary background information is available to be attached.

ERM: Doesn't it recommend itself to you as an idea that if it is a difficult problem it would be to the advantage of any agency of government and any administrative head of any agency to have at his beck and call someone who was a specialist in doing that kind of thing systematically, just as he has the help of other experts in legal counsel, public relations, or what have you?

McA: While I agree with you in many ways, I have to think back to my term as chief. I had enough people thinking up things for me to do without having one more.

ERM: Yes, but there always were one or two things more, and that has been the history of administration and decision making. The bigger the organization got and the more complex its tasks, the more difficult was the role played by the decision makers.

McA: There isn't any question that a better record should be kept of some of these important activities. Today we are forced to rely not on good summaries made at the time, but on digging through files, which may or may not contain what we need. It takes a tremendous amount of time and we don't always get what we are looking for.

ERM: I think this is all wrapped up in the American male syndrome. Most of us are so much involved in the current day's affairs that we really don't give too much thought to clarifying our recollections of each day so that we can set them down in a form that will help in six months or two years hence. Part of this is because we are involved with the present and in planning the future. This is a part of our training from the time we are youngsters. We are oriented to thinking in terms of going over the top into the future and not spending too much time looking back over our shoulders at the past. There is associated with that going forward, a notion of good old red-blooded American manhood, and anything that's looking over the shoulder to the past is associated with being effeminate, little old ladies in tennis shoes, and little old men over the hill. We don't want to be associated with that, we want to be associated with the go-go thing. We lose sight of something very important

in adopting that philosophy. We fail to give adequate recognition to the fact that the thing that distinguishes us from all the other animals is that we are the memory animal. We are the animal that depends for his judgment on what he is doing now and what he is going to plan to do in the future upon what he recalls from his experience and from that he can draw from the experience of others he respects. I think we give short shrift to the resource of human experience. Do I make my point clear?

McA: Yes, I think so.

### Louis Brownlow on Harold Ickes

This discussion of keeping records for historical purposes makes me think of Louis Brownlow's story of Harold Ickes and his diaries – I think Brownlow said it was diaries. When I retired from the Forest Service, John Macy, chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, asked me to take charge of a project for sending bright, young, federal, state, and municipal employees to college for a year of broadening education in preparation for advancement in administrative positions. To receive the rather large grant of money Macy had obtained from the Ford Foundation, I had to reactivate the National Institute of Public Affairs. My two years with NIPA would make an interesting story but this is not the place for it. Among other things I had to reorganize the NIPA board of trustees. The former chairman of the board was Louis Brownlow, a remarkable man then in his mid-eighties. Brownlow had been editor of two newspapers, a city manager (the first in the country, I believe), chairman of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners which in effect made him mayor of Washington, and had held many other important positions. I used to take Brownlow to lunch, partly to dig out information about NIPA but also because he was full of interesting stories.

One day Brownlow said, "I've been reading some publications of Harold Ickes and I swear I don't know whether Harold put things down as they actually happened or as he thought they should have happened. Last night, for example, I read Harold's account of a conversation he had with President (Franklin D.) Roosevelt and what he says isn't the way I heard it. I was there."

I asked Brownlow to go on. He said, "Well, this is something you will have to take my word for because FDR is dead and so is Ickes. There were only the three of us present when Ickes says this conversation took place. I was in FDR's office discussing a study of government organization. There were three of us working on this: Frederic Delano, the president's uncle, Charles (E.) Merriam and I. This was an early day version of the Hoover Commission." Here Brownlow wandered off on a long description of this study, which he insisted was organization and not reorganization. After I got him back on the track he said, "Suddenly the door burst open and Harold Ickes rushed in. You know, you don't enter the president's office without an appointment and without being announced so FDR was startled. Ickes came over to the desk where FDR and I were working and pounded on it with both fists. He literally shouted at the president, "You promised me you would transfer the Forest Service to my department and I want to know when you are going to do it."

Brownlow continued, "I never saw FDR so angry. His face turned white and for what seemed like a long time he was unable to speak. Finally he said very quietly but I thought his voice trembled, 'Harold, I have never promised you anything of the kind. Now I want you to turn around and go out of this room. And I don't want you to come back until I send for you. Now go!' Well, you know, last night I read Ickes's account of this meeting and he says, 'Today the president again faithfully promised me to transfer the Forest Service from Agriculture to my department.'"

ERM: This is a conversation that should have been recorded and preserved.

McA: I thought so, too. When I got back to the NIPA office, I wrote the story about as I've told it to you and sent it to Clint Davis who was then head of the information division (Division of Information and Education) in the Forest Service. I suggested that we take a tape recorder and go see Brownlow. But I was busy and forgot to keep after Davis. It wasn't very long after this that Brownlow died. I was one of the pallbearers and after the funeral I telephoned Davis. I told him that we had missed a bet and that my memo to him should be preserved. Davis said he had been keeping it on his desk to remind him to do something about it but in an hour he called back to say that the memo had been lost.

A week or so ago I was reading a book called The Politics of Conservation by a former director of TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) and he says that Roosevelt never officially endorsed

the Ickes proposal to transfer the Forest Service, nor did he prohibit other administration people from actively opposing it.<sup>43</sup> So maybe Brownlow was right. I was mixed up in this squabble and I always thought FDR approved although I had no personal knowledge of it.

ERM: You could probably set down a catalog of Brownlow stories, knowing him as intimately as you did. Since we're batting on the Ickes wicket maybe you can think of another Brownlow story about the famous curmudgeon.

McA: Brownlow told me another story about Harold Ickes that might be of some interest. Brownlow had been Washington correspondent for several newspapers and a newspaper syndicate. He said the Forest Service was on his beat and that one day (I think this must have been in 1906 but I am not certain) when he called at Pinchot's office he found GP and his main assistant, Overton Price, engaged in working up a plan to improve public knowledge of the Forest Service. I suppose today we would call this improving the image or something like that. Pinchot asked Brownlow if he knew of a prominent person who would allow his name to be used as honorary head of this project and who might also be willing to contribute some money.

Brownlow said, "I told Mr. Pinchot that Mr. Charles Dawes of Chicago might be willing to allow his name to be used if Pinchot thought he would be prominent enough. Pinchot said Mr. Dawes would be a splendid choice but he didn't know him. So I offered to write to Mr. Dawes and see how he felt. I did this and Mr. Dawes wrote back and said he would let his name be used on one condition, that he not be asked to do anything. He also offered to donate some money. In a postscript to his letter Mr. Dawes said he wasn't attaching any strings to his offer but there was a bright young man in Chicago in whom he was much interested. If Mr. Pinchot could use this young man in his proposed campaign to create a favorable impression of the Forest Service, he would be pleased and grateful. Mr. Dawes said the young man's name was Harold Ickes."

<sup>43</sup> Frank E. Smith, The Politics of Conservation, (New York: Random House, 1966) p. 267.

ERVIN L. PETERSON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, 1954 TO 1960

ERM: Ervin L. Peterson took Assistant Secretary of Agriculture (James Earl) Coke's place. I wonder if you would comment on this man's importance during your time as chief of the Forest Service, in interdepartmental affairs, in working relationships with the White House, the Congress, and other groups outside of government. How do you appraise Ervin L. Peterson?

McA: I rank Pete Peterson very high. He was a lifesaver to the Forest Service in more ways than one: because of his interest in what we were doing, his knowledge of what we were trying to do, his recognition of all the surrounding circumstances and his willingness to make decisions and to back us up when he thought we were right. There was nothing wishy-washy about Ervin L. Peterson. He came from near Marshfield, Oregon, and served in various capacities in state government and in local government before he came to Washington. He was certainly a splendid choice for assistant secretary to supervise the work of the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, and several other agencies of the Department. He is still in the Department of Agriculture. He is head of one of the bureaus and I see him rather frequently. I don't know what other information you want on this question.

ERM: How important is it to have a man of his caliber and interest in that particular post in the Department of Agriculture?

McA: I don't know that I could find the words to say how important this is. You see, before the (Ezra Taft) Benson administration, the chief of the Forest Service reported directly to the secretary. After Mr. Benson reorganized the Department, the work of the Department was delegated to a number of assistant secretaries each with a number of bureaus under his wing. Well, if we must deal with the secretary through these people, it is very important that we have confidence in them and that they have confidence in us because then when decisions are made by the secretary, they are made on the basis of the assistant secretary's presentation to the secretary, not our presentation. Peterson and I, I think, made a very good team when we went to the Hill to testify on various proposed pieces of legislation. Pete took

the political aspects and I took the technical aspects and if I got stymied and didn't know the answer right off the bat, Pete would jump in and take it away from me and keep the attention of the committee diverted for a couple of minutes while I searched for the proper answer and then I'd get back in the picture. And if he got into difficulties on the political aspect, maybe I could help him by taking the ball away from him for a moment. This was something that was new to the Forest Service. It had not existed previously when no one from the secretary's office would go with the Forest Service to testify on important proposed legislation. We were no longer entirely on our own and having an assistant secretary, a knowledgeable, competent assistant secretary, go along with us was no hardship at all. It worked fine. It wouldn't work well if the assistant secretary wasn't competent.

## OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LANDS

ERM: Another subject I want to explore is the O&C controverted lands. How was the impasse in this troublesome problem resolved? This was done during your time as chief. Before you tell what you did, I suggest you give some background information on this subject.

McA: Soon after the end of the Civil War Congress granted the Oregon and California Railroad Company a large acreage of land in western Oregon as an incentive to construct a railroad from Portland to the California line.<sup>44</sup> This land was the odd-numbered mile-square sections in a strip twenty miles wide on each side of the proposed railroad. In addition, lieu selections could be made in another strip ten miles wide on each side of the main grant. The terms of the grant required that any land sold must go to actual settlers for not more than \$2.50 an acre and no one purchaser could buy more than 160 acres.

These conditions were flagrantly violated. In 1916 Congress revested in the United States title to all unsold lands to which the railroad had received patent or to which it was entitled to receive patent.<sup>45</sup> Congress also provided for disposal of these revested lands by the Department of the Interior. As I remember it, about 2 1/2 million acres, including some of the finest timberland in Oregon, was involved in the revestment.

This story does not concern the lands in the main grant, that is, in the twenty-mile strips on each side of the railroad. The so-called controverted lands were in the two ten-mile strips outside the main grant. Within these ten-mile strips 465,000 acres had been

<sup>44</sup> Act of 25 July 1866, 14 Stat. 239.

<sup>45</sup> Chamberlain-Ferris Act of 9 June 1916, 39 Stat. 218.

patented by the railroad company and no patents were pending at the time of revestment. I don't remember all the legal questions involved and I'd only confuse this story by reciting the ones I do remember. I think it's enough to say that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior claimed jurisdiction over these 465,000 acres of fine timberland.

Along about 1939 Agriculture and Interior reached agreement that the Forest Service would continue to administer these lands but receipts from sale of timber would be put in a special fund until the jurisdictional problem could be solved. Eighteen Oregon counties had a considerable interest in the outcome of this dispute. If the controverted lands were ruled to be national forest, the counties in which these lands were located would receive 25 percent of gross receipts from sale of timber. If the controverted lands were ruled to be regular Oregon and California grant lands, such as those within the twenty-mile strips of the main grant, the counties would receive 75 percent of receipts. I have forgotten how much money was in the special fund when I became chief in 1952 but it was up in the millions of dollars and increasing very rapidly.

ERM: I'm surprised that no attempts had been made long before your time as chief to resolve this dispute.

McA: Over the years numerous bills had been introduced in Congress in attempts to resolve the jurisdictional dispute. It was only in part a dispute between two government departments. Many people in and out of government were strongly opposed to giving these few counties so large a percentage of income received from sale of public property.

The advice that Chief Watts got from his Department of Agriculture legal advisor was that these 465,000 acres were national forest, that the railroad company had not been entitled to patent them and that they were not included in the lands to be administered by the Department of the Interior. Watts felt obligated to follow this advice. Having been regional forester in Oregon, he was well acquainted with the O&C land problem. His personal belief was that these were national forest lands and should not be transferred to Interior.

Senator Guy Cordon and Representative (Mathew) Harris Ellsworth, both of Oregon, wanted to settle the impasse by new legislation, which would take these lands out of Forest Service control. Agriculture wanted a court decision. In a sense Watts was caught between two fires. His refusal to agree with Cordon and Ellsworth

resulted in bitter feelings between the two congressmen and Watts. I am not sure they were on speaking terms when Watts retired.

When I became chief I decided the impasse had to be broken somehow, I had lived in Oregon and had seen the whole O&C land situation at first hand. The problem really was more than the controverted land dispute. The O&C lands were intermingled with national forest lands. This made administration of both kinds of land difficult. If the two jurisdictions could be blocked up by land exchanges administration would be immensely easier and less complicated. Many difficulties were in the way of doing this. For one thing, I doubted if I had legal authority to make these particular exchanges. The counties were suspicious of any land exchanges because there was variation in the kind and amount of timber on all of these lands and therefore differences in value. Even so, I decided that the problem we must solve must include a directive to block up the two kinds of land. To get such a directive would require legislation, so I went to see Senator Cordon. I told him a judicial decision would take several years. I told him why I thought legislation would be needed. I said I had no strong feelings about whether the counties should get 25 or 75 percent of receipts; my main concern was to keep these 465,000 acres in national forest status and next most important to block up the two kinds of lands. I suggested that my side and his side each give a little.

ERM: How did Senator Cordon react to your proposal?

McA: Cordon said he was suspicious of my motives. He asked Ellsworth to come over and join our discussion. Ellsworth said he wanted no part of it. I suggested to Cordon that the only way I could erase his suspicions was to react to a specific proposal by him. I explained what I thought our objectives should be and said I was open to any counterproposal. After a great deal of discussion we came up with a legislative proposal that declared these controverted lands to be revested O&C grant lands which were to continue under administration by the secretary of agriculture. The proposal also directed that the land exchanges I wanted must be made within two years. This proposal became law.<sup>46</sup> It may not have satisfied everybody but it was a workable solution. It broke an impasse that was rapidly becoming more difficult to live with and it helped additionally by blocking up some of the intermingled O&C and national forest lands.

<sup>46</sup> Act of 24 June 1954, 68 Stat. 270.

There is a second ending to this story. Some years later my legal advisor told me that he was mistaken in believing that the controverted lands would be ruled national forest if this matter had gone to a court decision. This change of opinion came about through a decision in the Aztec Land and Cattle Company case in Arizona. If I remember correctly that case went as far as the Supreme Court and we lost. So maybe I did the right thing in going contrary to the opinion of my legal advisor. I don't recall another instance where I went contrary to his advice. I felt I had to follow my own opinion in order to settle an onerous administrative problem.

ERM: It is interesting to note that in making the decision on strip mining/ you followed the advice of your legal advisor and in the O&C case you did not.

McA: Well, I guess I should break down and admit that in the O&C case I wasn't straying so very far from expert legal opinion. I did what Watts evidently did not do; I consulted other lawyers in the Department's legal office. I found that the advisor assigned to the Forest Service was almost the only one who believed that a court decision would favor the Forest Service. I wasn't flying too high with my own wings.

ERM: What did Senator Cordon and Representative Ellsworth seek in getting the O&C lands administered by the Forest Service turned over to another federal agency? The higher rate of return to the counties?

McA: On the matter of more or less income to the counties, I can give you only an opinion. I am sure that neither Cordon nor Ellsworth considered it would be to their personal advantage to have these counties get 75 percent of receipts. I do think it helped them politically.

ERM: I can't imagine anything making more votes than a greater income.

McA: At the time I could have argued either way. There was some reason to believe that giving only a few counties more money might not help Cordon and Ellsworth politically. I don't think either man was trying to get more votes. I believe they were trying to do what they thought was the right thing to do.

ERM: Did they have much support from their colleagues in Congress, and if so, from what quarter did it come? What other persons in the Congress were inclined to aid them in this pursuit?

- McA: I am not competent to answer that question because I simply don't know what conversations they may have had with their colleagues. To the best of my knowledge and memory, the proposals they had in mind had not attracted a great deal of attention in Congress. I think it was considered purely a local matter.
- ERM: Did this controversy divide on party lines or not? What were the political stakes involved?
- McA: No, not so far as I know. Both Cordon and Ellsworth were members of the same political party.
- ERM: How does a career man seek to insulate himself against such political scraps? Especially at the higher levels of administration that you operated in? What built-in protection does the system provide and is it always adequate?
- McA: The answer to that question is that they'd like to insulate themselves from such disputes but can't always do it. They have to be involved and that's all there is to it. You take them as part of the work.
- ERM: This system does not provide any built-in protection to them.
- McA: It would be very easy in responding to this question to get off on quite a long harangue on politics as these affect the career service. I'd like to avoid that not because I'm hesitant to talk about it, but because it does get into a lot of words and whether or not they would be of any value here is questionable in my mind. I was a career civil servant employee. It would have been difficult for the secretary of agriculture to discharge me out of hand except for something very, very serious, but nevertheless, he could have done this if he had wanted to. One device that has been used would be simply to offer me a position of corresponding grade and salary somewhere else. Under Civil Service rules I would have been obliged to accept that offer. Then that position, after six months or so, could be eliminated and I would be out. Civil Service does offer some built-in protection but, as you see, it can sometimes be more apparent than real.
- ERM: What have been your own political inclinations over your lifetime in and out of government?
- McA: I don't think that career employees in certain jobs either can or should seek to divorce themselves from some of these political questions. I didn't. I don't think my predecessor did. There is no

reason to do this. These political disputes are the facts of life. They are coming up all the time, almost every major decision that I made had political overtones of one kind or another. I didn't make decisions on a political basis. I avoided this as I would the plague. Those decisions that involved politics were made by the secretary of agriculture, the assistant secretary of agriculture, or some other person whose responsibility was in the political field. My responsibility was not in that field and I wouldn't have been allowed to make such decisions even if I had wanted to. This is what I meant a little while ago when I said that Assistant Secretary Peterson and I made a good team when we testified before members of congressional committees because he would take the political aspects of a question and I would take the technical parts. I don't know if this answers your question or not.

## THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THE FOREST SERVICE

ERM: In relation to decision making in matters of strip mining and the O&C lands, you have referred to seeking counsel from legal experts. What other inputs were there to you in this decision making process? Could you describe how that process worked under your administration?

McA: Many kinds of advice are brought into the decision-making process. Take a decision for a major Forest Service policy, for example. A letter would be sent to our field people explaining the purpose of the policy. We asked for comments and advice on whether this policy should be established and how it should be worded. Before a major Forest Service policy was finally established advice was sought clear to the ground level, if we needed to go so far.

Frequently after getting opinions inside the Forest Service, advice on a proposed policy would be sought from outside the Service from a few, to many individuals and groups. We might ask a small task force to bring all comments together and prepare in semi-final form the proposed regulation or policy. This was brought to the chief's staff consisting of myself and the six assistant chiefs. We would spend as much time as seemed necessary to discuss the proposal. It might then be necessary to seek additional advice inside the Forest Service or in the secretary's office of the Department of Agriculture or some other unit of Agriculture. And we might again ask for advice from outside of government, from organizations, user groups, and advisory committees, before any final decision was made. Sometimes there were public hearings. Eventually the policy was developed in final form, was given tentative approval, and might again be sent to our field offices for advice. On some matters the proposal was announced in the Federal Register and comments invited. The advice we got on this final go around was then cranked into the final write up of the policy.

ERM: How were you as chief assured of the transmittal of all of that material on down the line? Might it not get screened out at each higher level by someone superior to the one below who had rendered a comment?

McA: That is an important question and it always gave me some concern. Assume that we are talking of national forests. I'll first explain the national forest administration chain of command. The chain of command is short coupled. It includes only the chief, the regional foresters, the forest supervisors, and the district rangers. I thought that the movement up and down this chain should be free and unimpeded. It is very difficult for the chief to consider all of the advice he might get on any particular question. In addition to the then 804 district rangers, 145 forest supervisors, and 10 regional foresters, the staff men were brought into the picture at each of these levels. In the Washington Office our division chiefs and their staffs were brought into the discussions. So conceivably any question concerning policy or administration which I might want advice on could be put to 20,000 people, and I would consider 20,000 individual answers. Obviously, I couldn't do that. So I had to depend on the chain of command in the national forest system, when the question concerned national forests, to do some screening, to assemble and summarize points of view. Not all questions needed to go to everybody, either.

I'm sure you realize that we are just darting around the edges of the extremely important subject of decision making. We can't do much more in an interview covering many important subjects. But I must make one thing clear before we leave the subject of decision making. No matter how much advice I got before making a decision, when the time came to make a decision, I was the one who made it. It was not a vote by my staff people although I always paid particular attention to their views. It was a one-man decision and I had to take the responsibility for making it and I had to live with it if it turned out to be the wrong decision. This responsibility cannot be abdicated. If it was a regional forester decision, he alone made it and accepted responsibility for it. And so on along the chain of command. There is a lot of loose talk these days about decision making and I don't want our discussion to end on a loose note.

ERM: I agree. But something you said prompts the comment that in any organization it is important to have freedom of access to the boss. Many organizations don't have this. How is it in the Forest Service?

McA: During my tenure as chief my door was always open and anybody could walk in and speak his piece. That was done on a good many occasions. I remember when one of the assistant chiefs came in and told me in polite language that he thought I was wrong and had made a mistake. He was forceful but polite. I recognized that he

was right and I was wrong. I said so and promised to mend my ways. Then another man came in who was a long ways from being an assistant chief. He didn't bother to sit down when he came in. He said, "I came in here to give you hell," and he proceeded to do it. I didn't tell him that I had already been reprimanded. I sat there and took it, told him he was right and I was wrong, and that I would not do it again. I've forgotten now what it was. The point is that two Forest Service people felt free to say what they thought.

I recognize that in any big organization there is always a reluctance on the part of the person far down the line to break in on the boss and offer him unsolicited advice. You've got organizational and office politics, the chain of command, and so on. You can have an open-door policy but people may not use it.

ERM: And you've got an established methodology that's set up and that is hard to buck. For example, statistical reports, the substance and real meaning of which may be deceiving rather than revealing. Let's assume somebody at the ground level sees that there is something not very meaningful about perpetuation of certain reports in their present form and he says so to his superior. The superior might say, "We've been doing it that way for a long time, we like it that way, don't rock the boat." Yet the fellow might persist in finding fault with the system and he's likely to get his neck in the noose and suffer a career setback severe for him and for the organization itself.

McA: Such a situation does prevail in public and in private organizations, too. The larger they are the more you find it. In the Forest Service, we tried to get around that and we succeeded in large part, I think. I gave people an opportunity to talk with me privately as I went visiting around the country. I sought opportunities to speak privately with individuals. I think they felt free to say what they pleased. You have to consider that the man at the end of the line may have a valuable opinion; on the other hand, his experience is not great, usually. So some of these ideas do need filtering as they go up the line.

I tried to operate the Forest Service not only on the basis that suggestions for betterment were welcome, but on the basis that suggestions for betterment were damned well expected. No organization has ever solved this problem adequately. We did the best we could to seek advice.

ERM: You pick up things from outside advice. If some of the basic criticisms that might be reflected in the opinions of your people at

the lower level fail to run the gamut of the chain of command, they tend to leak out to people in the local community who are not in the Forest Service. Thus they rise to your attention through other channels.

McA: I'm afraid they do. Frequently, I had more advice than I knew what to do with. But an honest attempt was made to obtain advice from all those concerned before making an important decision. There were also many decisions I had to make immediately without being able to get advice.

ERM: This is all part of the horrors of decision making. Those encountered by administrators in the Forest Service are not much different from those in other government agencies or private enterprise. I expect now you can see this from the standpoint of one who is involved in private enterprise.

McA: There actually aren't a lot of differences. Private industry has the same problems of seeking guidance and counsel from people along the line and from outside the organization. But I think that the Forest Service does a better job than is ordinarily done in private industry. Private industry decisions are likely to be made at the highest level and are handed out without advance consultation or opportunity to change or better them.

## MULTIPLE USE MINING ACT, 1955

### The mining claim problem

ERM: At our first interview some months ago I asked you to name what in your view were some of the major accomplishments during your term as chief. One of these is the Multiple Use Mining Act.<sup>47</sup> Just to get our record clear, was all of the action toward getting this legislation taken during your ten years as chief? That was 1953 to 1962. Is that correct?

McA: Yes, from July 1, 1952 to March 17, 1962. As to your first question, I believe the first steps toward getting legislation such as the Multiple Use Mining Act were taken in 1950 when Lyle Watts was chief. He was the one who really started action on mining claims. There were discussions before 1950 but I have never seen evidence of specific action leading to legislation. While we are getting the record clear, I'd like to make it plain that credit for getting this legislation shouldn't be laid at my door. I was only one of many working for this end. A lot of people worked at it. I think Ed Crafts should have most of the credit. He was the guiding genius and did most of the work. I suggest that the reason for including this subject be not what I did but simply that this occurred while I was serving as chief.

ERM: That's not the point I want to make. It's true that this law was passed while you were chief but the reason why I want to discuss this subject is its considerable importance. Didn't this act help to solve a very troublesome problem in administration of the national forests? What was this problem?

McA: It was most helpful in clearing up a difficult problem. What the act did was to re-establish the rights of both mining claimants and the government with respect to surface resources of unpatented

<sup>47</sup> Multiple Use Mining Act of 23 July 1955, 69 Stat. 367, as amended.

mining claims. This problem did, of course, exist prior to 1950 but the urgent need for solution did not arise until the late 1940s.

ERM: That's what I wanted to bring out. I wish you'd expand your answer a bit so that right at the start we will have a clear idea of the problem this mining law was aimed at.

McA: The mining claim problem of the 1940s and 1950s arose from two rather different causes. One of these was the uranium boom which started about 1948 and lasted about ten years with a peak of activity around 1953 to 1957. The discovery of uranium and other fissionable materials caused tremendous interest in staking out mining claims with the objective of making a fortune in nothing flat. Drugstores in the Southwest rented Geiger counters; high school students spent their weekends searching for likely uranium prospects; any road the Forest Service built for access to timber or to recreational sites would be surrounded by newly staked claims of people who thought the road was going to some new uranium discovery. I haven't looked up the exact figures but my guess is that before this boom only a few hundred mining claims were staked on the national forests each year. After the boom started tens of thousands of claims were staked each year. The Forest Service never objected to legitimate prospecting and mining. The uranium claims fell in this class. Very few of these claims, however, were ever worked. But forever and a day they would be an encumbrance to any other use of the surface – for timber sales, recreation, roads, or whatnot. There was no way to fully clarify this situation legally so other uses would not be hindered.

The other cause was a rapidly growing interest in acquiring national forest land for summer homes, filling stations, curio shops and many other purposes. There was always this kind of interest but following World War II this interest increased greatly. Probable reasons were more and better roads, better cars, more leisure time and so forth. All this came with the boom in recreational use of the national forests in the late 1940s. The demand for summer home sites, for example, was many, many times more than the Forest Service could provide. Needs for mass recreational use of the national forests also made it necessary to curtail the summer home program and to give it low priority. Unscrupulous developers took advantage of this situation by staking out mining claims along lake shores and almost immediately selling lots in the subdivided claims. Sure, it was illegal to sell these lots but they did. Groups of selfish sportsmen ignored mass recreational needs and staked out adjoining claims along rivers and in this way created their own private fishing waters. New cross-country highways brought in service stations

which attempted to locate on national forest lands by filing mining claims. I can't remember how many times we had to move the junction of U.S. 66 with the access road to Grand Canyon National Park because a filling station operator staked out mining claims at this junction. In many instances the claimants in this group that I say were misusing the mining laws resorted to fraudulent statements and fraudulent actions in order to obtain patent. They had no intention of mining. What they wanted, and this is why a patent was essential, was something other than minerals, for example, a valuable stand of timber or a summer home site. Our biggest problem was with these claims established in outright abuse of the mining laws. Legally, these claims could be eliminated but the process was onerous, expensive, and time-consuming. This was mainly a BLM (Bureau of Land Management) job and BLM did the best it could but there were simply so many of these claims that the legal process of tossing off claimants was more than BLM could handle.

ERM: Can you give me some idea of how many mining claims, legitimate or, you might say, illegitimate, there were?

McA: No one ever knew, exactly. In preparation for our discussion I tried to dig out some information to help refresh my memory. I think I have something on that in my notes. Yes, here it is. As of January 1, 1952 the Forest Service estimated 84,050 unpatented mining claims on the national forests. Only three years later, on January 1, 1955 we estimated 166,200 claims. In May 1955 Agriculture Under Secretary (True D.) Morse wrote: "The number of claims is snowballing so fast that the situation on the national forests is rapidly getting out of hand. . . . new claims are being filed at the rate of about 5,000 a month."<sup>48</sup> As a matter of fact, all these estimates were low: when the Forest Service completed its survey a few years later more than a million claims were found.

ERM: I want to be sure I understand this. Couldn't a mining claim be patented?

McA: Oh yes, it could go to patent if there really were minerals on it. After it was patented it became fully owned private property and the Forest Service treated it as such. That wasn't the root of our

<sup>48</sup> Report of Secretary of Agriculture on S. 1713, May 17, 1955. (In Report to Accompany S. 1713, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate Report No. 554, 84th Cong., 1st sess., June 15, 1955.)

trouble. Our main trouble was not with patented claims but with unpatented claims. The basic problem was that relatively few claims went to patent. It was not obligatory that patent be sought. The claims could be held forever simply by doing \$100 worth of assessment work each year – and Congress had waived even this modest requirement almost continuously. Another prospector could jump a claim on which development work was not done, but the government could not get rid of unpatented claims not actually being worked for minerals.

### Attempt at a solution

In the early days of the Forest Service none of this was much of a problem except in isolated instances. And usually something could be worked out on those few. In many miles of travel on western national forests from the early 1920s onward, I rarely heard much talk of mining claim difficulty. There was some but not much because at that time there wasn't much staking of fraudulent claims and there weren't many claims of any kind.

After I moved to Washington in 1944 I don't recall hearing much discussion of the mining claim problem until about 1947 or 1948. It may have come up at chief's staff meetings when I was absent and it may have come up at the annual regional forester-station director meetings. I just don't remember if it did come up. I think I'd have to say that all of us were unprepared for what happened after World War II. I don't mean that we didn't try to deal with the situation. I'm saying that the problem suddenly became so immense that we hadn't the manpower or the money to make much of an impression. And we had legal obstacles in our way which would have been difficult or impossible to surmount even if we'd had money and manpower.

In the late 1940s I recall hearing various remedies discussed in chief's staff meetings. It soon became evident that we had a sort of two-headed problem. One part was to obtain freedom to manage the surface resources of mining claims prior to patent. The other part was to get rid of fraudulent claims and legitimate but abandoned claims more expeditiously than was then possible. We decided that a change in the basic mining laws was necessary. The basic mining laws of 1872 had not been changed despite

attempts to do so for one reason or another.<sup>49</sup> The mining industry was vigorously opposed to any changes.

ERM: What did you decide to do?

McA: I didn't decide anything. Lyle Watts was chief then. Watts decided to seek a change in the 1872 mining laws by giving major emphasis to abuses of those laws. He wanted information that could be used to influence public opinion. To get this information he hired G.B. MacDonald, retired head of the forestry school at Ames, Iowa. To give MacDonald's work more prestige, Watts arranged to have the assignment made to the National Forest Advisory Council, a group of prominent, non-Forest Service people. This assignment was made by the secretary of agriculture.<sup>50</sup> So far as I know this is the first time a vigorous step was taken to meet the situation that the Multiple Use Mining Act eventually solved.

#### Aroused public opinion

ERM: I see. You'd say then, that the starting point for what became the Multiple-Use Mining Law was about mid-1950? Is that right?

McA: In looking back after almost a quarter of a century I am not sure where it was. There probably was not a definite starting point. As the problem was solved largely by building public opinion, I think perhaps the breaking point came in 1952. I don't think there was much national publicity before 1952 – perhaps because there was not a large problem much before that time.

<sup>49</sup> Act of 10 May 1872, 17 Stat. 91.

<sup>50</sup> Letter of 28 June 1950 designated the National Forest Advisory Council: Dr. Jonathan Forman, Professor of Medicine, Ohio State University; Dr. Roland R. Renne, President, Montana State University; Professor G. B. MacDonald, retired head of forestry school, Iowa State University, (Washington, D.C.: Department of Agriculture.)

ERM: Can you recall any of that early publicity?<sup>51</sup>

McA: I can recall no publicity of nationwide distribution until 1952 when the American Forestry Association published several articles in American Forests.<sup>52</sup> These articles were by Cleveland van Dresser. There was also an editorial. So far as I know these articles by van Dresser were not the result of a definite, planned campaign by the American Forestry Association. I think van Dresser, a professional writer, saw an opportunity to write some articles and sold them to American Forests. Later on I think he became genuinely disturbed by what he had seen.

ERM: Was AFA the only organization to publicize this problem?

McA: There wasn't a great deal of publicity in 1952. C.M. Granger, a former assistant chief of the Forest Service, published an article in the Journal of Forestry.<sup>53</sup> At this time, I suppose the Journal of Forestry had a circulation of about 15,000 and to a rather restricted audience, mostly foresters. American Forests then had a circulation of about 25,000 to a wider but still rather restricted audience. An article by van Dresser in Sports Afield in May 1952 undoubtedly had many times more reader exposure than the articles in the two forestry magazines. The Outdoor Writers Association passed a

<sup>51</sup> Not available at the time of the interview was a Packet of Material on Application of Mining Laws to National Forests, Prepared at the request of a Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, 82d Cong. (Forest Service, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1952).

<sup>52</sup> Cleveland van Dresser, "Abuses Under the Mining Laws: Plunder in the National Forests," American Forests 58, no. 1 (January 1952): 6-9; "Abuses Under the Mining Laws II: Pumice- Despoiler of the Santa Fe," AF 58, no. 2 (February 1952): 20-2, 49-52; "Abuses Under the Mining Laws III: You're Being Robbed," AF 58, no. 3 (March 1952): 20-2, 42-4; "Editorial: Let's Stop the Land Grab," AF 58, no. 1 (January 1952): 48.

<sup>53</sup> C. M. Granger, "Mining Claims on the National Forests: It's Time to Take Another Look," Journal of Forestry 50, no. 5 (May 1952): 355-8.

resolution on this subject in June. I don't know of any other publicity in 1952 although there probably was some.

#### Congressional activity during the McArdle years

ERM: I think you said that Watts retired at the end of June 1952. Did you pick up the torch from Watts?

McA: I suppose you mean the mining law torch. I spent nearly all of my first six months as chief on trips through the western national forests. I heard and saw a lot about the mining claim situation. I couldn't have avoided this even if I had wanted to. Everywhere I went just about every Forest Service man sought to impress me with the urgent need to do something about mining claims and to do it fast. I don't mean to say that previously few Forest Service people had been concerned. My point is that the big upsurge in staking claims had started.

ERM: National elections were that fall. Eisenhower was elected president and, if I remember correctly, control of both Houses of Congress passed to the Republicans. Did this change in administration and in Congress favor or hinder your effort to revise the mining laws?

McA: Opinion was that the new Congress and the new administration would be strongly pro-industry and would not favor a change in the mining laws if the mining industry didn't want a change. That was my opinion, also. It is essential to understand, as I think I mentioned earlier, that the only real solution to this mining claim problem was to modify the basic mining laws. We knew this would be difficult to do.

ERM: I believe this brings us to 1953. Now what?

McA: As soon as Congress had reorganized itself in January of 1953, I discussed the mining claim problem with various members of Congress. I got the best reception from Congressman Clifford Hope of Kansas, the new chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Mr. Hope said quite frankly that if the mining industry opposed change in the mining laws there probably was no chance at all of getting these laws changed. He thought the mining

industry would be opposed. He also pointed out what I already knew, that mining on western national forests was a matter for the Interior committees. I had talked to Clair Engle, chairman of the House Interior Committee. He was not disposed to do anything. I didn't know (Thomas J.) Murray, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, but I did know Senator (George D.) Aiken, Senator (Clinton P.) Anderson, and others, and I talked this matter over with them. All agreed as to the problem but no one was willing to do anything about it. Those early days of 1953 were lively times with the first major change in Congress and the national administration for twenty years. Members of Congress had other things on their minds and felt that they had more important things to do. I made little progress. Finally, Congressman Hope said something like this: "We probably won't get very far but I'll introduce a bill and hold hearings on it. If we can stir up enough interest, it may throw a scare into the mining people, and we may be able to get something started."

He did introduce a bill and did hold hearings as he had said he would. I testified for the Forest Service and the Department. There may have been other hearings in the field, but my memory is blank on that.<sup>54</sup>

ERM: Was this the first bill to be introduced on the mining claim problem?

McA: No, I don't think so. Congressman (Harold D.) Cooley, the previous chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, introduced a bill in 1952 and so did Senator Anderson of New Mexico.<sup>55</sup> But there never was much, if any, publicity on either bill.

ERM: To get back to Mr. Hope's bill. Can you remember anything about the hearings?

McA: I can remember more than you'd want to bother with here. Nearly 100 people testified in person and a good many others sent letters and telegrams. Witnesses were members of Congress, representatives of the Audubon Society, Sierra Club, National Parks Association, Society of American Foresters, American Forestry Association, labor unions, sportsmen's associations, newspapers, and many other groups and individuals. Not all witnesses favored the bill but the sentiment was so overwhelmingly in favor of it that opponents

<sup>54</sup> U.S., Congress, House, HR 5358, 83d Cong., 1st sess., 1953. Hearings on this bill were held in July 1953.

<sup>55</sup> U.S., Congress, HR 7023, S 2866, 82d Cong., 2d sess., 1952.

were snowed under. Hope's bill applied only to the national forests, and I made Professor (G.B.) MacDonald's report a part of my testimony.<sup>56</sup>

ERM: I take it you think these hearings were pretty significant?

McA: I do indeed. Looking back, it is my strong impression that it was these hearings that got the ball rolling. This was the first time that effective national attention had been given to the mining claim surface rights problem and especially to widespread abuse of the mining laws. The mining industry became very much alarmed as I soon found out.

ERM: What did you do after Congressman Hope's hearings?

McA: Well, our main problem was how to continue the interest aroused by Mr. Hope's bill and the hearings. Locally, national forest people were able to call attention to local problems and to get newspaper publicity on these. But I don't think we were able to get much national publicity. About all the national publicity we got was in American Forests with more articles by van Dresser. And as I recall, these were published before the Hope Committee hearings.<sup>57</sup> There was also an article in American Forests, presumably by the editor, on (Lowell) Besley's testimony before the Hope Committee.<sup>58</sup> Oh yes. There was the Fourth American Forestry Congress sponsored by AFA in October of 1953. By referendum vote this congress endorsed a change in the 1872 mining laws.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>56</sup> USDA, FS, Report on the Problem of Mining Claims on the National Forests, by the National Forest Advisory Council, (Washington, D.C.: Forest Service, January 1953).

<sup>57</sup> Cleveland van Dresser, "Abuses Under the Mining Laws: The Great Road Block," American Forests 59, no. 1 (January 1953): 18-9, 42; "Abuses Under the Mining Laws: Two Determined Women," AF 59, no. 2 (February 1953): 21; "Abuses Under the Mining Laws: Profiteering With Impunity," AF 59, no. 3 (March 1953): 9, 30-1.

<sup>58</sup> "Editorial," American Forests 59, no. 10 (October 1953): 5,26.

<sup>59</sup> The following resolution became Section III-D of a Program for American Forestry: "Efficient management of many millions of acres of Federal public lands, including the discovery and development of new or known mineral resources, is in the public interest. The legitimate miner and prospector should be encouraged to carry on such work. However, widespread abuses under existing mining laws as a means for acquiring Government land for other than mining purposes should be stopped. We therefore recommend that Congress revise the Federal mining laws to prevent their abuse by claimants or patentees who use their claims to tie up more valuable timber or other resources than they legitimately need to develop the minerals."

The gist of all this is that there was not much national publicity during the last four or five months of 1953. This was unfortunate. There was considerable danger that we might lose all we'd gained. I remember thinking that our child hadn't lived to grow up.

#### The Al Sarena Case

ERM: Obviously something of importance must have happened in the following year because you did get your mining law passed in the year after that. Did something significant occur in 1954?

McA: It seemed significant to me. As I look back on events affecting enactment of corrective mining claim legislation, I can't escape the feeling that the Al Sarena case had a good deal to do with building public opinion favoring cure of mining law abuses.

ERM: I've heard of this and have a note to ask you about it. I remember that the Al Sarena case had a good deal of publicity at the time. I realize that this happened twenty years ago. Can you remember what this case was all about? Or if you can't describe it, perhaps you can say how it influenced action to change the 1872 mining laws.

McA: As a matter of fact, I do remember a good many details of this hassle. Recently in looking through my files, I found a folder of personal notes on the Al Sarena case. With the help of these notes, I think I probably could summarize some of the significant aspects if you'd like to have me try. I may not get everything in the right sequence.

ERM: Go ahead. Take whatever time you need. I'll try not to interrupt.

McA: All right. Let's see where to start. The A1 Sarena case involved a group of twenty-three mining claims on the Rogue River National Forest in western Oregon. The Alabama people who owned these unpatented claims had done no mining on them since 1943. There was a very heavy stand of timber. The mining company wanted to take the claims to patent and sell the timber. To obtain patent there would have to be evidence of adequate mineralization on the claims. Mineral examiners from the Land Office in the Interior Department routinely examined the claims for mineralization. The Forest Service, as was customary for claims on national forests, was asked to examine the claims and to comment. Forest Service mineral examiners protested fifteen of the twenty-three claims as not being qualified for patent (no minerals). The company could have done all the mining desired without going to patent but decided to press for patent so as to sell the timber. The hearing officer for the Land Office held a hearing in Portland, Oregon late in 1950. The mining company demanded a radical departure from legally established procedures. The hearing officer denied this demand. The company people walked out. The manager of the Land Office examined the evidence and approved the Forest Service protest. Later, the Bureau of Land Management in Washington approved the manager's action. The mining company appealed to the secretary of the Interior. The secretary offered a new hearing. The A1 Sarena people said they didn't want a new hearing but to have the Forest Service overruled. This was refused by the secretary.

Nothing more happened for two years, until the administration changed in January 1953. Within two months after taking office, the new Interior Department solicitor, Clarence Davis (later Under Secretary of the Department), began to get much political pressure to grant the patents over the protests of his own people and the Forest Service. The A1 Sarena company turned on all the steam, working Congress from both Oregon and Alabama. I sat in on a visit Congressman (Frank W.) Boykin of Alabama made to Lyle Watts, also a visit from Congressman (Mathew Harris) Ellsworth of Oregon. Watts told them the matter was entirely in Interior's hands. A report of a Joint Congressional Committee later set up to investigate this case says that Solicitor Davis worked out with the help of Congressman Ellsworth an entirely new procedure which in effect gave the A1 Sarena company full control of the situation.<sup>60</sup> As a result of this procedure, the A1 Sarena people picked a company in

<sup>60</sup> U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 2408, "The A1 Sarena Case," 84th Cong., 2d sess., 1956.

Alabama to do reassay work. Mr. Davis also ordered new assays by his own Bureau of Mines. However, he did not wait for the Bureau of Mines report but accepted the Alabama assays which (the report says) were delivered to him on Christmas Eve, 1953. On January 6, 1954 Mr. Davis ordered patent to be granted on all twenty-three A1 Sarena claims. On February 15, 1954 the Interior Department issued patent to 475 acres. The mining company promptly sold more than 2 1/2 million board feet of timber from the newly patented claims. The company estimated that they had about 18 million additional feet to sell. No more mining was done. When I testified on this case, I said that the timber on the fifteen disputed claims could be sold for around \$350,000 taking only the trees larger than sixteen inches in diameter. Perhaps this will help to show that abuse of the mining laws could and sometimes did involve more than peanuts.

There is no point in rehashing here all the sordid details of the A1 Sarena case, of ore samples being lost and found again under peculiar circumstances, and a lot of other questionable things. Most of these were widely publicized long before the congressional hearings on this case in 1955 and 1956. Drew Pearson was one of the columnists who had a field day on A1 Sarena. Following Mr. Davis's action in granting patent so hurriedly, the whole issue of mining law abuse got more publicity than it ever had had before, and maybe since. There was so much complaint to Congress that subcommittees from the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs formed a joint committee and held hearings in Oregon and later in Washington, D.C. I should note, however, that the work of this joint committee extended beyond the A1 Sarena case and also that actual committee hearings were held after enactment of the Multiple-Use Mining Act.

I don't have a complete record of publicity arising from the A1 Sarena case but there was a great deal of it all through 1954 and into 1955. As to other sources of publicity, I have a note that American Forests published an account of a meeting of the Natural Resources Council where general agreement was reached that something about mining law abuses must be done soon.<sup>61</sup> American Forests also had editorials in November and December.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> "What's News Across the Nation," American Forests 60, no. 11 (November 1954): 61-2.

<sup>62</sup> Editorial, "Today," American Forests 60, no. 11 (November 1954): 7; Editorial, "Flexibility on the Forests", AF 60, no. 12 (December 1954): 7.

Sometime during the year there was a “Mid-Century Conference on Resources” one part of which considered mining law abuses but I have no information on it. There was a large volume of newspaper articles and cartoons, some of which I saw but I am sure far from all.

ERM: Well, that’s a short summary of what I’m sure was a complex situation. I do have a sneaky feeling, however, that you’ve deliberately passed over some of the, shall I say, juicier aspects. How about enlarging a little on what you refer to as the sordid details?

McA: I readily agree that some of the things I’ve left out would make my account a lot more interesting. Two thoughts ran through my mind, however, as I was trying to squeeze a good deal of information into as few words as I could. One was that the A1 Sarena affair wasn’t a really outstanding example of mining law abuses. Yes, it was an example but no worse from that aspect than thousands of others. A1 Sarena got its far-flung publicity because of the political angles and because there were some pretty smoky undercover doings not really part of the mining law abuse features. I thought I’d best stay away from those two aspects. I didn’t quite do so but that was my purpose. I take it you’d like me to go back and bring out some of the shady deals and the political considerations. I don’t think I should.

ERM: Why not?

McA: I guess the reason why I feel I shouldn’t do that is the second thought that was running through my mind while I was trying to give a quick summary. I’m not sure I can explain this very well. My understanding is that these interviews with me and with others are part of a historical project the Forest Service is paying for with public funds. I don’t intend consciously to say anything that might turn out to be embarrassing to the Forest Service. That applies not only to this A1 Sarena thing but to all the other subjects. It may make my interview sound rather dull but that’s how I feel about it. I just don’t think it would be appropriate to get too far into some of these side issues, interesting, juicy, or sordid though they may be. I don’t think this is the place for them. Some other time and under other circumstances it might be all right. We’ve wandered away from the history of the mining law amendments. Can we return to that?

ERM: We’ll just leave it that way. Back to mining law history. Did the A1 Sarena affair have any effect on the willingness of the mining

industry to allow changes in the 1872 laws?

McA: I think it did. Late in 1954 and early in 1955 I began to get reports that some of the leaders in this industry felt that concessions would have to be made to stop the continuing bad publicity. Actually, the legitimate mining industry wanted about as much as we did to prevent misuse of the mining laws. But the industry was afraid that once the door was opened to change there might be further and more radical changes. A special concern was that they wanted nothing to interfere with existing procedures for obtaining patent to mining claims. Only patent would give them full protection and this was one part of the mining law that they simply would not agree to change. It was also one part that we had no desire to change but the industry was taking no chances. However, they began to feel that the bad publicity building up would make Congress jump the gun and take action. This would put them on the defensive even more than they were with publicity about mining law abuses.

The result of this concern and self-examination was a policy statement adopted at the September 1954 meeting of the American Mining Congress. I have this statement here. I think it would be a valuable part of this record. Here it is:

We believe...that suitable amendments can be made in the general mining laws, which, with proper use of available procedures, will simplify enforcement and minimize bad-faith attempts through pretended mining locations to serve objectives other than the discovery and development of minerals. We believe that this can be accomplished in a manner, which will protect the incentive and reward now inherent in the mining laws.<sup>63</sup>

ERM: Did all this publicity have any effect on Congress that you could see?

McA: I think it did. The notes that I kept at the time indicate that pressure was building in Congress for change in the mining laws. I think the mining industry sized this up pretty accurately. Congressmen (Milton R.) Young and (Harold D.) Cooley introduced bills and so did Senator Anderson.<sup>64</sup> Maybe there were others.

<sup>63</sup> Minutes, American Mining Congress, September 1954.

<sup>64</sup> U.S., Congress, House, HR 230, HR 4314; Senate, S 687, 84th Cong., 1st sess., 1955.

The House Interior Committee, acting with unprecedented speed, reported out HR 230 on February 1.

AFA calls a meeting of government and industry

ERM: You've mentioned the American Forestry Association several times. Was this organization more helpful than others in getting the mining law passed?

McA: I think I'd have to say that the American Mining Congress was the most helpful organization but that was because they felt they had to do so to protect their own industry. AFA was helpful because they thought it desirable in the public interest. But you didn't ask for reasons why different organizations were useful. Yes, I think AFA was more helpful than other organizations outside the mining industry. I don't mean to say that AFA was the only organization that helped get this law and I hope what I've said previously didn't give that impression.

AFA was helpful in two ways. One was publicity but I doubt if this was quite as effective as my rather frequent references to it may suggest. The magazine had only a small circulation, much smaller than it has now, and it reached mostly a rather specialized audience.

The other way AFA helped was what might be called critical help at a critical time. The executive director of the Association, Lowell Besley, was new in this job. I think he came to AFA in July 1953 just before the hearings on the Hope bill. He testified on that bill. Maybe this was what got him interested in the mining law effort. At any rate he set out to give a hand. Bill Besley has never gotten the credit due him for what he did personally to obtain a satisfactory ending to a really troublesome problem. You must remember that there were two opposing camps. We thought the mining industry should help clean up its fouled nest and the mining people thought the Forest Service was deliberately stirring up bad publicity for them. The fact that both camps were right is beside the point. The point is that we weren't getting anywhere. Besley brought us together. He didn't stop there but went on to do other things essential to solving this whole problem.

ERM: I'll be interested in hearing how Besley brought you two opposing

camps together. Talk about that for a minute.

McA: Well, Besley arranged a meeting at the AFA offices where we and the mining industry people talked the whole matter over, discussed how best to solve a problem that we both recognized, and came to tentative agreement on how we would go about doing this. The meeting was February 10, 1955. Besley had already had a number of preliminary meetings with key people and this helped to get results at the February 10 meeting when the whole lot of us came together. One of the AFA directors, DeWitt Nelson, was brought in to chair the meeting.

ERM: Can you get me a copy of the minutes of this meeting? We could include these in the appendix to this interview.

McA: No formal record of the discussion was kept. I suppose all of us made notes. The closest to a formal report might be an editorial in American Forests magazine and an article, presumably by the editor, in the same issue.<sup>65</sup> I can get this reference for you. At the start of the conference the mining industry representatives served notice that if any photos were taken or any immediate publicity given to the meeting all bets would be off. Next they said they would stop all negotiation if any attempt were made to upset the existing patent system. They wanted nothing to interfere with the right of a prospector to take his claim to patent. We had no objection to either of these demands. In fact, we were rather amused by them.

ERM: You seem to have a rather clear recollection of this meeting. I suggest that a few details would be of historical interest.

McA: I can't remember everyone who attended this conference. I'm sure the Forest Service has a record somewhere. From Agriculture there was Assistant Secretary Irvin L. Peterson accompanied by Wesley D'Ewart, Edward C. Crafts, Edward P. Cliff, Reynolds G. Florance, Edward F. Mynatt, John Sieker, and me. From Interior there was Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis accompanied by Elmer F. Bennett, J. B. Bennett, G.R. Bradshaw, Jim Lanigan, Walter Horning, Lewis E. Hoffman, William G. Guernsey, and I think Felix E. Wormser. The American Mining Congress had Julian Conover and Harry Moffett and also, I think, John Arant and Henry I. Dworshak, From the

<sup>65</sup> Editorial, "Credit Where Credit is Due," American Forests 61, no. 5 (May 1955): 7; "The First Step Toward Correcting Abuses of the Mining Laws," AF 61, no. 5 (May 1955): 18-9, 44.

mining industry there were several lawyers. I remember Raymond B. Holbrook, Keller, McConnel, and Parkinson. The conference lasted all day from about 9:30 or 10 in the morning to around 5 p.m. A good deal of time was spent, as I remember it, in getting things off our chests. Nelson did a good job in not letting us stray too far from the point of the meeting.

ERM: I wish it were possible to get into our record here at least some indication of the decisions that were made at this significant meeting. Can't you stir up your memory enough to give some idea of the results of your discussion?

McA: I'll have no trouble doing that. As I grow older I find my memory faltering but I do remember this meeting rather vividly. Let's try to keep in mind that the mining people were beginning to run scared. They were ready to come to terms or they wouldn't have been there. Perhaps they would have come to terms even if AFA hadn't arranged this meeting. I don't know about that. I do know that the AFA meeting hurried the process up considerably.

Well, the Forest Service people were ready to come to terms, too. Our problem was that we didn't have a very clear idea of what terms to consider. We felt we'd have to stick tight to certain things but thought we might make some compromises on others. The truth of the matter is that we just didn't know how to solve the problem that was plaguing us. I guess you might say that we knew where we wanted to go but not how to get there.

After quite a lot of discussion, we reached agreement on several objectives. These were:

1. To clear up mining claim surface rights, past, present, and future.
2. To prohibit use of mining claims for purposes other than mining prior to patent.
3. To authorize the government to dispose of surface resources on claims prior to patent.
4. To bar claimants from timber and other surface resources except as needed for mining.

ERM: I don't know anything about mining law but I should think existing law would take care of some of these, such as prohibiting use of claims for purposes other than mining.

McA: No, either existing law didn't do these things in the sense of prohibiting them outright or existing law was not clear and needed to be restated. Let me go on. Reaching reasonable agreement on objectives was only a first step. We then had to reach a meeting of minds on how to achieve those objectives. As one device toward this end one of the industry lawyers, I think it was Holbrook but am not sure, proposed an in rem procedure. At one time I could explain this legal procedure but I don't think I can now. As well as I can recall it means a proceeding to recover rights or property. The government once had all the rights there were to these mining claims. Now we needed to recapture some of them such as title to surface rights. I'll be way over my head in a minute so I'm not going to try to get too far into an explanation. We talked about this and about other measures. At the end of the day we still had a lot to do – to draft a bill, agree on exact procedures, and so on. But in the main we had reached agreement on what to do and how to do it. And on who would handle the details remaining to be done and when they'd do it. So all in all it was a very profitable day.

ERM: I've heard that you folks and the mining industry people reached a secret agreement at this meeting. How about that?

McA: I don't know what you've heard or who told you and perhaps I should stop here and ask you some questions. This isn't one of those things that should be dodged. I'll say straight out that if there were any sub rosa agreements I didn't know about them at the time and I've never heard of any since. The accusation doesn't make sense to me, anyway. The mining people would be short of brains if they thought I could commit the secretary of Agriculture or even future chiefs of the Forest Service. And I certainly would not have considered that the industry people present could commit all the industry. As I say, we still had to take our discussions and tentative agreements back home, each of us, and get agreement from our bosses. And with twenty-five or thirty people present at a meeting I should think an undercover agreement between some of these would be a lot less than secret. No, there were no secret agreements. Have I answered your question?

ERM: Yes. Let's go on. Were you completely satisfied with the results of the AFA meeting?

McA: Well, I was and I wasn't. My own personal feeling then and now is that the surface and subsurface rights on mining claims should be completely separate. What we had agreed to do was a step in that direction but it did not go the whole way. So that much was

unsatisfactory. However, if the Forest Service and the mining industry could work together and do what we thought could and should be done we would certainly be far, far better off than before. And doing what we had agreed could and should be done would keep us busy for at least ten years and maybe longer. So, to answer your question I, for one, was entirely willing to take this big step before thinking about going further.

ERM: Did the mining industry help or hinder you after making their proposals for solving this problem?

McA: The industry helped us in every way they could. They might, you see, have agreed with us on language of a bill and then gone around behind and blocked it. They did not. They might, after legislation had been enacted, have blocked appropriations and so made the new law ineffective. They did not. On the contrary, they helped us get appropriations.

#### Passage and implementation of the mining bill

ERM: What happened following the February meeting?

McA: As agreed at the meeting, we and the industry people got together and worked out details. A bill was drafted and discussed with various members of Congress. If you don't mind I am going to use some notes I made at the time. I probably could do this from memory but as I have the information here we may as well use actual bill numbers and names of congressmen.

ERM: That's okay. Go ahead.

McA: On second thought, I'll just give you the information for inclusion in the appendix if you want it there.<sup>66</sup> In April 1955 seven bills were introduced in the House and in May three more. There was only one bill in the Senate (S 1713) although it had four co-sponsors. Hearings on the Senate bill were held May 18 and 19, 1955 and in the House on HR 5891 and the nine related bills on May 19. I don't remember the House hearings at all. I do recall the Senate

<sup>66</sup> For bills introduced in 1955 see Appendix D, p. 232.

hearings, chiefly, I think, because of the acrimonious comments and antics of Senator “Molly” (George W.) Malone of Nevada. Malone apparently hadn’t gotten word that the mining industry approved of the proposed legislation and was trying to protect an industry important to his state. Or he may have wanted publicity. Senator Anderson was pretty disgusted with Malone. Malone entered a minority report. So did (Richard L.) Neuberger but he supported the bill; he just thought it didn’t go far enough.

Both houses took favorable action on their respective bills in June and agreed to a conference report in July. On July 23, 1955 at the Geneva Summit Conference President Eisenhower signed the enrolled bill with the comment that, “This is one of the most important conservation measures affecting public lands that has been enacted in many years.”

ERM: I suppose you had to wait a year or so to get going in carrying out the provisions of the new law. I know it takes time to go through the budget process and get appropriations.

McA: No, we started right away. In the closing days of that Congress a supplemental appropriation for, I think, \$300,000 was pushed through so we could make a quick start. As soon as the president signed the bill the Forest Service sent memos to the regional foresters telling them what the new law does and does not do, ordering prompt and aggressive action but cautioning against being overly zealous. Mineral examiners were hired and job training started in the two Pacific Coast regions. Alan Miller was brought to Washington from California to head up the big job of clearing up all existing claims. He did a fine job and kept on schedule for the more than ten years this task required.

ERM: Can you give some of the results?

McA: I can try. I’ve been especially interested in this work and have kept fairly well informed on progress over the years. I asked about it again not long ago. I can’t give you many details. The Forest Service processed more than 137 million acres within which something like a million mining claims existed at the time the project was going. This is ten times more claims than we thought existed. As I remember the figures only 2,283 claims were recognized as valid. On these the claimants retain surface rights. Otherwise, the program has eliminated claim encumbrances, so far as surface rights are concerned, on millions of acres of national forest lands, opening these lands to timber management, grazing, recreation and other uses. Road access across claims

to timber stands and to recreation areas is no longer a matter of possible litigation. And all of this applies also to claims staked in the future. I believe the work contemplated when the act was passed has been completed.

ERM: Have you anything to add to this discussion?

McA: I don't think I mentioned anything about removal of sand, gravel, pumice, and cinders. These materials were eliminated from coverage of the mining laws so people couldn't stake claims just to get this kind of material. This required amendment of the Materials Act of 1947.<sup>67</sup> And maybe I should mention that the 1955 act didn't change the basic provisions of the 1872 mining law protecting the rights of legitimate miners and prospectors to take their claims to patent or to work for minerals without going to patent.

## Summary

ERM: These are worthwhile additions. It's probably asking too much but can you sort of summarize what happened? We've covered a lot of ground and a summary might be useful. If this is too difficult we can pass to another subject.

McA: No, I don't think it's too difficult but I may leave out some events that should be included. Let me have a moment to get my thoughts in order. By way of summary I think I'd say that in retrospect several features of the mining claim situation stand out in my memory. (1) Prior to the late 1940s I don't think mining claims were much of a problem on the national forests. (2) Suddenly, in a very few years, certainly less than ten, hundreds of thousands of mining claims were staked out on the national forests, principally for uranium and other fissionable materials. The peak of this activity was 1953 to 1957. Very few of these claims were ever worked but were, in effect, abandoned. Being legally alive, however, they could be revived at any time

<sup>67</sup> Materials Disposal Act of 31 July 1947, 61 Stat. 681.

and were an encumbrance on the land. (3) A great many claims were of a fraudulent or questionable nature, not staked for mining purposes but for summer homes, to obtain valuable stands of timber and for dozens of other purposes not connected with mining. (4) Legally, the Forest Service could do very little, almost nothing, to eliminate or reduce the troubles caused by these hundreds of thousands of claims and as a result everyday administration of some national forest resources came virtually to a halt in a good many places. What could be done legally was enormously time-consuming, expensive and dependent on what another government agency (Bureau of Land Management) could or was willing to do. (5) The Forest Service had no objection to legitimate mining operations but to eliminate abandoned claims and especially to correct abuses of the basic mining laws some modification of these laws would have to be made. For perfectly understandable reasons the legitimate mining industry was opposed to making any change in the basic legislation. (6) An aroused public opinion was the major factor in making the necessary modification of the mining laws.

CARL ALWIN SCHENCK

ERM: I note that you lived for some years in Asheville, North Carolina. This was the home of the famous Biltmore Forestry School. Did you know Dr. Schenck who founded that school?

McA: Well, Dr. Schenck had, of course, left Asheville many years before I moved there but I met him once, possibly twice, when he was in this country on return visits. I distinctly remember one rather long visit with Schenck but I can't recall whether it was in Portland, Oregon or in Washington, D.C.

ERM: I believe the Biltmore School was the first forestry school to be established in the United States.

McA: Yes, that is so. The Biltmore Forest School was started in the early fall of 1898. A few weeks later the first four-year professional school of forestry opened at Cornell University. I believe Yale was next in 1900. My own school at the University of Michigan began in 1902. There were ten or a dozen schools of forestry established before 1905.

ERM: You seemed to make a distinction just then when you spoke of a four-year professional school. Wasn't Biltmore a professional school?

McA: For those days it was but it wouldn't qualify under the standards used today by the Society of American Foresters in accrediting schools. Neither would some or all of the other early schools. I think the difference you are asking me to bring out is that Biltmore was a one-year school and did not grant a professional academic degree. Anyone with a high school education could be admitted. I guess you'd call it a master type school. Schenck was the master who gave lectures and then took his students out for further instruction in the woods. In a sense they learned by doing and that's a pretty good way to learn anything. Some top-notch men came out of the Biltmore school.

ERM: Biltmore didn't last very long, did it?

McA: Let's see if I can remember the dates. I think up until 1909 the school was headquartered on the Biltmore Estate at Asheville. Schenck left the estate in 1909 but the school was continued by Schenck using tours in the United States and Europe. I've always thought these tours would be a good way to get a full knowledge of forestry here and abroad. The school eventually ended because of lack of students. Maybe it was doomed to failure from the beginning because it had no association with a university where basic courses in botany, zoology, and the many other subjects essential to forestry could be obtained.

ERM: You say Schenck left the Biltmore Estate. I've heard that Pinchot had Schenck discharged. Is that true?

McA: Not so far as I know. Pinchot was the first forester hired by George Vanderbilt. That was in 1892. He had an agreement with Vanderbilt allowing him to do consulting work elsewhere. After a few years Pinchot wanted to devote all of his time to work away from Biltmore so he recommended Schenck to replace him as Biltmore forester. I remember reading in Pinchot's book Breaking New Ground that he asked Sir Dietrich Brandis, inspector general of forests for India, to suggest a successor and Brandis recommended Schenck who came to the United States for the Biltmore position in 1895, I think.<sup>68</sup> Schenck was dismissed by Vanderbilt in 1909 but this dismissal, as I remember hearing about it, is a rather involved story but does not concern Pinchot.

ERM: This seems rather important to me. Can you recall any details of what you say is an involved story?

McA: Well, what I say is not firsthand knowledge. It is what I've heard or read. When we lived in Asheville I became acquainted with Chauncy D. Beadle who at that time was general manager of the Biltmore Estate, or what was left after Vanderbilt sold the government 110,000 acres for the Pisgah National Forest. Beadle told me that one day Schenck burst into his office and began beating him around the shoulders with a cane. I understood Beadle to say this beating was begun without any preliminaries except some shouting by Schenck. So, Beadle said, he fired Schenck. Schenck's book on Biltmore says that Beadle accused Schenck of lying and when Beadle wouldn't retract or apologize Schenck boxed

<sup>68</sup> Gifford Pinchot, Breaking New Ground, (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1947).

his ears.<sup>69</sup> According to Schenck, Beadle brought charges against him, Schenck was found guilty and fined one dollar. But Schenck admitted that the incident got much publicity and got him in bad with Vanderbilt. I doubt if Beadle had authority to discharge Schenck but he probably did urge Vanderbilt to do so. Schenck claims that his forced resignation came as a result of making Vanderbilt angry by signing a long-term lease to a large acreage of the estate. He says Vanderbilt called him an idiot and worse. My own opinion is that Schenck left Biltmore because of a combination of circumstances. Schenck was not happy with his own work, felt Vanderbilt wasn't supporting him, the forestry work was deeply in debt, Vanderbilt had made some unfortunate investments and was in great financial difficulty, the forestry school couldn't get enough students for profitable operation. And so on and so forth. There is no question about Schenck being dismissed but he may have been happy to go. Schenck had an agreement with Vanderbilt that if the Biltmore job ever folded he would be given an annuity. I believe this was an insurance policy bought by Mr. Vanderbilt. This annuity, or something similar, was the subject of a bill in Congress along about the time I was chief.

ERM: Perhaps Pinchot had nothing to do with Schenck leaving Biltmore but I've heard that Schenck and Pinchot did have a big fight. Tell me about that.

McA: If these two men had a big fight I can't tell you about it because I don't know of any fight. I wouldn't be at all surprised to hear of disagreements because many of those old-timers, as nearly as I can tell, were forever squabbling with each other. But I never heard of any knock-down, drag-out public or private fight between these two men. I can think of some differences of opinion between Pinchot and Schenck. For example, whether to urge a very high tariff on imports of lumber, newsprint, and other forest products. I've heard also that Schenck got pretty sore at Pinchot for devoting too much time to establishing forest reserves – now called national forests – out of the public domain. Schenck thought Pinchot should put all of his time on private forestry. Biltmore was about the only private forestry there was at that time. I believe another disagreement was about Schenck's desire to have a national park along the Appalachians from somewhere around Philadelphia to the outskirts of Atlanta. I don't know the details except that Schenck blamed

<sup>69</sup> Carl Alwin Schenck, The Biltmore Story, (St. Paul, Minn.: Minnesota Historical Society, American Forest Products Foundation, 1955). Reprinted as Birth of Forestry in America (Santa Cruz, Ca.: Forest History Society and the Appalachian Consortium, 1974).

Pinchot for not sharing his views. Schenck seemed to me to have a genius for getting into disagreements with nearly everyone. I don't think he squabbled with his students but he seems to have rubbed many people the wrong way. He fell out with (Bernhard Eduard) Fernow, he fought verbally and in writing with (Charles) McNamee who was general manager of the Biltmore Estate when Schenck first came there, he quarreled with President Eliot of Harvard and, if I remember correctly, had a real battle with his superiors when serving his regular summer periods of service with the German army. (This was during Schenck's Biltmore days). I remember also Schenck recording in his book that Vanderbilt "had declared war on me." In my own brief conversations with Schenck I found him agreeable and pleasant but I could also sense that he thought well of himself and wouldn't stand still for much criticism.

ERM: Did you ever see Dr. Schenck when you were in Germany? He went back to Germany after closing out at Biltmore.

McA: No, I never saw him on any of several trips to Germany. As a matter of fact, I was never near Darmstadt where he was living except one time, in 1957, I think, when I was traveling as the guest of the German government. The German foresters conducting my tour asked if I wanted to visit Schenck but were obviously relieved when I suggested that we already were behind schedule. I got the impression that Schenck was not highly regarded by his fellow German foresters.

ERM: Did you ever have any other contacts with Schenck after he returned to Germany?

McA: Only indirectly. While I was chief I was visited by a reporter for Time magazine who said he had a couple of questions to put to me about Schenck. He wanted to know the details of Schenck's big fight with Pinchot and he wanted some specific examples from me to bear out the contention that Schenck was the father of American forestry. I remember being pretty much floored by both requests. This was the first I'd ever heard of a big fight and I said so. I told the reporter of the disagreements or differences of opinion that I knew about but said none of these could qualify as a fight. I told him that Schenck had had real fights with Beadle, with McNamee, with Vanderbilt and probably others and that such differences of opinion as he'd had with Pinchot he had also had with many other foresters. I said I just did not know of any big fight as the reporter expressed it and asked why he wanted to know. He said only that he was assigned to do a story on Schenck and

had been told to get the dope on his big fight with Pinchot. Incidentally, I later asked a number of old-timers in the Forest Service about this and their replies were about the same as I've just told you.

ERM: What about Schenck being the father of American forestry?

McA: Yes, that was the other thing the reporter wanted to know about. I couldn't help him much. As I recall I said that Schenck was the third professionally trained forester to work in the United States, the earlier ones being Fernow who came here in 1876 and Pinchot who began work at Biltmore in 1892. Pinchot was the first native American Forester, Henry S. Graves was the second. There were, however, many other people interested in forestry in this country long before Schenck came here. I mentioned (Joseph T.) Rothrock in Pennsylvania, Charles Sprague Sargent, my own teacher Filibert Roth who was working in Fernow's office when Schenck first came here in 1895. Fernow was then head of the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. I mentioned the organization of the American Forestry Association in 1875, the first American Forestry Congress in 1883, and other events long before Schenck came to this country. I tried to give Schenck a good send-off but I was obliged to say that despite his contribution to American forestry Schenck was a long way from being its father. There is more to this story but I don't know that this is the place for it.

ERM: I'd like to hear it. What happened next?

McA: The reporter came back the next day, visibly embarrassed. He said he had talked to some of the other people I had suggested and that he believed the story I had told him but Time's front office as he called it had ordered him to go ahead and write up a story about a Schenck-Pinchot fight and about Schenck being the man who originated forestry in the United States. He volunteered that a major Time advertiser had requested the story. Anyway, the story did appear, about one column long with a picture. It was of small consequence, I thought, but some of the old-timers in the Service objected to it and told me that they had written to the editors of the magazine. I never saw any of their letters published. I clipped the item and wrote a brief note about it for the files. I should have kept it for my own files. If I were really interested I'd look it up but I don't remember the year this happened and I suppose it might be a bit of a chore. I wondered at the time if Schenck's cousin, George Merck, head of the big drug concern, had anything to do with this.

ERM: Is that all of the story?

McA: Well, no. But here, again, maybe there is no particular reason for dredging up this ancient history. Either just before or just after the Time article a bill was introduced in Congress to allow Schenck to receive some money impounded in this country because of the war, Schenck being an alien. As I recall it one of the Delaware senators introduced this private bill. I never saw the bill but heard about it in a rather peculiar way. I was working in my backyard one afternoon when my next-door neighbor, a high- up lawyer in the Justice Department, asked me if I had ever heard of a forester named Carl Alwin Schenck. I said I had. My neighbor then wanted to know if Schenck actually was the father of American forestry. I said that in my opinion he was not although he was one of the early day foresters in this country and had contributed substantially to early forestry progress. I asked why he wanted to know and he said something about the bill I've just mentioned. I can't remember now whether Justice had been asked for a routine report on the bill or whether the bill had passed both Houses and Justice was considering asking for a veto. I remembered Schenck's insurance policy and said if this was the money involved Schenck should be allowed to have it. The opinion in Justice was that allowing this one private bill through would open the floodgates to thousands of similar ones. My neighbor said that the big argument being used to favor this bill for Schenck was the gimmick that he had started forestry in the United States and so merited an exception. I said he deserved to have his money but on the basis that he had earned it and not because he was the father of U.S. forestry which he wasn't. I never heard any more about this bill. I never followed it up.

ERM: Do you suppose the Time article was propaganda to help get the bill through Congress?

McA: It might have been. I remember other things that were done presumably to honor Schenck but perhaps also designed to build up the father of forestry image. There were all sorts of tours, dinners, and so forth. One event was dedication of a memorial plaque in a redwood grove out in California. Schenck never had anything to do with redwoods and I thought this a bit odd. The plaque should have been in the Pink Beds on the shoulder of Mt. Pisgah in North Carolina where Schenck had his summer home and headquartered his Biltmore Forest School students. I guess I was the one having most to do with putting a plaque there in 1961. It supposedly marks the spot where Schenck started the first forestry school but the school really had its headquarters on the

part of the estate that Vanderbilt kept, near the present town of Biltmore. I heard that an advertising agency had been employed to promote all these things to build up Schenck but I don't know that. I thought so at the time but I have no personal knowledge of it. Very ineptly handled if true. If you don't mind, I'd as soon not talk about things where I have to depend on hearsay. Let's go to something else.

## THE WILDERNESS STORY

### Wilderness defined

ERM: Much of the current agitation for wilderness preservation is tied in, one way or another, with national legislation. For example, there is much lobbying going on now for designation of wilderness in eastern states which – if legislation is enacted – seems to me will define wilderness quite differently than did the original Wilderness Act.<sup>70</sup> I think it will be worthwhile to review some of the history of that original wilderness legislation. You were in on the events leading up to enactment of the Wilderness Law. Tell me about it.

McA: I was no longer in the Forest Service when Congress enacted wilderness preservation legislation. I was chief when the first proposals for this legislation were made.

ERM: Before we get started on specific legislation perhaps we should have some definitions. We hear various terms used in talking about wilderness preservation. For example, I'd like to know the difference between a wilderness area and a primitive area. Can you spell out some definitions so that everyone will know what we are talking about?

McA: Wilderness always has been an elusive term. It means whatever the user wants it to mean. I've had elderly ladies tell me that they could look out their resort hotel windows and see wilderness right below and that every afternoon they'd be driven around through that wilderness. Sometimes such people were persuaded to promote wilderness legislation not knowing that the kind of wilderness being proposed would absolutely prohibit all roads. I used to think this deception was practiced deliberately.

<sup>70</sup> Wilderness Act of 3 September 1964, 78 Stat. 890.

But to get back to your question. There is no difference between wilderness area and primitive area except in terminology. Primitive area was the term first used to designate specific areas of wilderness country set aside for preservation in primitive condition. In 1939 we changed to wilderness area and wild area when previously designated individual primitive areas were restudied and reclassified under new Department regulations.

The Forest Service probably is responsible for these terms. The specific term wilderness area originated in the Forest Service. I don't mean wilderness. That is a general term. Wilderness area applies to a specific area of wilderness. It may interest you to know that the second edition of Webster's dictionary published in 1957 defines wilderness area as an area of national forest land set aside for preservation of natural conditions for scientific or recreational purposes. I recently looked up this term in the newer third edition and the same definition is given. It is significant that wilderness preservation is tied to national forests.

ERM: How about primitive area? How did this term originate?

McA: The term primitive area also originated in the Forest Service. If you want Webster's definition it goes something like this – and I'm quoting from memory – a large area inside a national forest where no alteration or development is permitted. Here again the definition is tied to national forests. Incidentally, anyone making a historical survey of wilderness definitions should take a look at USDA Regulation L-20 and its successor Regulations U-1 and U-2 which define wilderness areas by spelling out the purposes for setting aside areas to be preserved in wilderness condition. I probably should mention that in 1929 to give more prestige and to assure permanency, we put wilderness area designations under secretary of agriculture regulations. This was the Regulation L-20 that I just mentioned. At that time the official term was primitive area.

ERM: You mentioned some other USDA regulation, U-something.

McA: Yes. These came along in 1939 and replaced L-20. The new regulations were established by the secretary of agriculture at our request. They imposed still more restrictive provisions for wilderness area preservation. Regulation U-1 provided for establishment of wilderness areas of more than 100,000 acres and Regulation U-2 was for wild areas which were exactly the same as wilderness areas but smaller, between 5,000 and 100,000 acres.

Regulation U-3 provided for other special kinds of areas. At that time we had seventy-three primitive areas and we announced that until all of these could be restudied and reclassified as wild or wilderness areas under the new regulations we would manage the whole lot in accordance with the more restrictive provisions of the new regulations. Looking backward I wish now that we had used only the one term wilderness area.

ERM: Weren't there some other early day definitions of wilderness?

McA: Probably. The only one I can think of right now is that of the Wilderness Society which went something like: "areas retained in their primeval environment or areas free from routes which can be used for mechanized transportation." I don't know the date of that definition but it would be after 1935 because that is when the Wilderness Society was organized.

ERM: What is the present-day definition?

McA: The definition of wilderness – no longer wilderness area – used by the Forest Service and all other federal agencies is that given in the Wilderness Act of 1964, a definition developed from language previously used by the Forest Service. I don't have a copy of that act before me and I'd rather not quote it from memory. If you want it included here I'll dig out the exact language for you.

#### Designation of wilderness areas

ERM: Was the Forest Service the first government agency to take definite action for wilderness preservation?

McA: So far as I know the Forest Service was the first government agency to designate large areas of wilderness with specific restrictions aimed at preserving wilderness conditions. This effort began on the White River National Forest in Colorado in 1919, on the Superior National Forest in Minnesota in 1922, and on the Gila National Forest in New Mexico in 1924. These areas were set aside for preservation as wilderness by the regional (then called district) foresters.

Until a very few years ago and with only one exception no other federal agency had formally set aside large areas for preservation as wilderness. The one exception was the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Interior Department. In December 1937, this agency set aside twelve roadless areas and four wild areas on Indian reservations totaling about 5 million acres. My memory is a bit dim on this but I seem to recall objections by the Indians and subsequent elimination of these special areas.

Other agencies had to be prodded into setting aside specific wilderness areas and this was one of the reasons why legislation was sought. The other main reason was to assure more permanency after the areas had been set aside for this purpose. Except for the areas on Indian reservations it was just about a full half century before any other federal agency formally established wilderness preservation areas. There were a few state wilderness areas, notably the Adirondack Preserve in New York. Even today nearly all the formally established wilderness is within national forests. I saw some figures the other day showing that the present wilderness system so far approved by Congress totals about 11 million acres, all but 300,000 acres of this in national forests.

ERM: That figure may be misleading. I believe there is more wilderness than that. How many wilderness and primitive areas did the Forest Service have when the Wilderness Act was passed?

McA: I don't have those figures but maybe I can answer your question in another way by giving you a little history. I'm looking at a speech I made in 1957 at a wilderness conference in San Francisco.<sup>71</sup> I see that I told the conference that by 1939 when we established regulations U-1 and 2, that is to say fifteen years after setting aside the first national forest wilderness area, we had seventy-three primitive areas and two roadless areas with a total acreage of 14 1/2 million. By 1957 I note that we had restudied and reclassified twenty-nine of these primitive areas, had added eight new wild areas and one new roadless area. I note also that Congress had transferred 638,000 acres from national forest primitive area status to national park status. With allowance for these transfers the net change in acreage of formally designated wilderness administered by the Forest Service was an increase of 65,376 acres.

<sup>71</sup> Richard E. McArdle, "The National Forest Wilderness System," speech delivered at the Fifth Biennial Wilderness Congressman Francisco, California, March 15 and 16, 1957. For excerpts from this speech see John W. Spencer, "The Wilderness Congress," *American Forests* 63, no. 5 (May 1957): 30, 59-60.

I don't know what the corresponding figures would be today. You see, the Service is again in process of restudy and reclassification under the Wilderness Act. Under this act recommendations are made to Congress and Congress then acts to formally establish or re-establish the areas as a part of the national wilderness system. About six months ago I read that there were sixty-six national forest areas so designated by Congress and another twenty-three national forest primitive areas in process of study or designation by Congress. These eighty-nine areas had a total of 14.7 million acres. This would be about half a million acres more than in 1939. Nor does this include allowance for more than 600,000 acres of national forest primitive areas transferred to national park status. I think the Forest Service has a right to be proud of this record. It covers fifty-five years of preservation of specific areas for wilderness. It covers the administrations of nine chiefs of the Forest Service and I think demonstrates strong continuity of policy and purpose.

ERM: It might be well to clear up another point. These formally designated areas that you speak of surely don't represent the sum total of all wilderness in the country?

McA: Absolutely not. I don't suppose anyone has much idea how many wildernesses and how much total acreage will be in the national wilderness preservation system when Congress completes this job. I should think it may never be completed. But to speak directly to your question: We must remember that even though not formally designated, not specifically set aside to be preserved as wilderness, there were, and still are, many millions of acres of national parks, wildlife refuges, unreserved public domain and other federal lands including national forests which are truly wilderness in character. One purpose in establishing national parks was to preserve natural conditions. The difference between that kind of wilderness preservation and that contemplated under the Wilderness Act – and before that act was passed was true for national forest wilderness and primitive areas – is having a definite policy for keeping a specific area as wilderness. If there is no definite policy and no specific boundaries the area may not stay in wilderness. I suppose some will say this is pinching at words but there is actually a vast difference between having a formally and specifically designated area with specific requirements for preservation and merely having areas where wilderness conditions happen to exist but where roads and other man-made developments can be put in at the will of the person in charge. A major purpose of the Wilderness Act was to force administrators to make specific designations and to preserve specific areas. When all the

designations have been made there may still be a considerable acreage where primeval conditions exist although I think wilderness enthusiasts aim at keeping this leftover acreage very small.

ERM: How many people use wilderness areas?

McA: Relatively few compared with other recreational uses of national forest lands. Wilderness use is increasing. I'm not sure just what you have in mind but to me this is an important point and I'd like to talk about it. At about the time I left the Forest Service twelve years ago I think only about one-half of one percent of all national forest recreational use was in designated wilderness areas. To set aside more than 14 million acres for the use of a few thousand people was strenuously objected to by people who wanted to drive to where they intended to camp, picnic, hunt, fish, or just enjoy a pleasant drive. At one of the Senate hearings on wilderness legislation I had to defend our policy for setting aside enormous areas which were or could be used by so few people. My personal feeling then and now, and it is a strong one, is that these large areas should be preserved as wilderness even if no one uses them. So far as I know this is still Forest Service policy.

### Legislative history

ERM: This is a rather lengthy introduction to wilderness legislation but I think some background is needed. Can you think of any other general background that we should include before discussing specific legislation?

McA: Let me see. You may want to include a comment on statutory authority to designate wilderness areas. The Forest Service had no such specific authority. Our authority to set aside areas for wilderness preservation stems back to the Act of June 4, 1897, which gives the secretary of agriculture authority to manage the national forests.<sup>72</sup> I recall some high-level discussions in the

<sup>72</sup> Organic Administration Act of 4 June 1897, 30 Stat. 34, as amended. Also known as the Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill.

Forest Service along in the 1940s about the desirability of specific legislative authority for wilderness designation. I can't remember why we decided as we did but the decision was to continue with secretarial authority.

It was late in 1955 or early 1956 when the Forest Service was first approached for support in getting legislation for wilderness preservation. I don't mean that this was the first time anybody thought about wilderness preservation legislation in the Forest Service or elsewhere. For example, in 1949 C. Frank Keyser of the Library of Congress reported in response to a congressional request on the desirability of a federal policy and program of wilderness preservation. The report was more concerned with policy and program than with legislation. It did explore to some extent the statutory authority for wilderness preservation.

ERM: You speak of being approached about wilderness legislation.

McA: What I mean is that so far as I recall the first person or agency to specifically propose such legislation to the Forest Service was Howard Zahniser, executive director of the Wilderness Society. He was accompanied by one of his assistants. I think there had been three or four wilderness conferences beginning about 1950 in which the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club were the most active groups. I believe legislation was talked about at the 1951 conference. I've always thought the Wilderness Society was the first group publicly to propose national legislation. Certainly they were the first to seek Forest Service support for national legislation.

ERM: What was the Forest Service reaction to this proposal?

McA: The Forest Service people at the meeting with Zahniser tried to talk him out of his idea for legislation. We were not unalterably opposed to legislation but felt that it was not urgently needed and that in any event it would be unwise to try for it at that time.<sup>73</sup> (Edward C.) Crafts, (Reynolds G.) Florance, and I repeatedly made these points with Zahniser. We explained that we were fearful that agitation for legislation might hinder our efforts to expand and consolidate the national forest wilderness program and that

<sup>73</sup> C. Frank Keyser, The Preservation of Wilderness Areas – An Analysis of the Problem, (Washington, D.C.: Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, 1949).

legislation applying to other lands might reasonably wait a few years. We said that we didn't want to jeopardize what we already had gained. All of us pointed out that there would be vigorous opposition to wilderness legislation both within and from outside government. We thought sentiment for wilderness preservation should be built up first and that there would be a better chance to get good legislation after doing this.

The question of permanence of already established areas was brought up by Zahniser as a major reason for seeking legislation immediately. I remember how impossible it was to convince him that an area set aside under secretarial regulation could not easily be changed or eliminated. We suggested an interim device such as having wilderness areas set aside by presidential proclamation. This would be even more difficult to change. We reminded Zahniser that all we had for national forests was presidential proclamations. Zahniser wouldn't buy any of this.

ERM: Did Zahniser want help from the Forest Service in drafting legislation or was he just seeking support for some proposed legislation already written?

McA: I can't remember whether Zahniser had draft legislation with him at this meeting. I believe he did. Anyway, legislation was drafted and at Zahniser's request we arranged a rather large meeting in the Forest Service conference room. At that time there was a Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources and also a Council of Conservationists, both groups being in effect committees representing the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club and such-like organizations. There are reasons for having groups with high-sounding names such as these but I won't go into that now. I mention this only because I seem to recall that these special groups did the drafting of the legislation we discussed in our conference room. A large number of conservation organizations were represented at the meeting in our offices. Except for the Wilderness Society people – maybe one or two others – no one at this meeting was in favor of the draft legislation Zahniser presented. I remember being surprised that certain organizations did not favor the legislation. I can't remember the date of this conference. I do remember how dejected "Zahnie" looked walking down the hall ahead of me after the conference ended.

ERM: Then what happened?

McA: Zahniser went ahead with his ideas for legislation. The first wilderness bill was introduced by Senator Hubert Humphrey with a number of co-sponsors. I'd have to check my notes on wilderness legislation but I think this was in June of 1956. This was essentially the draft legislation Zahniser had shown us. Maybe we should agree how best to handle this discussion of wilderness legislation. Here are some notes on the history of wilderness legislation. They represent my record of significant bills, tell how many bills were introduced at one time or another, and so on. As you can see this is a rather lengthy batch of information. I doubt if many readers of this interview would be much interested in all these details.

ERM: Why don't we put this information in the appendix and restrict our comment here to questions and answers?<sup>74</sup>

McA: That is fine with me.

ERM: Before I ask a few questions which I think are pertinent to the history of wilderness legislation could you just give a brief history, a sort of summary of the notes you just showed me?

McA: Well, the story of the Wilderness Act of 1964 is too long and I expect in some respects too involved to make for a simple summary. Let me see what I can do.

Public discussion of wilderness preservation legislation began about 1950. Proposed legislation was first introduced in 1956. Five years later in 1961 a bill passed the Senate. Both Houses of Congress agreed to a bill in 1964, eight years after the first bill was introduced.

The proponents wanted national legislation partly to assure permanent status to wilderness reservations and partly to force federal agencies to set aside designated areas as wilderness. National legislation was sought because it was federal, not state agencies, which controlled essentially all the remaining wilderness in the country. The proponents, chiefly the Wilderness Society and to a lesser extent the Sierra Club and some others, offered a bill they had had drafted. Senator Humphrey of Minnesota introduced this bill in the Senate and Representative John Saylor of Pennsylvania introduced it in the House. Neither of these two

<sup>74</sup> For Dr. McArdle's notes on wilderness legislation see Appendix E, pp. 233-7.

bills or the others introduced in this 84th Congress got anywhere. Essentially the same bills were re-introduced in the 85th Congress and public hearings were held. Agriculture and Interior opposed these bills but Agriculture tried to keep the subject alive by suggesting alternative language. There was strong opposition from outside government and all bills died with that Congress. From this point on substantial modifications were made in newly introduced bills. Gradually various objectionable features such as the proposal for a Wilderness Preservation Council which would have upset the relationship between Congress and the executive branch were eliminated. A satisfactory definition of wilderness was agreed to after about four years of effort. Opposition, however, was still strong. I haven't counted the bills but I would guess about sixty bills were introduced during the eight years the legislation was under consideration. A bill by Senator Clinton Anderson of New Mexico was the bill which finally became the Wilderness Act.

ERM: I'm sure those few sentences don't begin to reflect the immense amount of time and effort that went into getting wilderness legislation enacted. You said something about Agriculture keeping the subject alive although opposing the legislation as introduced.

McA: Well, as I've said the Forest Service didn't feel any urgent need for wilderness legislation but we were not world without end opposed to it. We didn't like some of the provisions of the legislation first proposed and we felt that considerable opposition would be stirred up to the detriment of wilderness preservation progress already made. The Interior Department was strongly against any kind of wilderness legislation and so was the Bureau of the Budget. It seemed to Forest Service people debating our course of action that strong and vigorous opposition by the administration, coupled with exceedingly vigorous opposition from outside government, would very likely kill the possibility of having wilderness legislation any time soon. Although the timing was bad it was a fact that bills had been introduced. We thought we should do something more than oppose them. The upshot of our discussions in the Forest Service was agreement to recommend to the Department that along with opposition to the particular bill we were reporting on (S. 1176) there should be a strong recommendation that substitute language be considered. This would at least keep the proposal alive.

Doing this sounds simple but it wasn't. After we got Department of Agriculture approval of our recommendation for substitute language and approval of our desire not to condemn all wilderness legislation of any kind we still had some pretty high hurdles to surmount in the Budget Bureau and in the Interior Department. Interior's public attitude was that having reported favorably on a bill to establish what later became the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission there should be no wilderness legislation until the report of that commission was received. Interior said that wilderness was only a minor part of the whole outdoor recreation picture and did not merit special legislation. Connie (Conrad L.) Wirth, director of the National Park Service, told me privately that wilderness legislation such as had been proposed would tie his hands in building roads and other developments needed in the national parks and for this reason alone he would oppose legislation. Interior never would agree to offering substitute language but eventually we won permission from Budget to add this to our report and Interior was told not to oppose our substitute proposals. They did, however, oppose when testifying on S. 1176.

I testified on S. 1176 for the Department of Agriculture when the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands held hearings June 19, 1957. I testified again on another Senate bill four years later along with Secretary Freeman, Crafts, and Florance. This may be a good time to comment that practically all the work in the Forest Service on wilderness legislation was done by Ed Crafts and Reynolds Florance. My own part was small.

ERM: You said something about a Wilderness Preservation Council. What was that?

McA: This council was only one of several things Agriculture and Interior objected to in the early wilderness bills. The council would have had absolutely no administrative powers and would have been responsible to no one or to Congress. The council would have stood between the secretaries of Agriculture and Interior in all their dealings with the Congress on wilderness and all communications would have had to be transmitted through this council. It would have caused a tremendous amount of paperwork and lost time and effort. It is difficult to think of a more awkward, impractical, and cumbersome arrangement.

ERM: Do you think wilderness legislation would have been enacted more quickly if Forest Service advice had been followed to modify the

language originally proposed?

McA: Well, of course, this has to be a matter of opinion because nobody really knows. The original bill, the one proposed by the Wilderness Society, got exactly nowhere. This is what we told the Wilderness Society people would happen. It is also evident that the features of the original bill that we objected to before the proposal was introduced in Congress were later eliminated one by one. And perhaps I should comment that the Forest Service was by no means the only objector to these features. So the proposed legislation wound up when enacted about where it would have been at the start if our friends had been willing to listen.

Looking back after twenty years it is easy to say that events might have gone a certain way if certain things had been done or had not been done. But I just don't know. The Forest Service never said it would be impossible to get a wilderness law. Our advice was on content and on timing of the proposed law. The long struggle to get a wilderness law caused a lot of ill-feeling that need not have developed. It certainly seems unwise to have made specific proposals on a subject known to be controversial before public opinion had been built up to support these proposals. The original proposals immediately aroused opposition. This opposition got organized and moved pretty fast – much faster than the proponents could organize support. The history of the legislation shows how effective that opposition was right up to the end. For example, there were several times when a bill looked like it was headed for approval when it got bogged down in executive session of a congressional committee. I can't prove what happened inside this committee meeting because I wasn't there. But there are leaks of information and through such sources and also as a result of long experience it is not difficult to know that opponents of the proposed legislation were getting in their innings. However, we should remember that there would have been some opposition no matter how the first bill was worded or when or by whom introduced. The only reasonable response to your question is that it is idle to speculate on what might have happened.

ERM: Your account of the legislative history of the Wilderness Act didn't go into much detail on opposition to this legislation except for inside government. My recollection is that there was a great deal of opposition entirely outside of government. Let's talk about that opposition for a moment. Who – what individuals and organizations – opposed enactment of a wilderness law?

McA: I hesitate trying to answer this question without checking the hearing records. But even that would give only a partial answer. The hearing records would show only the publicly expressed opposition. I'm sure you know that there is also what might be called non-public opposition: comments in letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and conversations directly with members of Congress. I don't mean secret, illegal activity. I'm talking about perfectly legitimate methods of providing Congress with information it should have and wants to have. My point is that this kind of effort, pro or con, often is more effective than testifying at committee hearings. The hearing records wouldn't tell the whole story, either, because complete reliance on them would ignore the newspaper and magazine articles and all the other publicity that any controversial question usually receives. And the wilderness proposals certainly were controversial.

With all that prologue I'll give you some personal opinions. The strongest, longest continued and most effective opposition to wilderness legislation came from the forest industries. But other industries were opposed, too. Mining people saw – or thought they saw – closure to prospective mining operations. Stockmen all over the West were afraid the legislation would jeopardize grazing on public lands. There was exceedingly effective opposition from highway construction interests. Then there was adverse influence by various groups of mass recreational users of public lands, for example, many sportsmen's organizations, individuals, also. One of the surprises to us was opposition by the American Forestry Association. I recall meeting with the AFA board of directors to provide more accurate information than they apparently had received. This organization later did change its position to one of mild support or no opposition but by that time the legislation was headed down the home stretch.

The Society of American Foresters, as an organization, neither supported nor strongly opposed the proposed legislation. This organization held a referendum in December 1961 on whether wilderness areas should continue to be set aside by executive action of federal department secretaries or be included in a wilderness preservation system established by act of Congress. Which is to say, the existing system or the proposed legislation. The vote was about 70 percent in favor of continuing the executive action route.

There was strong and long-sustained opposition inside Congress, opposition which was felt inside the committee considering the

various wilderness bills. Even after the legislation had reached a form acceptable to the executive branch of the government there was active opposition from various individuals in the executive branch.

I know it isn't kind to say so but some of the most devastating opposition can be laid to the ineptness of some of those most in favor of wilderness legislation. I doubt if some of these well-meaning, conscientious people have any understanding at all of how easily and how greatly they can irritate members of Congress by what they do and say.

ERM: Can you give me an example?

McA: Well, I remember Senator Anderson telephoning me shortly after he had been visited by Howard Zahniser. Now keep in mind that "Zahnie" was about as thorough a gentleman as I ever knew. I used to disagree with him but I never lost my respect for him. But getting this wilderness legislation had become an obsession with Zahniser and this probably accounts for his persistent rubbing of congressmen the wrong way. Anderson was really upset. He told me that if Zahniser came up to beat on him just one more time he (Anderson) was going to drop the whole effort. He said he was working as hard and as skillfully as he knew how to work and he just was fed up with constant yapping at him. I tried to smooth it over. Anderson was never one to cherish a grudge and perhaps I served as a safety valve in this instance. But without Clinton Anderson there would have been no wilderness law.

ERM: In 1961 Eisenhower went out and Kennedy became president. Was the administration attitude toward wilderness legislation better or worse with Kennedy?

McA: Both Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman and Interior Secretary Stewart Udall enthusiastically endorsed legislation to preserve wilderness. It didn't make much difference in Agriculture because we had been doing what we could to further the legislation but this was a big change in Interior. It was very helpful to those trying to get wilderness legislation. I'd have to say, though, that some of Udall's people continued to undercut him. Don't ask me for names because I'm not going to give any.

ERM: Which members of Congress had most to do in getting wilderness legislation enacted?

McA: I don't think that question can be answered merely by saying who introduced bills or had their names on bills as cosponsors. From my observation point I think I'd name Senators Hubert Humphrey and Clinton Anderson if I were to name only two senators. In the House, John Saylor stands out most prominently. Lee Metcalf (then a representative) would not be far behind. Actually there were quite a number of congressmen who stuck with this proposal from start to finish.

The man who got the bill through Congress is Clinton Anderson. At that time Anderson was not chairman of the Senate Interior Committee or chairman of any of its subcommittees. But he was a member of the full committee and was number two man on the majority side of the Subcommittee on Public Lands. I don't know if he asked for the job but much of the long drawn out activity of hearings and so on was headed up by Senator Anderson.

ERM: Would wilderness legislation have been enacted if the Forest Service had opposed it?

McA: I doubt it.

ERM: That seems rather positive.

McA: Yes.

ERM: I've heard it said that the purpose of the Forest Service in establishing wilderness areas was to forestall agitation to make these scenic areas national parks. Would you care to comment on that?

McA: I never heard this purpose mentioned inside the Forest Service. Certainly establishment as national forest wilderness has not prevented transfer to national park status. Over the years a good bit of national forest wilderness has been so transferred. I can remember when what was the Olympic Wilderness inside the Olympic National Forest was transferred to the newly created Olympic National Park. Or so much was transferred, I should say, that we had to abandon the rest as designated wilderness. In the same state but more recently land in designated wilderness in Northern Cascades national forests was moved to national park jurisdiction. It seems rather obvious to me that being in wilderness status never stopped proposals being made to move jurisdiction to the National Park Service. The Park Service has never been much in favor of being tied down to designated wilderness areas and in former years when

a national forest wilderness was transferred to national park administration the area lost the protection we had given it through wilderness classification. The Wilderness Act, of course, prevents this loss of wilderness classification except by act of Congress. This was one reason the Park Service opposed wilderness legislation.

Maybe I should make it clear that Forest Service wilderness areas were not established for their scenic values but to represent typical areas in various parts of the United States. For example, to have a large sample of conditions in the northern Rocky Mountains, or southwestern semi-desert country. Our purpose was to preserve, over large areas, primitive conditions of environment, especially vegetation. Many national forest wilderness areas do have outstanding scenic values and I expect these values did have some weight in wilderness area establishment but I have reviewed many proposals for establishment of wilderness or wild areas before giving my approval and I don't recall ever seeing much discussion of scenery; the arguments dealt with other values. Anyone wanting to know what the purposes were in establishing primitive, wilderness, and wild areas should take a look at USDA Regulations L-20, U-1, and U-2.

ERM: What in your opinion are the main dangers to wilderness preservation? Or can it be said that the wilderness legislation we have been talking about has eliminated all dangers?

McA: Let me think a moment. I believe I'd list the dangers – not in order of importance – about like this: mineral exploitation, reservoir sites, and ingress and egress to privately owned land or to mining or water impoundment operations. If you will look at the Wilderness Act I think you will see that none of these dangers has been eliminated. So we still have significant dangers with us.

I am going to add one more danger even though I know wilderness enthusiasts won't like me saying it. Wilderness enthusiasts are themselves a danger. Portions of many wilderness areas are being over-used with resultant damage. Visitors, especially those using horses, tend to stick to the same trails and same campgrounds year after year. Inevitably the trails get chewed up and become eroded. Vegetation is injured and in some places non-native vegetation gets introduced in the horse feed. It is difficult to know how best to manage wilderness but if not managed it doesn't seem to me that all of it will remain wilderness. My opinion is that present wilderness legislation is effective in having specific areas

established as wilderness and in preserving purely man-made boundaries. Legislation so far isn't of much value in eliminating the basic dangers to preservation of true wilderness conditions.

Wilderness: a resource or a use?

ERM: In recent years we've seen a great deal of agitation for preservation of natural resources of all kinds – soil, water, air, and many others. Does this newly developed interest in resource conservation include expanded effort for wilderness preservation? What do the people you refer to as wilderness enthusiasts want next?

McA: This question is both easy and difficult to answer. The easy answer is that these people want to put a fence around every acre of federal land and to call the whole thing wilderness. They'd stop all other use of this land. They'd do this at public expense for the benefit of the chosen few who can appreciate wilderness. This would be called an extremely biased opinion and of course it is but no more biased than some of the comments made by those who go overboard for wilderness preservation. I might suggest the old adage that many a truth is spoken in jest.

Let me go at this the more difficult way. I shall be talking only about federal lands because this is where just about all the push is. I have seen no public statements of intention and would be surprised to see any. But reports of private meetings (they'd be called secret meetings if held by government people) do filter out now and then. I think, however, I will base my answer on what I have seen, what anyone can see.

The first push I noticed was a series of attempts to get wilderness mentioned in connection with related legislation. This effort just to get a mention soon developed into a determined drive to have wilderness stated as one of the major uses of the national forests and other public lands. When what became the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was being considered it was stated as congressional policy that the national forests shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and for wildlife and fish purposes. We always had thought of wilderness use as a part of the broader recreation field and so had everybody else.

All of a sudden, this listing was not satisfactory to the wilderness people. They began to insist that wilderness use be given equal billing with recreation, range, watershed, timber, and wildlife. This was not done but vigorous efforts still continue to get wilderness listed as the sixth major use of public lands. This effort includes repeal or revision of the Multiple Use Law. Last year when I testified at hearings on Senator Humphrey's bill S. 2296 for forest and rangeland management I again heard wilderness proponents – this time the Sierra Club – strongly insisting on inclusion of wilderness as a major use of national forests with language suggested that would make significant changes in the Multiple Use Act. Somewhere along the line the wilderness folks began pushing to have it recognized that wilderness is not a use but a resource. This effort has become rather involved. Consistency has never particularly bothered these people but some of the inconsistent statements being made now are to say the least a bit peculiar. I have seen wilderness described as both a use and a resource in the same sentence.

Another recent development that I have observed is a determined effort to have all federal land having no roads or timber cutting or other prominent uses designated immediately as wilderness in order to preserve it. There is strong lobbying to have all this de facto wilderness immediately declared off bounds to any other activity. This comes pretty close to putting a fence around land, the thing I mentioned earlier somewhat jokingly.

I suppose the most recent development in the campaign to get more and more land declared wilderness by act of Congress is the effort to break away from what is sneeringly called the purist definition of wilderness and blanket into non-use, or at best little-use, a host of used areas, especially in the East. I suppose this would be a case of wilderness restoration. It seems one thing to me to preserve what really is wilderness but something quite different to try to recreate primeval conditions on land that by no stretch of the imagination can be thought of as wilderness. I have no objection to rehabilitating some of these areas for recreational purposes but they are no longer wilderness and should not be called wilderness. The definition of wilderness would also be weakened by including areas of a hundred acres or less. In my opinion this makes a farce of any reasonable definition of wilderness. It is simply preservation for the sake of preservation, or preservation for a highly restricted form of recreation. And to do this under the sacred banner of "wilderness preservation before it is too late." The people doing this, I might add, have always been pretty free to accuse others of subterfuge and deceit.

Robert Marshall and the establishment of wilderness areas

ERM: We have wandered away from consideration of wilderness legislation. But before we end this discussion it might be well to add one more comment. Who inside the Forest Service has had most to do with wilderness preservation?

McA: I hope I do no one an injustice in responding to this one. I need to say at the outset that a great many people in the Forest Service have worked toward wilderness preservation. That a large number of people have been involved should be obvious when you think that Forest Service effort in wilderness preservation has been going on for some fifty-five years, that millions of acres of wilderness have been surveyed and studied, that nearly a hundred specific areas have been set aside permanently for wilderness, and that doing all this involves a large number of people at all administrative levels. Just the routine job of protecting wilderness areas from destruction by fire, insects, and disease has not only taken time and effort by many people; it has taken millions of dollars. It has also taken some lives – and this is more than can be said by those who shout the loudest about their concern for wilderness preservation.

But to get down to individuals. Wilderness preservation by the Forest Service got its start with Art (Arthur H.) Carhart and Aldo Leopold in the late teens and early 1920s. Another early laborer in the vineyard who has never gotten the credit he deserves for encouraging others in wilderness work is E.A. Sherman who many years ago was associate chief of the Service. I suppose many would say that Robert Marshall should have major credit for the establishment of many or most present national forest wilderness areas. I would not go so far as to say that Marshall did more than anyone else to sell the wilderness concept in the Forest Service because I don't think he did. John Sieker did a lot more than Marshall to preserve wilderness and for many more years. But it is true that a good many present national forest wilderness areas owe their establishment or designation as wilderness to Marshall's efforts.

ERM: Tell me a little about Marshall.

McA: Bob Marshall was for a few years head of the Forest Service division of recreation in our Washington Office. I'm not sure of the exact name of this division when he was head of it but I can recall the dates 1937 to 1939. Marshall died in 1939 presumably

of a heart attack while on a trip to New York, I think. He was only thirty-eight years old when he died. Bob Marshall was an unusual chap, some said peculiar. He was independently wealthy and the Wilderness Society, which he helped to organize got its start with a bequest of, as I recall, about a quarter of a million dollars from Marshall. Bob was one of my temporary summer student assistants in 1925 when I was stationed in Oregon and Washington. Then and later I got to know him fairly well. I never heard him mention wilderness preservation in 1925 when I first met him; this interest must have been aroused somewhat later. He was an enthusiastic cross-country walker, although his walking gait was more of a half-trot, and I have known him to go fifty miles in one day in the mountains and not all on trails, either.

When Marshall was chief of recreation he went out and looked personally at potential wilderness areas. Unfortunately he had little surveying sense and the maps he brought back left a good deal to be desired in accurately describing boundaries of the areas he wanted designated as wilderness. I remember seeing some of these maps one time when Bob asked me to go with him to see (Ferdinand A.) Silcox who was Forest Service chief at the time. I think I was stationed in North Carolina and was in Washington for some reason I no longer remember. Several of Marshall's maps – these were small scale national forest maps – had Bob's wilderness proposals shown only as irregular blue pencil ovals or rough circles.

This haziness in boundary designations was years later to be the cause of much trouble when I was chief. If I had known that I would later be sitting in Silcox's chair I would have paid more attention to Marshall's free, wide, and handsome boundary indications. You see, in order to set aside these areas (then called primitive areas) even tentatively, and to prohibit roads, timber sales, and other activities inconsistent with wilderness preservation the areas had to be described more accurately than Marshall had done. These descriptions had to be shown on individual national forest status maps by legal subdivisions. For much national forest back country there were no actual land surveys and the section lines were only on the maps, not marked on the ground. (A section is a square a mile long on each side). Not infrequently, if there had been actual land surveys, perhaps before proclamation as national forests, the marked lines on the ground were not where the survey reports or the maps said they were. Much of this early surveying was contract surveying but I shouldn't get off on that subject. I'll just say that I have seen section corners a mile away from where they were supposed to be and where the maps indicated they were.

This is getting too long. What happened was that someone translated Marshall's by-guess and by-gosh maps into legally described boundaries and these descriptions were sent to local national forest supervisors so they could keep out non-wilderness activities until someone could get around to making a more careful examination on the ground and see where these registered boundaries actually were, and where they should be placed. In my time as chief we were trying to do this. If even a small acreage was eliminated the wilderness folks protested loud and long over every small adjustment of these tentatively recorded boundaries. I used to get pretty fed up with their shrill and hysterical protests. Whenever I'd try to explain why the boundaries as recorded originally were not intended to be final the response was, "No such thing; the way they are recorded is the way Marshall drew them and wanted them to be." By this time, you see, Marshall – or his memory – had become some sort of holy guru to the wilderness people. Of course, by the time we got around to examining these primitive areas under the requirements of Regulations U-1 and U-2 we had learned that the boundaries should be something other than legal survey lines. Even if marked on the ground these lines would not be clearly visible and would have to be searched out. What was needed was a boundary along a well-defined ridge or a stream that could easily and definitely be seen.

ERM: We digressed a bit in talking about Marshall. You mentioned several Forest Service people who had a part in wilderness preservation. Are there others?

McA: I think I will stop here. There were many Forest Service people who over the years may not have done the spectacular things that Marshall did but who have been "hewers of wood and drawers of water" in achieving wilderness preservation on the national forests. These are the people who did the onerous everyday jobs. My answer to your question of who did the most is that in sum total it was these unnamed and unsung folks.

## Conclusion

ERM: Can you think of anything else that should be included in this discussion? We've covered quite a lot of territory. Can you sort of tie a knot before we go to another subject?

McA: Well, I believe the thought I'd like to end with may be obvious but let me say it anyway.

Wilderness preservation has degenerated into too much of a squabble between those who want everything preserved as wilderness whether or not it really is wilderness, and those who are opposed to all wilderness preservation, or think they must take this attitude to offset the extravagant claims of wilderness enthusiasts. The thought I'd like to end with is that this should not be an either/or proposition.

We need to preserve substantial areas in wilderness condition. I think we will need wilderness more and more as we diminish our primeval resources and as we become more urbanized and further removed from our original resource heritage. We need wilderness to renew our sense of balance and to keep our spiritual fabric in good condition. Forget about the dollar value of wilderness. Maybe there isn't any. It doesn't matter; it is worth whatever it costs.

At the same time we must use our natural resources, including some of what is now primeval and untouched, in order to live. Just caveman existence requires food, clothing, shelter, and fuel to warm the shelter. To have more than caveman living we must add to those necessities of bare existence the raw materials that must be used to make the many things we take pretty much for granted in modern life. These things have to be made from natural resources. From what else can they be made?

These are the simple facts of life. So the knot I'd tie in this discussion of wilderness is to say that enactment of wilderness legislation didn't mark the end of anything. The question still before us is not preservation or use of resources but how best to achieve both preservation and use. If this be a sermon, make the most of it!

EDWARD C. CRAFTS, LEGISLATIVE ADVOCATE

ERM: At what time did Ed Crafts come into the picture as a participant in that work on the Hill?

McA: It might be easier to say at what point he didn't come in. It would take a lot fewer words.

ERM: All right.

McA: No, I'll try to answer your question. He was into legislative matters from start to finish and in many instances he instigated them to begin with. He testified on some bills on his own and many times when I testified he prepared my testimony. You realize that on some of these things when you do your homework before you go up there this might mean drafting some possible questions and figuring out what the answers should be. You are not finding excuses. I don't mean that when I talk about finding possible answers. You might have to look up a great many pieces of information to have an answer ready in case you are asked a question. Sometimes I would have a book several inches thick with tabs on the side to enable me to quickly locate an answer to some question that might be asked. The Forest Service is a far flung agency. It has a lot of interests. There's more information than one man can keep in his head all of the time no matter how good his memory is. Crafts usually would brief me on my testimony if I were doing it. But as I say, he'd frequently do it entirely on his own representing the Forest Service. He was a splendid witness. No one ever spooked him. He didn't scare easily. If he didn't know the answer, he'd just wait until he figured it out, or if he didn't have the information, he'd simply say, "We'll see that you get it."

Ed Crafts was deeply into all legislative programs and other activities of the Forest Service. He had imagination and vision; he could look ahead and suggest things that we ought to be doing; he could suggest legislation. Crafts was the one who pointed out to me that we had no specific statutory authority for grazing or recreation and several other types of work that we eventually took

care of in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.<sup>75</sup> He was my right-hand man in all matters of legislation. I should perhaps say that Crafts did not handle appropriation hearings nor did he attend those hearings.

Crafts was for part of the time in poor health. I remember telling his wife, Sally, one time that I'd rather have Ed Crafts half the time than anyone else that I could think of, full time and overtime. I still feel that way about it. There were some things that Ed Crafts wanted me to do that I didn't feel the Forest Service was quite ready for and didn't do, and I am sure on many occasions Ed was exasperated because I didn't do things immediately. He was probably right, but, in my judgment, I couldn't do them at that particular time.

ERM: When you came to retire as chief was there any consideration given to putting Crafts into that position?

McA: Yes. The decision was not mine. I was asked by Secretary (Orville) Freeman for suggestions. I gave Secretary Freeman three names. He did not ask me to choose or recommend one of those names. His choice of Cliff was entirely his own. Crafts had been working in the secretary's office for several months before I retired. This was something that I had done realizing that I was going to retire. I tried to see that several people in our organization were known personally to Secretary Freeman. For example, Freeman's knowledge of Cliff was based in part on a trip through some of the Colorado national forests but in other ways he came to know Cliff and several other people in our organization. I can't tell you what factors went into his choice of Cliff because I simply don't know. Crafts, as you know, became head of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Interior Department. I thought he was a fine choice for that position.

ERM: Who was the third man?

McA: Do you mind if I don't tell you that?

<sup>75</sup> For further information on Edward C. Crafts see Forest Service Researcher and Congressional Liaison: An Eye to Multiple Use, typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Susan R. Schrepfer, (Santa Cruz, California: Forest History Society, 1972).

## CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN GOVERNMENT

Too much or too little?

ERM: You were an experienced person in government bureau administration. You were also a student of public affairs and have been involved in a study on a serious level ever since you retired from the Forest Service, if I'm not mistaken, and I think with that dual kind of experience, you may be in a position to make responses on these things in a way that carries a good deal more weight than someone who had not had both. There is in today's paper a report, which I think I mentioned to you on the way down here this morning, in which a panel has come forward with a rather strong criticism of the centralization of power in the presidency over recent years.<sup>76</sup> I wonder if you would take just a minute or two to scan this article and see what place it might have in further answer to what you have just now given me. The main thrust of my question concerned the whole matter of the trend toward centralization in the government and the growing power of the executive branch, particularly the White House. How is this developed in your view both in office and since you left it?

McA: Well, when I think back on my time as chief of the Forest Service, there were proposals every now and then which would have led to more centralization of power and authority and responsibility in the federal government generally. I've noticed in the last half-dozen years or so a distinct move toward more centralization in the federal government, perhaps in state government also, but certainly the federal government is concentrating more and more of the decision making authority and program planning in the president's immediate office. I don't mean by the president himself, but by those reporting directly to him. I'm thinking chiefly of what's now called the Office of Management and Budget. I don't think so much centralization is a good thing. This opinion may be influenced by having grown up in an organization, which has tried to go in the opposite direction,

<sup>76</sup> "Abuse of Executive Power Hit," Washington Post, March 21, 1974, p. A-1, A-13.

that is to decentralize as far as possible and to put decision making as close to the point where the decisions take effect as could possibly be done. The Forest Service started decentralizing in 1908 and has had some sixty plus years of experience with it and I think still feels it is operating on a decentralized basis. When decisions must be made in Washington on everything, I don't believe that it's the best form of public service.

I am not able to comment on the article in the newspaper and the report on which it's based because I have read neither. I don't know what they say and I don't know whether I'd agree or not. I'm simply commenting in general that I think centralization can be carried to an extreme and my opinion is that it is being carried to an extreme now. I think decentralization can also be carried to an extreme and that when it is it can be as harmful as too much centralization.

ERM: In the process of democracy, we tend to go in a pendulum motion between these two and the balance is to keep the pendulum not rocking in too wide an arc and I think perhaps the criticisms of the present day are that the swing of the pendulum in the direction of centralization of power has indeed swung much too far in that direction to be healthy and is now perhaps in the process of being pulled back in line a bit.

McA: This is what I intended to say when I started my response to your question, that there are cycles in these things and we encountered them when I was still in active service. They are going on now. Sometimes the pendulum swings very far and sometimes it's only a short way. But generally speaking, I believe these changes in attitude don't persist, they eventually swing the other way. I don't know what additional comment you want on this subject.

And the U. S. Forest Service

ERM: The Forest Service has had a long experience in testing the decentralization approach. I wonder if you could sketch some of that experience as you have seen it, studied it, and also indicate what requirements have to be met to make such a program effective.

McA: The Forest Service originally was administered entirely from Washington but in 1908 Gifford Pinchot decentralized and established the regional offices. At that time Forest Service administration was almost entirely national forest administration and did not include very much research or state and private cooperation. But this decentralization has been a good thing for the Forest Service. As the Service became bigger its responsibilities expanded and the number of people in the Service grew from a few hundred to some twenty thousand. Obviously some way had to be found to overcome bigness and the difficulties of administering a large organization all from one desk, you might say, in Washington. Pinchot was ahead of his time in doing this, and when the Service did get larger and had larger responsibilities, we were prepared for it. The Forest Service has about sixty-five years of experience in trying to make decentralization work. The basic purpose as I have already mentioned is to put decision-making as close to the people the agency serves as is possible so that they don't have to wait for a decision from Washington or even go to some regional headquarters.

Some agencies, you know, claim to be decentralized but all of their decentralization is in Washington. I've walked down the corridors in the South Building of Agriculture and seen signs projecting from doors indicating the headquarters of such and such a region. These agencies are decentralized but the decentralization is all right here in Washington. Forest Service decentralization has been different. The regional headquarters are outside of Washington in areas that they are administering. I am talking now about national forest administration but the same sort of thing applies to research as operated by the Forest Service and to state and private forestry cooperation as the Service has administered it. The decentralization with the Forest Service is geographical but it's also decentralized by subject matter.

National forest administration might serve as an example of what I'm talking about. When I was chief there were ten regional administrations each headed by a regional forester and his staff. Since I retired I believe there has been some small consolidation of regions. Each of the regions is further broken down into individual national forests each headed by a forest supervisor with a staff, and each national forest is broken down geographically into ranger districts which might be as big as 250,000 acres each in charge of a district ranger. For many things, a member of the public would not need to go any further than the local district ranger. For some other things he might need to go to the forest supervisor to get a decision. Almost everything that would concern him could be

settled by the regional forester. Only in a few instances would he be required to come to Washington.

You asked what are the requirements that have to be met to make decentralization work. I am going to mention three. The first is that there must be a thorough understanding of the organization's objectives, its goals, its policies, and programs. If this is not done, there is a pretty good chance that everyone in the organization will not go in the same direction. They need to go in the same direction and this requires an understanding of policies, objectives, goals, and programs. I'm not talking about hard and fast inflexible uniformity in methods to carry out these policies and to achieve these objectives. I do mean that a decentralized agency must operate within a recognized framework and everyone in the organization must know what that framework is. I guess in simple terms you could say that everyone in the organization must know what the organization is trying to do and where he fits into this whole framework. Otherwise, one decentralized unit is very likely to go in one direction and another decentralized unit of the same organization might very well go in a different direction. So, to repeat, one basic essential is to have everyone thoroughly understand the organization's policies, objectives, programs, know exactly what is being attempted and where he fits in.

ERM: How do you accomplish that?

McA: That is accomplished in literally scores of different ways. In the Forest Service, it is achieved by directives that are in the Forest Service Manual. It is achieved by extensive correspondence back and forth not only between Washington and regional offices, but between regional offices, forest supervisors, and rangers, between one regional forester and another. It is achieved by frequent meetings at which policies and programs and goals are discussed. It is achieved by cutting field people in on formulation of policies and programs. I could go on at great length on this, but I think you get the idea that you do this by constant communicating with each other.

ERM: And encouraging and keeping open the channels of communication.

McA: That's correct. Let me go on with a second major requirement that must be met if decentralization is going to work. There must be effective delegation. What do I mean by effective delegation? I mean that the person doing the delegating must delegate real responsibility and that he must also delegate real authority to match that responsibility. It does no good to delegate responsibility if

the person on the receiving end has no authority to redeem his responsibility. Delegation should mean to really delegate. You can't give and keep also. If the one doing the delegating is going to insist on prior review of everything, if he's going to check out every minor detail, is going to be constantly second-guessing and overruling decisions, you are not going to have effective delegation. The whole idea is to get just as much of the responsibility and decision-making authority as close as possible to the places where the decisions are taking effect and you can't have that if you are going to keep all the authority yourself. You have to also keep your delegations delegated. If that sounds involved let me give you an example. I've been on a fire, when I was chief, with the regional forester and the national forest supervisor. The local district ranger was in charge of the fire. None of the three of us over the ranger, myself, the regional forester, or the forest supervisor attempted to give any orders. The ranger was the boss. I had delegated my authority up to a certain point to the regional forester. The regional forester had shared his delegation of authority and responsibility with the forest supervisor and the forest supervisor had shared his portion with the district ranger. In this instance it was the district ranger who had to make the decisions. We did not attempt to take either responsibility or authority away from him. We could have taken our delegations away from him. But as long as he had them, he was the boss. He could have put me to work on the fire line. I think he would have been somewhat hesitant to suggest that I grab a grub hoe and go to work but he had the authority to do it because it had been delegated to him and the delegation was kept there.

Another aspect of effective delegation is very important. This is to have a clear understanding of the specific responsibility and the specific authority that have been delegated. Spell it out in writing. For example, the regional forester in Portland, Oregon used to have delegated authority to make a timber sale of up to 50 million board feet. He didn't have to ask Washington or anyone for authority to complete such a sale. He'd been given that authority. A forest supervisor in that region might have delegated authority to make a timber sale of smaller size, say 10 million board feet; a district ranger would have authority for still smaller sales. I'm trying to illustrate that each person had a definite, specific authority. The delegation varied according to conditions. The regional forester in Atlanta, Georgia at that same time had authority to make timber sales of no more than 10 million board feet. The conditions were quite different in the South than they were in the Northwest and the delegation of authority and responsibility took account of this.

You can't delegate, you can't decentralize management, unless the one who delegates and the one who receives the delegation both clearly understand what is delegated. This is why I said, write it out, and for most things the Forest Service does write these delegations out.

And finally, delegation is not effective unless the delegation is accepted by the person on the receiving end. If he's going to fail to make decisions, if he's going to side step the authority and responsibility that's been delegated to him, if he's going to delay decisions and buck them back up the line, then you don't have effective delegation. As an illustration, I might bore you with another fire story.

In my early days I was assigned to be boss on a forest fire. I was in research at the time. We had reached the bottom of the barrel and were taking researchers as crew leaders and fire chiefs. I did have some experience in fighting fires, but I had never been in charge of a big crew on a big fire. I met the train carrying the several hundred fire fighters that had been shipped to us. We started marching up the street of the little town and I saw a huge cloud of black smoke coming up from the fire I was suppose to get on top of. It had suddenly broken out of bounds and gone into the tops of the trees and was making off across the country. I panicked and phoned the forest supervisor. I said, "What shall I do?" This man had probably been up for seventy-five hours without sleep and the tiredness was in his voice as he said, "I don't know, Mac. It's your fire." That was all I ever needed. I learned then to accept delegated authority and responsibility. You do have to have some of these lessons in your early life.

What I've said is that to have effective delegation you must really delegate, don't try to give it and keep it also; you must keep the delegation delegated; you must have a thorough understanding by both parties of what is delegated; and finally, that delegation of responsibility and authority must be accepted.

ERM: It seems to me, Mac, that in recent years especially, there has been a trend quite away from this philosophy of management in the federal government, that where once there was a much more clearly delineated assignment of responsibility on a decentralized basis, we have in more recent years been working, it seems, in the other direction. Today almost across the board in federal government, control is being hauled back through the efforts of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget – to take away some of this assignment of responsibility to decentralized branches of the government.

Am I correct in that judgment in your view or not? I don't know that I stated it very well but I think you get the thrust of my question.

McA: If I understand you correctly, I think I'd have to say that to some extent this may be true. I'm qualifying my answer because for one thing I am not completely posted on current events in government administration. I am hesitant about making a flat statement, which may not be completely true. I'm also qualifying my answer because I think we have to understand that the Forest Service has not been undecentralized, if there is such a word. It's still decentralized but certain of the decisions, which may formerly have been granted to field units of the Forest Service may, under present directives, no longer be granted. I don't know this. I'm just simply saying that it could have been done. I do know that in general there is more centralization now than previously. For example, the Office of Management and Budget has proposed a system of ten regions. The objectives behind that proposal are perfectly logical and worthwhile.

I once saw a map, which showed the regional organizations of various government bureaus and agencies. As I recall, there were 109 different regions. This is what the Budget folks would like to correct and, as I say, their ambition to do so is completely understandable. However, there is another aspect to this regionalization which I hope the Budget people will remember to take into account and that is that logical regions for different types of work may not all be the same. The ten standard federal regions which have been proposed are, as I have heard it, arranged on the basis of population. So far as the Forest Service is concerned, this isn't a good basis on which to establish local regions. It is more logical to make the division on the basis of the amount of Forest Service work in particular areas. Thus, the Forest Service has Washington and Oregon in one national forest region because the work there is enough to have a local region. In the South we had eleven states in one region. The attempt to force all government agencies into ten standard regions might not and I think would not improve the federal service at all, simply because this doesn't fit the many, many kinds of work being done.

ERM: All of this, of course, is being offered as an argument on behalf of greater efficiency but sometimes the efficiency experts may be treating what is a complex problem in an over-simplified way. Their solution is not taking into account the complexities.

McA: Let me see if I can make an additional comment here that might be of some interest. At one time while I was still chief the Department of Agriculture decided that there should be only one headquarters in each county so that the people of the county would have to make only one stop for whatever dealings they might have with the Department of Agriculture. In a number of places buildings were constructed and all agencies of the Department of Agriculture that were represented in those particular counties were moved into these buildings. This worked well in certain instances and was pretty much of a fizzle in others. If a national forest ranger district is in two or three counties, which county is to have the ranger's office? The Department of Agriculture, I understand, is right now attempting to do again somewhat the same sort of thing. They are repeating what was done a good many years ago. I have no real reason to criticize the objective for one-stop service is a consummation devoutly to be desired, but I don't know whether it really makes for more efficiency or not. In some instances it might. In others it would not.

ERM: This is all related, of course, to growing concern that bureaucracy has gone ape in the last twenty or thirty years and has created a far more monstrous structure than is necessary. Is that essentially the argument?

McA: That's what a good many people do believe. Whether it's true or not is something else. The fallacy in some of this reasoning is the assumption that every citizen deals with every agency of government and therefore all of these agencies should be in one room or in one building, or all handled by one person. I think a little reflection will show that the ordinary citizen needing to talk with a government agency is aiming for a particular agency and not for a whole handful of agencies. Actually, it's easier for him to locate that agency if it's not conglomerated with a dozen others. I can give arguments on both sides of the question. But we are not talking now about decentralization.

ERM: No.

McA: We are talking about something related to it. There is a third major aspect of making decentralization work, which I haven't yet touched on. I have mentioned so far that what we need to do to make decentralization work is to have a thorough understanding of the organization's goals and objectives. Second, that there must be effective delegation. The third major requirement for effective decentralization is to check periodically on the delegated

responsibility and authority. You do this to see if responsibility has been used effectively. You do it also to see if delegated authority has been abused. In the process you recognize good work as well as poor work. The purpose of checking is not entirely to uncover sins of commission and omission but to use this process as a training device to achieve better work, and by discussing sins of omission and commission to show the way toward doing a better job. But the inspection or checking of the delegated responsibility and authority is an absolute essential to effective decentralization. Without it, I am not sure just where you'd end up. I think you'd end up in chaos.

ERM: What methods did you use to do this checking?

McA: We had two types of checking, or as we called it, inspection. One was functional inspection in which the staff people who were experts on, let us say, grazing or timber management or some other particular Forest Service activity, would make an inspection of the administration of this particular activity. The supervisor inspected the rangers. The regional office inspected the individual national forests and the forest supervisor and the Washington Office inspected the region. I am talking now about national forest administration. But the same principle is applied to other major activities. One of the purposes of these inspections was to see independently if the people along the chain of command were doing the proper supervision of the responsibilities and authorities that they had delegated. Another kind of inspection was what the Forest Service called general inspections or sometimes general integrating inspections in which a blue ribbon panel, you might say, of inspectors looked into all activities to see how well one activity was coordinated with another. This kind of inspection did not go into great detail on the functional aspects of any one activity but did check to make sure that functional inspections were being made. All inspections were done on a regular schedule and I perhaps ought to mention that in recent years the Department of Agriculture has set up an Inspector General's Office which does pretty much this same sort of thing although their efforts, as I understand them, focus largely on the financial aspects of delegated authority. This has happened since I left the Forest Service and I am not well enough informed to discuss this departmental type of inspection.

ERM: To what extent is that a reflection of the increasing impact of the Bureau of the Budget in the total picture of things?

McA: I don't think that enters into it to any extent, maybe to no extent.

It would be more likely to enter into it from similar inspections done by the General Accounting Office, which is an arm of Congress. Inspectors from the GAO have sought out wrong doing. In fact, their whole effort, as I observed it, is directed towards uncovering any misuse of funds or misuse of authority. There is nothing objectionable in doing this. I am only saying that their inspections are not used as the Forest Service inspections are used or at any rate used to be, as a training device in part. You see, the attitude in the Forest Service in doing an inspection was that when someone from my office went out, for example, they were checking for me on authority and responsibility, which I had shared with the regional forester. And so, in a sense, I was checking on myself to see how well my job had been done. The same comment would apply to the regional forester and the forest supervisor and the ranger when they made their inspections.

Despite what I said earlier I hadn't washed myself out of the picture when I delegated responsibility and authority to regional foresters. I was still responsible to the secretary of agriculture. All the authority I had came from him. The secretary of agriculture was still responsible to Congress. So it was a matter of sharing rather than total washing your hands of it. You couldn't wash your hands completely. You were still responsible. I didn't give a regional forester all of my authority. I gave him a portion of it. Similarly, what he delegated to the forest supervisors was only a portion of what I had granted, for example. He couldn't eliminate himself completely.

The significant thing to keep in mind is that as chief I was responsible for everything the Forest Service did. I could not evade that responsibility and to the best of my knowledge I never did.

ERM: When you received bad reports from your inspectors what were your usual actions that followed? What proceeded from that?

McA: Depends on what you mean by bad reports. It might be simply a matter of procedure that could be corrected right then and there on the ground. This is what usually happened. It might be that someone had misunderstood his authority, or it might be that in actual practice it was found that you couldn't do certain jobs in a certain way and it was necessary to make a change. It might not be a personal fault. Local people had authority to correct most of these shortcomings. They didn't have to refer back to Washington. Now, if you mean by bad reports a matter of embezzlement of funds or something of that kind, this was very serious and a report of this was always made on

up the line. If necessary, appropriate punishment was made. We had very little of this in the Forest Service, virtually none. Offhand, I can remember only two instances in all Forest Service history.

ERM: I wasn't thinking so much of that as I was bad reports on failure to handle delegated authority and responsibilities well.

McA: I should have covered that in my comment because it's something that does happen. Now that doesn't always mean that people are not competent. It frequently means that the delegation isn't clear and isn't understood. Sometimes it means that a person doesn't accept his responsibility or doesn't redeem it fully. That's what I meant a moment ago, that you don't accept responsibility if you are going to delay decisions or postpone them or not make them or buck them back up the line. In such instances you don't have effective delegation. When you uncover things of this kind you correct them. That's all there is to it.

ERM: By demoting the person.

McA: No, not necessarily. I think he wouldn't be demoted or removed unless it was a flagrant abuse of authority or flagrant failure to measure up to delegated responsibility. If it was just a failure to do what he should have done, you might have an understanding that he's on trial from that point on and he gets another chance to prove his competence.

ERM: What about those that fail repeatedly? I'm sure you must have encountered instances of that.

McA: Not very many. But there are such instances and you do what needs to be done. The person is moved to another job. You don't take a perfectly good employee who has demonstrated his competence over the years – he might have been promoted beyond his capacity and you rescue what you can of that – you don't just banish the man to all eternity. You shift things around. This is sensible administration. It's not only sensible, it's sensitive and human administration which is important because you get work done through people. You don't hold a man up to ridicule. There have been some instances in which a person hasn't done what he should have done and sometimes you can do something about it and other times there isn't too much you can do. I am thinking now of an instance in which three regional foresters, one after the other, attempted to get on top of a grazing problem in a certain region and for one reason or another, they were not able to do it. The chiefs of the Forest Service before me kept

trying and I finally accomplished it with the regional forester that I appointed. I gave this man perhaps somewhat more help than my predecessors had given but we were still trying to work this problem out because no one had succeeded. These things are not absolutely black and white. They are gray. At some point you have to decide whether they are gray enough to make a change or if you are going to try to go on. It may be a failure in something that isn't tremendously important. This whole subject is a difficult one to discuss in just a few words. It has so many ramifications.

ERM: Is the record of accomplishment and ability kept in certain prescribed ways by the Forest Service so that it can serve in determining advancements, new appointments, et cetera? Will you explain a little bit about how that works?

McA: Sure, there is a record kept of both failures and achievements. In one way or another such a record is kept on just about everybody in the Forest Service. At various times there have been attempts to formalize this type of record keeping. I can recall when once a year each supervisor was required to rate those working for him according to a standard system of various subjects. I don't remember all of the different points that had to be covered. Sometimes these were word descriptions or you'd cross out excellent, very good, good, or whatever, where it needed to be crossed out or circled. Other times, I recall we had a form that had a line across for each particular topic a person was rated on. You made a check mark on this line from left to right about where you thought the person rated. If he was absolutely top, the check mark went way over to the right. If he was very poor, it went way over to the left, and so on. We have also had systems in which we made what was known as a bird's eye review of the more up and coming people. No, that's the wrong expression. We made reviews of people in key jobs and some other jobs that were not quite so key but were on the road towards key jobs. These bird's eye review reports were pretty thorough and again followed a fairly standard system in which we would try to rate each individual according to his achievements, according to the aspects of his competence that his supervisor thought needed strengthening; poor qualities that should be watched or guarded against, and so on. These reports often were used in making promotions. This is a very complicated subject also, you know. The Forest Service, I think, has been pretty much in the forefront among government agencies in intelligent personnel management.

## PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN THE FOREST SERVICE

ERM: Perhaps with that, you ought to go into a discussion of the people aspects of administration. The executive has to remember all the time that he gets his job done by, with, and through, and sometimes in spite of people. Could you talk a little about that?

McA: We are very likely to embark on a long discussion if we pursue this subject very far. It is an important one and I am inclined to think that it's the most important discussion that we have had thus far. As chief of the Forest Service, I recognized that I had to depend on people to do the work of the Forest Service. I had to depend on people inside our own organization; people who reported to me and people outside the Forest Service that I reported to. I also had to depend on people outside of the Forest Service because we had need to coordinate or weave our Forest Service programs into those of related agencies such as extension services, state foresters, forest industry, and others. As time went on, this necessity to coordinate our programs with those of other agencies became more and more important and more and more difficult, too. I had to deal also with people outside my own organization when it came to selling our programs and policies. I had to deal not only with those who favored our policies and our programs but with those who opposed them. Sometimes those who opposed them were more important for me to deal with than those who favored them.

ERM: Who were those that most often opposed you when you first came in as chief?

McA: I don't think I can answer that specifically because it depends on what particular activity you are talking about. We might, for example, have a certain policy that would be chiefly opposed by those who were in favor of preservation of resources. Or we might have a policy that favored preservation that would be opposed by those who wanted to make some commodity use of resources.

ERM: What are the problems of dealing with people as your organization gets larger? What are the problems that come with bigness?

McA: The problems of dealing with people as any organization gets larger is true not only for public agencies but for private organizations, too, as corporations become big or individual companies become big. When this happens and an organization becomes very large, dealing with people becomes not only more difficult but more necessary. I think I mentioned earlier that one of my problems in the Forest Service was that once upon a time when the organization was small everyone knew everyone else. When I came in as chief we had many thousands of people who didn't know each other and who didn't know me and I didn't know them. As organizations get larger you run into some of what might be called the penalties of bigness such as workers tending to forget the spirit of service. Bigness, I think, tends to dull workers to the traditions of the organization. We had this problem in the Forest Service. We were proud of our traditions of service and esprit de corps but as we got bigger this became more difficult to maintain. You have a problem, as you get bigger, of workers becoming complacent, of sticking strictly to the eight-hour day, taking all of their allotted vacations, and things of that kind. I guess I could express it better by saying that mental stagnation sets in. You no longer have the verve, the vivacity, the aliveness of individual workers that you have when the organization is small. You have also a need for controls in a larger organization that you don't have in a small organization and this need for control and the imposition of controls tends to make younger workers particularly live by rule book. I used to take the attitude that rules are for use when the brains run out but when you have people who want to play it precisely by the rule book because they are going to be stepped on, then you have a different kind of organization than when you have people who feel free to use their own initiative and still stay within the framework of the organization's policies and objectives. I am not talking about being so flexible that as Steven Leacock used to say, an employee jumps on his horse and rides madly off in all directions. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about using some common sense and not being content just to look for answers in the rule book.

ERM: To what extent were you aware of these fundamental changes in the character of employees in the early years of your administration as chief? And if you were keenly aware of them, what devices and methods did you use to try to offset them?

McA: You keep asking me these double-barreled questions. I'm going to have a hard time answering two questions at once.

ERM: First of all, the first one. When did you become aware of this

change in the character and spirit of the employee?

McA: I don't think I became aware of it at any particular time and I want to make one point clear that this never did affect the Forest Service too seriously but to some extent it did. For instance, federal laws came into existence for eight-hour days, which required us to double man fire lookout stations. When the Forest Service first started the people on the lookouts were perfectly willing to work a twenty-four hour day. That doesn't mean that they had to work all the twenty-four hours but they were there and available for twenty-four hours. They hired out with that in mind. The new law prevented us from letting anyone work more than eight hours and this tended to make people more conscious of the eight-hour day. I told you in the early part of this interview about Thornton Munger's comment to me when I said I'd done something on my own time. He responded that I had no "own" time, that the government had it all. And so it was in the early days we didn't feel either obligated or did we desire to quit after eight hours. We were interested in the work. We wanted to continue it. It didn't seem a hardship to go on. When legal requirements came along that tended to prevent us from working as long as we'd like they didn't prevent a lot of us from putting in what became known as contributed time. Unless the Forest Service has changed a whale of a lot more than I think it has most of the people in it are still not paying much attention to the legal eight-hour day or forty-hour week. They are putting in whatever time it takes to get the jobs done. The clock has never ruled us in the Forest Service and I don't think it ever will.

I don't know that I can put my finger, Woody, on the exact time when I began to notice a change in attitudes. I would say that the change in attitudes was far more than a result of bigness. It was more the result of controls that had to be imposed, not necessarily by us but by other units of government which tended to make people more cautious, more careful in what they did, and as I have said, to live by the book and the calendar and the clock rather than by goals and objectives that they hoped to achieve. It was never serious in the Forest Service.

ERM: You didn't have to take some special measures to counteract what you assigned to growing condition of bigness, that it dulls workers to traditions of the organization. How did you keep alive in your personnel an awareness of the traditions of the Forest Service? What did you do?

McA: I don't want to leave you with the wrong impression that we didn't

feel that we needed to do something, that this wasn't a potential danger, because it was. We recognized this danger of developing complacency, of rigidity, of taking arbitrary action, of not being wholeheartedly willing to work long hours to carry out Forest Service policies and programs. Sure, some of this came into the picture. We attempted to overcome it in various ways. I doubt if I can remember all of what was done but measures were consciously applied. Some of them had to do with me personally. I spent a great deal of time visiting with people in the Forest Service in Washington and outside of Washington. Many times I would walk down the hall in Washington and visit with some individual member of the Forest Service. It might be one of the clerks or it might be one of the technical men. I'd do the same when I went for a visit in the field. What I was doing was duplicated by others and I'd like to think it was the good example that I set, but I don't think it was. I think these people, my subordinates, did it of their own accord. The regional foresters, forest supervisors, and rangers also would do this sort of thing. Enthusiasm and interest is catching and this personal contact was very effective.

Another way of overcoming bigness is to have more conferences on the aims and objectives of the organization and cut more people in on making decisions and on what the policies and programs should be. If people feel that they are at least partly responsible for working out the details of a program or a policy, they are much more likely to want to carry it out and to be enthused about carrying it out. These are just a few of the kinds of things that any organization can do to overcome some of the difficulties that come along when an organization gets large.

ERM: What do you feel, from your experience, people really want out of life?

McA: Well, we are really getting into some philosophy now for sure. As it happens, this is something that I have been greatly interested in for a good many years. I tried to find opportunities to talk with younger members of the Forest Service. For example, I'd seek an opportunity to be alone with a district forest ranger. This wasn't always an easy thing to do because the regional forester and his staff would want to be right there. So I'd have to find some way of sidetracking them and getting in the pickup truck alone with the ranger and try to find just what his hopes and ambitions were. Partly this was done because I wanted to know, but also because I felt that if the ranger knew I was interested in his hopes and aims and aspirations, he'd probably do a better job. When I left the Forest Service and was with the National Institute of Public Affairs, I had to deal with many young

people in their late twenties and early thirties all through the federal government, in state governments, and in some municipal governments.

I had a little private research project of trying to find out what these younger people really wanted out of life. Did they want to make a whole pot of money or just what did they have in view? Now, I don't think that any one out of the several thousand people that I must have talked to over the years ever expressed it as precisely as I'm going to try to say it now. But their aims and ideals and objectives went about like this: They wanted to have a sense of achievement, of accomplishment, and they wanted to have the satisfaction of feeling that the job they were doing was worthwhile especially if it was a public service job. And I don't mean by public service, public employment. There is a difference between public employment and public service. You can have public service in private employment not as easily perhaps as in public employment, but you can have it. These young people found a lot of satisfaction in sensing that they were performing something of public value for their fellow man. I don't think any of them expressed it in terms of making a lot of money. In fact, I can't remember any of them saying that making a lot of money was their aim in life. They wanted to have a sense of achievement and of doing something worthwhile.

Second, they wanted to have this accomplishment recognized. I am not talking about formal awards because they knew that only a few people can get these formal awards. The kind of recognition that I'm talking about can be said, can be written, it can be done in lots of different ways. I used to try to praise somebody for good work in front of his fellow workers. I'd frequently find an opportunity to tell a man's wife that he was doing a good job. I had to be somewhat careful in doing this because most wives, whether they said it or not, would immediately be thinking, "Well, why doesn't he give him more money." But as far as most workers were concerned a bit of praise now and then for good work was something that they all wanted and I'm not talking about being either very formal or doing it in a perfunctory fashion. If an executive or supervisor can't offer some praise wholeheartedly and sound like he means it, then he'd better not do it at all.

A third thing that most of these young people wanted was to have a respected place in the community. Sometimes this pretty much depended on the reputation of the private company or the public agency that these people worked for. If the public agency had a

good reputation or the company had a good reputation, some of the reputation was reflected on them. This desire to have a respected place in the community is partly responsible, I think, for the way many people volunteer for local public service jobs.

I perhaps should comment that my survey also included some older people, not just those who were still looking ahead but also those who were near the end of their jobs and were looking backwards. Strangely enough, these older people had somewhat the same ambitions and measured their satisfactions by whether they had had a sense of accomplishment, by how much their accomplishments had been recognized and by whether or not they occupied a respected place in the community. Very few of the older ones expressed their feelings in terms of salary or how much money they had been able to save. They were interested in something aside from money, having had a good family life, for example.

ERM: That was the view you had from your independent survey of what people are really looking for in life.

McA: Yes, and looking at it from a purely personal standpoint, I think I'd say it for myself. What would you say? Let's include you in the survey. It isn't ended yet.

ERM: Well, add me to the list. I would say that the first thing that I require out of life is a sense of self-fulfillment in whatever enterprise I put myself to do. I've got to have a sense that it is something that adds up very definitely as being of value and not just perhaps momentary value but of something that will have continuing value.

McA: This is what I said. Very few of the people that I talked to expressed themselves in exactly the terms that I just put down. But this sense of achievement, of accomplishment, I would call essentially what you've just said.

ERM: I take a great deal of satisfaction out of the work that I've done in the last twenty-odd years in the Forest History Society. For that very reason, it has been a work that has given me a great deal of personal satisfaction in doing. I can see that in what I have done. I can see the tangible evidences of it in things that are already on the shelves of libraries. I can see it in the collections that I have helped to build up in research centers all over this country. I can see it in little bridges of understanding that have been built between different sectors of the forest related community that may have

needed a little bridge building and I know that that work and those works of different kinds are going to be there fifty or a hundred years from now, and perhaps they may even be of more value then than they are now.

## McARDLE RECOUNTS HIS FOREST SERVICE CAREER

Research, state and private cooperation, administration

McA: At lunch I told you that sometimes I wish that I had stayed in research. About a third of my life has been spent in research and I prepared myself in my graduate work to go on with research and I fully intended to keep on with it but my bosses in the Forest Service willed otherwise. Had I stayed in research, I might have pushed back the frontiers of knowledge a little bit and be able to look with satisfaction on that. But I have had much satisfaction in what I did in the cooperative field of the Forest Service; the friendships that were made; the fact that we have some laws on the books that we wouldn't have had otherwise; that there's a lot of tree planting going on that might not have happened if I hadn't pushed it; cooperative forest management assistance that might not have been there if I hadn't pushed it; fire control on state and private lands if I hadn't pushed for bigger appropriations.

Similarly with being chief of the Forest Service, I sometimes wondered what did I ever accomplish. It's difficult to put my finger on it. I hope I did a good job but it would be rather hard to say what I did personally because I don't think in resource conservation very many jobs are done all by just one person and I can't point to any particular big achievement in resource conservation that I was completely 100 percent responsible for. But I think, perhaps one way or another, maybe I did some good as chief. It's not for me to rate that achievement, I didn't intend to be chief. I never sought the job. I don't know whether I would have done better had I stayed in other work but this is the way the chips fell and, to mix up the metaphor, you play the hand the way it's dealt to you.

ERM: You never consciously worked to that end of becoming chief of the Forest Service?

McA: No.

ERM: When it was suddenly thrust your way, how did you react? And under what circumstances did that invitation come?

McA: Well, to be completely honest, I was rather overwhelmed at first, and also to continue being completely honest, I was quite pleased. It was only later when I got into the difficulties of the job that I tempered that pleasure a little bit and could have wished sometimes that I was somewhere else. But my own feelings were perhaps at that time ones of accomplishment that I had done well enough in certain kinds of work to merit consideration for a more important, more difficult job. Charlie (Charles F.) Brannan was secretary of agriculture at that time. He appointed me. I had known him in Denver when he was in the Roosevelt administration. I don't know how much this long friendship had to do with my appointment. I'd like to think that ability was the principal factor. I asked him why he selected me and not someone else. He gave me some reasons but I don't think I should repeat them here. Brannan did not rely entirely on Lyle Watts's advice in appointing me, but consulted a number of members of Congress and wrote to several people. Sam Dana was one of these.

ERM: Your work up to that time had been a mixture of both research and administration, but more heavily research, had it not?

McA: About evenly divided. There are three ladders of achievement in the Forest Service; one is national forest administration; one is research; and a third is state and private cooperation. These are the three principal activities of the Service. Lyle Watts had come up the research ladder and the national forest administration ladder. His predecessor, Earle Clapp, had been . . .

ERM: In research?

McA: Not entirely. He was with national forest administration in the early days but mostly in forestry research. His predecessor, Ferdinand Silcox, had had only national forest experience. I came up the research ladder and the state and private cooperation ladder. I had had no direct personal experience in national forest administration. I had accepted an offer by Watts to go to Milwaukee, Wisconsin as regional forester of that region and was looking forward to it with great anticipation. I didn't know if I could be a regional forester but I wanted to try. Several things happened between the time of that offer and the time when I would have moved from my job as director of the research station in Asheville, North Carolina, which caused Watts to change his mind and ask me to come to Washington instead

of Milwaukee and to take over as assistant chief for state and private forestry. I didn't want that job. I didn't want to come to Washington but it worked out all right and looking back I found those eight years in state and private very satisfying, very happy years in spite of all the difficulties at the time that I thought were pretty bad. I used to, as chief, regret that I had never been a district ranger, for example. Ed Cliff, who was in charge of national forest administration, said he was very happy that I had never been a district ranger because if I had been, I would have been a ranger some thirty years earlier, would think I knew it all, but would have been thirty years out of date. His point was that things change as you go along. I never noticed any lack of acceptance of me as chief by national forest people. I had always worked very closely with national forest people in all of my Forest Service career, knew most of them before I became chief and I never felt insufficient because I had not climbed up part of the way on the national forest ladder. I don't know if this answers what you are driving at or not.

ERM: Looking back down that ladder do you see any milestones or rungs that may have projected you a little ahead of your peers of the times for something that you were particularly noted for having done? What brought your promotions up that ladder?

McA: I don't know.

McA: Oh, you must have some notions now. Let's not enter any element of false modesty.

McA: I'm not being modest, I simply don't know. I know what promotions are based on in the Forest Service and if you want to get into that, I would be happy to give you my own views on that point and perhaps you can judge for yourself why it was that I was selected as chief. You see, I started in research and then moved over to this other field. I was in every position in research from the bottom to the top except the topmost rung of the research ladder, which is today the deputy chief in charge of research. In the state and private ladder I moved over to the highest rung and stayed on that one rung for eight years as what is now deputy chief for state and private cooperation.

ERM: What were the milestones of research that you mark? You specialized in certain areas of research. What were they and what do you see as being of most lasting value in that part of your career?

McA: I believe that very early in this interview I mentioned that I started on a yield study of Douglas-fir, so I began my research career in the field of mensuration. I moved from that to be in charge of fire studies. From fire studies to being in charge of forest management research generally. This was at the Portland station. Then I left the Forest Service to be dean of the forestry school at the University of Idaho and when I came back to the Forest Service, I came in as a director of the regional forest experiment station at Fort Collins, Colorado. As director of the forest experiment station I had responsibility for all the research at that station, which included forest management, range management, wildlife management, watershed management, and I guess just about every field of forest research activity that there is today. Some of the fields of activity were new to me and I had to learn those. I moved to Asheville, North Carolina as director of the regional experiment station there and except for range management, had all of the same activities that I had at Fort Collins. Actually, we started range management at Asheville, so that I guess I had all of the research activities there.

ERM: Now when you say you were head of these research stations, you became less directly involved in research of your own and more involved in administering research programs totally, did you not?

McA: Yes. I should have made that plain. When I became a station director I quit personal research not because I wanted to but because the job required that I spend full time directing the work of others.

ERM: You see that as the beginning of the end?

McA: Yes, it was. The end of one period of my career.

ERM: When you speak nostalgically of wondering whether you should have gone on into administration and to the role you played at the top of the heap, that was the turning point in a sense, was it not, when you accepted a command post in research rather than a continuing research assignment?

McA: Yes, that's true but perhaps I should point out also that being a director of a station, at least as I found the job, or as I made it, doesn't completely divorce you from active, intimate participation in research. At Asheville, for example, I found a research worker, George Byram, who had been a student at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, in the physics department. At that time I was on fire research and one of our problems was how far we could see the

smoke from a small fire. A fire, let us say fifteen or twenty feet square. This information was needed in order to know how far apart to put fire lookout stations. I hired Byram to help me in fire research. Well, while I was away from Portland at Idaho and again in Colorado, Byram was moved to Asheville and was still working on fire research. So when I went to Asheville he and I again worked very closely on fire research, chiefly on visibility, picking up not where we left off in Portland, because Byram was further along, but on many aspects of the work. I expect I'd have to say that Byram furnished the brains and I furnished the inspiration, but at any rate, I wasn't looking at fire research from a great distance. I was deeply involved in it almost every day.

I could say the same thing for watershed management research, for range research, for mensuration, for almost every research activity. A director of an experiment station should not be sitting everyday at his desk. He should be out amongst the research workers taking an active part, listening to what's going on, making suggestions for a different approach, evaluating the results so far achieved, and so on. This is one of the difficulties you get into as an organization gets large and the Forest Service research organization has now become as big as many individual bureaus so that an experiment station director decentralizes his job through assistant directors, each man with a particular field. One would be range management, another would be forest management, and another watershed management, economics, and all the rest. But that doesn't mean that the experiment station director himself need become a remote figurehead. If he's any good he doesn't allow himself to become that and I never allowed myself to become a remote figurehead when I was a station director.

This gets off, Woody, into something else of the individual himself as to how he operates. It isn't something that necessarily is a part of his university training or his Forest Service training. It's characteristic of the individual. Some people operate one way and some operate in another way but I would never allow myself to get remote from the research that I was responsible for.

ERM: Research people too, in great part, are very unequipped to deal with financial problems, of obtaining the sources of money that they need to do their work, or to deal with some of the other problems attendant to setting it up and getting it done, providing the facilities for it, and so on. I would imagine this all comes down heavily upon the director of the research stations to look after these things, to be expert in achieving them. Because you started with very limited sources of support in the early days of the research stations

and a great deal had to be built up, did it not?

McA: Yes, we are still talking decentralization. If you expect the individual research worker, the man working on a project, a particular research job, to spend his time trying to get financial support for his work, he'll never get his research done. In the first place he can't seek that financial support locally; it would have to be done in the halls of Congress in Washington. You don't expect this man to do things that are not within the purview of his job. If you try to do that, then you have people trying to do everything. I wouldn't, as director of a station, allow myself to get involved in a research project that would require eight hours or ten hours or twelve hours of my time every single day of the year. If I did, I'd not be able to do the other things that only the station director can do. So you see you have a division of labor here and each shoemaker to his own last.

#### Employer expectations

ERM: Going back to the matter of what do people want out of life and their work, what kind of people does an employer want? What qualities does he seek? What does he look for when he's considering promotions?

McA: Well, I'm going to start off by saying that with my more recent experience in private employment, I haven't noticed any difference between public employment and private employment. Bosses in both public and private employment seem to look for about the same thing. I'm not sure that I can say this as accurately and as concisely as I'd like to say it because part of it depends upon recruitment of people and you reach into the grab bag then and, in effect, buy a pig in a poke despite every type of check that you can make. I'm talking particularly about professional people. You don't know how an individual is going to develop. You try to get one who is technically competent to begin with. The Civil Service examinations are based almost entirely on this matter of technical competence and I suppose technical competence is an obvious quality that's sought by all bosses. If you hired a plumber or electrician, you'd want these people to know their stuff. If you hired a professional engineer or a professional forester, you'd want him to be

completely competent from a technical angle and this technical competence continues to be of prime importance throughout the person's whole life. But technical ability is not the whole thing and I suspect that some of these other qualities are what you'd like to have me talk about.

ERM: What are some of the others?

McA: I'll answer that but maybe I should add one more thought to this matter of technical competence. Technical competence should be kept up-to-date. This isn't easy to do. I had a hard time doing this myself. I couldn't stay technically competent in every type of activity that the Forest Service did but I tried to keep as up-to-date as I possibly could because many of my decisions either had to be based on my own technical knowledge or more often had to be based upon my evaluation of the advice that I got from technicians. My own technical competence was a very important aspect of whatever achievement I may have made as chief of the Forest Service or any other job that I ever occupied in the Forest Service. I don't want to low-rate technical competence; it is of tremendous importance not only to start with but to continue all through any person's career. There are other characteristics, other qualities that a boss looks for as time goes on, when the time comes for picking people to fill a particular position for promotion, and I judge this is what you'd like to have me particularly cover.

ERM: Yes, it is.

McA: All right, then I'll express these as the add-on qualities.

ERM: Not necessarily subordinate, but I guess you would claim that it would be subordinate to the technical skill.

McA: I'd say these were equally important with technical competence.

ERM: Equally. All right, fine.

McA: I'm saying that these are things that a person may not start out with when he gets his first job. Let's take the Forest Service as a specific example even though I said what I'm talking about could apply to private employment as well as to other public agencies. When we first employ a person we know nothing much about him except his technical competence. But some of these other qualities are there all the time; they are latent. One of the duties of an executive, public or private, is to develop these latent qualities.

You are asking me really to sort of boil down, to crystallize some thirty-five or forty years of experience into a few well chosen points. I hope I can do it.

I'd put as one of these additional qualities, self-reliance. Any boss that I've ever known wants people who are self-starters. He wants people who don't stand around waiting to be told what to do. Self-reliance is especially necessary when you are engaged in activities such as resource management where a great deal of the time you may be working alone. A boss wants people who can handle themselves, who can see what needs to be done and then go do it. I'm not talking about exhibiting a lot of energy but accomplishing very little. I'm thinking at the moment of Ray Taylor's comment about another person in the Forest Service who used to disgust Ray considerably by doing what Taylor called, "sweating out loud." You've seen people of that kind who make a great show of doing a lot but nothing much ever happens. I'm talking about having initiative, ideas on how to do the job better. Well, I don't know how to say it any better than just to say that a person is self-reliant.

A second quality or characteristic that bosses look for when they are thinking of people for certain jobs or for promotion is leadership ability. Now here I'm going to be getting into difficulty because leadership is not an easy thing to define in a few words and I don't mean to try to give a lecture on leadership. I'm probably not competent to do it anyway. People know a leader when they see one, even if they can't explain why they know he's a leader. Let's put it this way, an employer not only wants a person who is a self-starter for himself but a person who can be a self-starter for others too and can get other people to do what needs to be done. Resource management, as you well know, deals with many different kinds of work and requires many different kinds of people to get the work done. You have to do all of these many kinds of work through other people.

Leadership ability is partly what a leader is personally. It's partly what a leader does and how he does it. If you'd like to expand on those two points a little later. I'll be glad to give it a whirl. Leadership is not a matter of waving the sword and shouting, "Follow me!" You've seen people who have posed as leaders and waved the sword and shouted "Follow me!" and nobody did anything. I'm thinking now of a particular man in the Forest Service who had a lot of leadership ability but he fell down in one important respect and when he said "Column right!" everybody went column left.

Not out of meanness or anything of that type but simply because he didn't have whatever quality was needed to make people follow him.

Leadership is expressed in different ways. I watched two of my sons when they were in explorer scout work. Both had leadership qualities but each of them operated differently. One boy went through all the democratic processes with his fellow explorer scouts. They discussed where they might go on their hiking expeditions and how they'd get there and what they'd do when they got there, and so on. Everybody had a chance to speak his piece, then they elected my son leader and off they went. The other boy went at it in a completely different way. He'd listen to these other boys talk about what they wanted to do and finally he'd get up and walk off saying, "I'm going to do so and so." They all got up and followed him. So I don't know that I can spell out leadership in nice, neat terms as they might be in some textbook.

You find this sort of leadership ability, or lack of it, reaching way back in Forest Service history to the terrible 1910 fires in Idaho when Ranger Ed Pulaski had to take his fire crew into an old abandoned mine tunnel and hang up wet blankets to save their lives. In another fire crew in my time as chief we had a whole smoke jumper crew lose their lives. As nearly as we could reconstruct the tragedy either the crew spooked and ran into the flames or the foreman, unlike Ed Pulaski, was not able to control them. We don't know what happened but without question, it was a failure of leadership.

Leadership doesn't involve throwing your weight around. I'm thinking of some years back when my opposite number in Germany, Walter Mann, came to this country as the guest of our government and the Forest Service was assigned the job of showing him forestry in the United States. One day Mann commented to some of our local people – or so it was reported to me because I was not present – that everywhere he went his plane was met by five or six Forest Service people in uniform. He had noted that the uniforms were all alike and the badges were all alike. In Germany, you know, each professional forester has four different uniforms and the higher up the line you go the fancier the uniform gets – epaulets with acorns and special binding on the epaulets to show what rank you are and so on. There is a good deal of heel clicking and very strict attention to rank.

ERM: Sort of a military organization?

McA: Something of the sort, although the German people are rather prone to this type of organizing, I think. At any rate, Walter, so I was told,

finally unburdened himself one day and said, “Who’s boss? I can’t tell who is boss. All of you look alike.” The answer by one of the Forest Service people was, “Well, we know who’s boss.” Mann said, “But I don’t.” They told him, “Well, you don’t need to, we are the only ones who need to know who is boss and we don’t need to wear different uniforms to find out who is the leader.” Am I taking too long?

ERM: No, go right ahead.

McA: Another incident that I happen to think of was early in my career as chief. A subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee made a tour of western national forests to examine Forest Service grazing work and grazing policies. Senator George Aiken of Vermont was chairman of this subcommittee. They had a DC-3 airplane put at their disposal by the army and we toured the West, I went with them on most of that tour and it was in New Mexico that the incident that I’m trying to remember occurred. The pilot of the plane was an army major and his co-pilot was a captain. We didn’t treat these people – the pilot and his assistant – as part of the furniture, but invited them to go along on all of our trips and saw that they were well fed and housed and had a good time and could observe everything that was going on. This made quite an impression on these men because they said that congressional trips were not trips that they sought. They tried to avoid them, drew straws to see who would be obliged to go. They were happy to get out where something interesting was going on and they were a part of it.

Well, we started out this day on the Carson National Forest, which has headquarters at Taos, New Mexico, but at the time this particular incident happened we were on the Santa Fe National Forest, just south of the Carson. We were standing around in a big half circle, maybe fifty or sixty people, listening to a researcher standing on the stile going over into a research plot that was fenced. He was lecturing us on range research and what information was being discovered on these research enclosures. It was while I was idly listening to the researcher and casting my eye around the group that the army major, the pilot of the plane, came up and said, “You know, one thing puzzles me. I’ve been in the army all my life and I know that orders are being issued and obeyed but I can’t see anybody giving orders. How does this happen?” I laughed and said, “Well, maybe I can show you best rather than try to tell you. You see that man in the blue shirt over there next to the researcher that’s giving the speech?” He said, “Yes.” I said, “Well, you probably didn’t notice it but he has worked his way from about where I am clear

around the semicircle to where he is now. This man is one of our enemies. He is getting ready just as soon as the researcher quits talking to leap up on those steps and launch forth in a speech of his own. He said, "Yes, he does look rather on the qui vive." I said, "All right, now look over to your right. Do you see two Forest Service men, those two chaps in uniform over there? One of them is Otto Lindh, the regional forester from Albuquerque. The other is the local forest supervisor. Now, I know without going over there that they are discussing how to handle this particular problem that's coming up. They have already noticed it. I don't have to interfere with it. I don't have to give any orders. They are talking it over between themselves and deciding what to do." Then I said, "Now look, the supervisor has left the regional forester and is going over beyond that fringe of trees to where we are going to have lunch. I don't know what they've decided but they have decided on some way to stop this man and in a way that he can't take offense at. Let's keep our eyes open and see what happens." In a few minutes the researcher got to the end of his speech and just as this other man in the blue shirt was getting ready to get up on the steps and launch into his tirade, I saw the regional forester wave his hand. At that moment over beyond the fringe of trees where lunch was to be served was the most terrific clatter of pans being beat on and shouts of, "Come and get it or we'll throw it on the ground." The regional forester shouted, "Lunch time, let's go!" So we all went, and there was the man in the blue shirt left without an audience. I said, "You see, that's how it works." Orders were issued in a different way than in the army but there were orders just the same.

Here is another aspect of leadership. A leader may need to prepare his followers for a course of action. He may know of something that needs to be done but his organization is not quite ready for it. I think I could give you some instances.

ERM: Give me a few for instances out of your own experience in the Service.

McA: I'm afraid we're going to get into too much space here.

ERM: Never mind. This is good. It's getting better all the time.

McA: There were times when there were things I knew we should do but I didn't think the Forest Service was quite prepared to accept them. We always were a rather independent group of people. We followed orders, yes, but the Forest Service had its own opinion of its leaders and a lot depended on whether they believed that what they

were doing was worthwhile and this determined the way in which they would do things, the enthusiasm with which they would do it. I don't mean to say that people would not follow the leader, would not obey instructions, but they wouldn't do it with the same degree of enthusiasm that they might otherwise.

One illustration that I could give would be Earle Clapp and his proposal for regulation. Clapp felt that Forest Service people would accept regulation if he said they should. I know this because I talked with him about it and this is what he told me. But the Forest Service was not prepared for regulation and didn't accept it and left Clapp holding an empty bag. It's probably not a nice way of saying it but it's what happened. I always tried to be sensitive to public opinion inside the Forest Service. I think I'd have to say that I consciously tried to be more sensitive to public opinion inside the Forest Service than outside. Now that doesn't mean that the people in the Forest Service did everything that I wanted them to do. They did not, at least not right away. There were some things that maybe a majority of the Forest Service didn't want to do and I had to counsel with them, so to speak, over a period of a year or so before I had willing support.

ERM: Can you cite just one or two specific examples of what you had to counsel them on?

McA: I'm trying to think of something. The only one that I can think of that pops into my mind at the moment I'd rather not say for fear of embarrassing someone who might read this. Let me come back to this. I may think of something later. The only point I wanted to get across here is that effective leadership, as I found it, sometimes required me to delay doing what I knew should be done, and which was eventually done, until the people who were going to be on the receiving end of my leadership were better prepared to receive it. I was careful, or tried to be careful, not to stir up turmoil by too much leadership. I think you can have that, too. The main thing that I tried to get across was that everybody is participating and we all know where we are going and want to go there. If I could get those thoughts translated into convictions, I didn't have much to worry about.

Let me go on, Woody, I'll come back to leadership if you want me to; of what a leader ought to be and how he ought to operate, but while I think of it I'd like to go on to another characteristic that I looked for when I was thinking of promotions and filling certain jobs. This other characteristic is number four if I'm keeping track correctly.

Let's see, the first was technical competence. The second was self reliance. The third was leadership ability. Yes, this is number four. The ability to work as a part of a team. It would be difficult for me to rank these qualities in priority as far as the Forest Service was concerned, but I'd certainly rate this one very high. It was absolutely essential that people in the Forest Service be able to work with people inside our own organization and the reason is that resource management is not a one-man, one-person job. I can't think of any really big job in resource conservation that was done by only one person 100 percent all by himself. Every big, worthwhile resource conservation job that I know of is a product of a number of people working together. It takes effective teamwork to get this total job done. It means that a person must sometimes be a leader but at other times must operate under someone else's leadership.

Years ago my children had a set of phonograph records – somebody's jungle band it was called. These records showed what happened when the animals in the jungle were seeking to form an orchestra. The instruments were all there but when they first attempted to play a tune, it was just a bunch of discordant notes for the reason that they were not all playing the same tune. They tried it again all playing the same tune but this time they were not all playing in the same key and so there continued to be discordance. The next time they tried it they played the same tune in the same key, but they didn't play in the same time and so they had discordance again. Finally, they were able to work it out so that they all played the same tune in the same key to the same time and it made a beautiful little bit of music. The same thing is true in the Forest Service. It's not a jungle band although some people may like to think it's that. We are not going to get anywhere unless all of the people in the Forest Service are playing the same tune, the same piece of music, to the same key, and at the same time. You may need some leader to call their attention to this fact and see that everybody does it in this order. There may not be one best way to get a job done but somebody has to decide which method you are going to use and then everybody does it that same way.

As one instance of that, I remember a big fire and I am sorry so many of my examples turn out to be fire examples but it just happens to be the way I am remembering things today. This fire had crowned, that is, had got up in the tops of the trees and went to hell and gone across country – some two or three miles as I recall. I was one of the foremen. We all met that night to try to decide, "Well, where do we go from here? We've got to put in a fire line

somewhere, where do we put it? Do we fall way back and then backfire or do we work right up close, or what?" I guess there were half a dozen different suggestions as to the best way to go from that point on. They were all good suggestions. But somebody had to make a decision as to which it would be so that all of the thousand or more people working on this fire would all work to the same end and would not be burning each other out. This is what I mean by ability to work as part of a team and to submerge your own wishes in a decision to do certain things in a certain way.

Let me move on to a fifth quality that bosses look for. This is the ability to deal effectively with people outside their own organization. I've just talked about dealing effectively inside. Now this is dealing effectively outside. Let me see what I should say about this. No organization operates in a vacuum. That sounds like a trite expression, doesn't it? But getting acceptance of agency programs or agency plans of action and so on does involve dealing effectively with people outside your own organization.

Most of the failures that I noted as chief were not technical failures. They were failures in dealing with people, especially people outside of the Forest Service. For example, we could have a ranger who was 100 percent technically competent but could not adjust to living in a new community, or his wife couldn't. This inability to adjust, of course, was recognized by the local people. He unconsciously was giving the impression that he disliked the locality, didn't want to be there, would rather be almost any other place. Another man coming in to the same place might have given the impression that it was the most wonderful place that he'd ever seen, that he intended to buy a lot in the graveyard, settle down and live there forever. The local people would have loved him and would have done whatever he wanted them to do. But if he went in with the attitude I don't like you, I don't like the place, I don't want anything to do with it, then he would have a difficult time getting their cooperation.

Another example might be, and I remember talking about this with a young man in the Forest Service who was just starting. He had recently graduated from forestry school, presumably was technically competent, professionally competent. But the Forest Service was requiring this young man, as we did with all of our young men in those days, to go through a course of sprouts in sub-professional work. So this man was going to spend some time, for example, scaling logs, not a job for a professional man, but we did it for the particular reason that someday this man might be in a position where he would be supervising fifteen or twenty scalers and it would

be of tremendous value to him as a boss of scalers to have done some scaling work himself and to be able to refer to it. I told this man, “Now, here’s one thing I think you ought to keep in mind. Let’s assume that you become, in the few weeks that you are going to be on this job, the most competent scaler on this forest. No, let’s go further than that and say that you are going to become the most competent scaler in the Forest Service or in the whole world. You are superior in scaling ability to everyone else. Now is that enough? I’ll tell you frankly it isn’t. It’s not even half enough because if an argument comes up about your measurement of these logs, who is it going to come up with? The logs are not going to argue with you. It’s going to be the person who’s buying these logs and unless you can deal effectively with him and convince him that your measurement is correct, you will not have done a good job. The same might be true if after you leave this scaling job, the local supervisor puts you to work on land surveys as another part of your beginning apprenticeship. You might be running a survey line from let’s say A to B and let’s assume that what you learned in school in running a compass or a transit well prepared you for this job. Let’s assume that you very quickly become the most competent land surveyor in the whole United States. Is that enough? My answer is that it’s not half enough until the owners on each side of the line are satisfied that you have done an accurate job – not that you think that you’ve done an accurate job, or your professor back in the university thinks that you’ve done an accurate job, but the people who own the land on each side of the line. They may not like the division of land but until they agree that you have done an accurate job, you haven’t completed your work.”

Well, I don’t mean to get off on some examples that stretch this interview out but I do think that I ought to mention in this matter of dealing effectively with people outside the organization, that it seems to me as I look back on my experience that many people may know what to do but they don’t know how to do it. They go at the job in a way that rubs people the wrong way. Sometimes it’s rather a simple thing and I realize that with my twenty-twenty hindsight, it’s awfully easy to sit on the sidelines and say how another person should do it. But nevertheless, I have a point to make here and maybe I’d better go ahead and make it. As one example, shortly after I became chief, the administration changed and a new administration came in for the first time in twenty years.

ERM: That was the Eisenhower administration.

McA: That’s right. About a month after that administration came in, I

received a letter from Senator (William F.) Knowland of California.

ERM: He just died.

McA: He wasn't dead then by any means! At that time he was a prominent member of President Eisenhower's party. He asked for my comments on a letter that had come to him. Here is the story. On one of the national forests in California there had been an avalanche, which brought down not only snow but rocks and dirt which had gone through a Forest Service summer home settlement. It had destroyed many of the summer cabins in this location. The particular cabin I'm going to be talking about was not completely destroyed but it was knocked wildly askew and came to rest at a slant. The local Forest Service people decided that the whole campground was in a dangerous spot for further avalanches and should be moved. So the permittees were given notice that this particular summer home site would be abandoned and were offered locations in a new summer home site with an offer of help to make the move. This was one of the things that we regretted. It made a lot of work for us but it seemed to us that to protect the summer home people it had to be done, because many of them were using their cabins during the winter sports season. This notice of abandonment, of course, went to each individual cabin owner and they were given a certain period of time to make the change. I've forgotten how many months or years were allowed. It wasn't to be done immediately. When the time ended, which was about the time Eisenhower came into office, everybody in the settlement had moved out except the people in this one cabin that I say was knocked askew. They had not moved and the letter Senator Knowland sent me enclosed a copy of the local forest supervisor's letter to the owner of this cabin.

The supervisor's letter was a cold, formal notice that the time had expired and the Forest Service would now move in and destroy the cabin. In effect, "Watch out! Here we come!" The owner of this cabin was a widow who had built the cabin many years before with her husband when her two sons were very small. The sons were now grown. One of the sons was a prominent physician in Oakland and he was the one who wrote this two-page letter to Senator Knowland complaining about the Forest Service action. It was quite a letter as I remember it, it had eighth-inch margins and covered two typed pages single-spaced. He put in it every complaint that he could possibly think of and even more of his own philosophy about things in general.

When I had a chance to look into this, and I did it personally, there wasn't anything that could be done except to carry out the local

decision to abandon the entire summer home site, including this one cabin which was the only one left out of the several dozen that had either been destroyed or severely damaged. I had no question about the correctness of the decision. What bothered me was the way our forest supervisor dealt with the people involved. Again I say, it's easy to sit at a distance and say how things should be done, but just consider for a moment how different the situation might have been had the local supervisor written not a formal letter saying, "Your time is up, get out of the way, we're going to tear down your house." But had instead written, "I know how much this particular location means to you and to your two sons. You've lived there, enjoyed so many happy years, memories of your husband, and I'm fully conscious of what it means to you to now abandon this dear spot but I hope you will keep in mind that I too have obligations and I have an obligation for your safety under the law which I have to carry out. It really makes no difference to me if you should continue to live in this cabin if you don't mind having your coffee at a slant in the cup. It is of no concern to me but I cannot under the law allow you to run the risk of further avalanches occurring in this area. Now, avalanches are not likely to occur in the summertime and this is the time of year when you use this cabin, so that if you are willing to send me a letter agreeing not to use this cabin when there is snow on the mountains, you may continue to stay there until you die. I cannot extend it however, through the life of your sons." Or something of this kind. I'm not trying to make up the words the supervisor might have written but it would have been something that would have indicated to the recipient that our supervisor was sensitive to her feelings and was not a coldblooded fish. The local forest supervisor knew exactly what to do but the way he went at it was completely wrong.

I'm thinking also of a timber sale cancellation in Florida but I guess maybe I won't get into that. Let me mention just one other instance, which shows that what I'm talking about isn't simply a present day thing. It's nothing new. When Dr. (Bernhard) Fernow started the forestry school at Cornell University he wanted to do some forest management experiments as a part of his school work and through the university obtained access to some private lands near Saranac Lake, New York. He went ahead with his plans to do these forest management experiments and in the process needed to do some logging. The shores of Saranac Lake were occupied by wealthy people who had summer homes there. They took exception to Fernow's logging – I think some logging had already started – served notice on Fernow that he would have to stop. Fernow was brought up in a rather strict Prussian tradition that he was technically correct, that he knew what needed to be done, and he

thought the local people were simply interfering in something they knew nothing about. To make a long story short, Fernow undoubtedly was absolutely correct from a technical standpoint but he was 180 degrees off in dealing with the local people. I don't say that he could have completely avoided local difficulty, but he could certainly have minimized it had he been willing to explain to the local people what he was trying to do and had he been willing to cut them in on his plans and what he hoped to accomplish and had given them some assurance that his logging would not permanently destroy the scenery. But he didn't do this and the end result was that these wealthy people arranged to have the appropriations for the Cornell Forestry School eliminated and there has been no forestry school at Cornell since that time. This is an example of being technically correct but not correct in the ability to deal effectively with people outside your own organization. I'm not talking about malicious, deliberate mistakes. I'm talking about things where people just don't know any better. But this is no excuse and I'd like to comment that the higher up the ladder you get, the more serious each mistake of this kind in dealing with people outside the organization usually becomes. You usually get only one turn at bat. If you miss on that one turn at bat, you get no other chance.

I think maybe I should comment, Woody, when I refer to dealing effectively with people outside one's own organization that I'm not talking about communicating which is one of these catchall phrases that seems to be in vogue just at present. I'm talking about the fact that dealing effectively with people is more than just communicating.

ERM: It's relating to them, isn't it?

McA: Yes, it's all of that and more. I'm not sure that I can put it into words. But let me give you an example. When I was in state and private coop work in the Forest Service, we had worked out with the state foresters a complete understanding that the Cooperative Forest Management Manual which was the state forester's bible on this project, would not be changed overnight without their knowledge and without discussion. We had complete legal authority to make changes with or without notice and the state foresters knew this. But the state foresters also knew that they would not come to their offices one morning and find a big manila envelope with a completely new manual in it. This isn't just communicating, this is a matter of working honestly with the state foresters, of having faith in each other. Unless others have this kind of confidence in you, you are not even beginning to deal effectively with them.

I think of another example that may help to illustrate my point that dealing with people is more than just communicating. Shortly after I had been working with Earle Clapp on what became Senate Document 199, The Western Range, I went back to Fort Collins, Colorado where I was stationed at the time and found that the amount of reaction of the livestock industry to this report was simply amazing.<sup>77</sup> It was agitation stirred up by the livestock associations. Most of the people who shouted the loudest about it, I think had never read the report. At any rate, there was a meeting of one of the associations, and I can't recall now which one it was, at Sheridan, Wyoming. Sheridan, you know, is the county seat of Johnson County where the Johnson County range wars took place many years ago. In some ways – at the time I'm talking about which would be around in the mid-1930s – the range wars were still a vivid memory for a lot of people there. At any rate, Clapp as chief, was asked to come to that meeting and justify the accusations of poor range conditions on privately owned range lands that were in our report. I had talked with Clapp when I worked on this report, telling him that I thought we were going at it in the wrong way. I was responsible for drawing up the maps and tabulations showing the condition of the western ranges, national forest as well as private rangelands, but Clapp insisted on showing these as percentages of complete depletion. For example, the map showed areas that were presumably 75 percent or more depleted, meaning that the good range plants were 75 percent gone and that the range was occupied by worthless plants; cheat grass and other vegetation that was of no value for putting meat on domestic livestock. I told Clapp I thought he would catch more customers if he would turn it around and say that here is an area that's producing only 25 percent of what it could be made to produce and this is the way to make it a hundred percent. But Clapp said, "I want to shock them." Well, he shocked them and so he was asked to come and explain his attitude. Clapp passed the job off to Allen Peck who was then the regional forester at Denver. Peck passed it on to me. So I went to Sheridan.

The meeting was held in the Bijou movie theatre and I was on this brilliantly illuminated stage along with the heads of whatever livestock association it was, and I had to sit there in this bright light looking into an absolutely black auditorium where I could see no one except in the front row. I could see only some white eyeballs

<sup>77</sup> U.S., Congress, Senate, The Western Range, S. Doc. 199, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 1936.

and some white teeth being gnashed at me. For two hours I sat there and took abuse. Taking abuse is part of the job, you know. There was also another federal employee on the stage, someone from what was then known as the Grazing Service of the Interior Department, an organization that is now a part of the Bureau of Land Management. After more than an hour of this abuse, the man from the Grazing Service said he had to go to the bathroom and went out and didn't come back. Actually, the feeling was so strong that I would not have been surprised to have had somebody take a shot at me. I felt like going out and not coming back but I thought, well, what's to be gained by doing that? These people, whether they are right or wrong, think they have a legitimate gripe and I might just as well respond to it. So just about five minutes before noon, the chairman of the meeting said, "Now, we'll call on a local Forest Service man (meaning me) to tell us how they got this way of accusing us of poor management so that our ranges are 50 and 75 percent depleted and saying we haven't done a good job at all." He turned to me and said, "Mr. McArdle can you justify these statements in this book?" I got up and said that it was about the first time in my life that I wished I were wearing long skirts because if I wore long skirts they couldn't see my knees knocking together and see that I was frightened to death. But I said I didn't see that we'd get anywhere by throwing nasty comments at each other. I said I had listened to two hours of very nasty comments about me. They had allowed me only five minutes of time to say some nasty comments about them and while I could think of some very choice expressions that I might use in my five minutes, I didn't see that it would buy us any mutual understanding on the problem that was worrying me as much as it seemed to be worrying them. So I thought that I would use my remaining few minutes by making a proposal.

I said that if they had any blame to attach to these maps showing range depletion, to throw them at me because I was the man who had written that chapter in the range report and I accepted full responsibility for it. I hadn't made all the surveys but I would stay responsible. I said the only way that I thought that this could be resolved to their satisfaction would be after lunch for them to appoint a small group, half a dozen people or they could appoint as many as they wanted but I thought a few people would do it better, to go with me along one of the highways leading out of Sheridan. We'd toss a coin as to whether we'd go north, east, south, or west, and we'd go out measuring the distance on an automobile speedometer until we'd gone five miles. Then we'd stop the car and we'd throw a stone out to our right and where that stone hit, we'd put in a little

yard square plot and we'd gather around that plot and see what vegetation was on it; good vegetation as well as cheat grass and other worthless vegetation. We'd throw a stone to the left and do the same thing and then we'd drive on for five miles and do the same thing again. We'd do that for twenty-five miles and at the end of that time we would summarize our results and if these spots showed considerable depletion, that is, if they showed there was more worthless material than good material, more nearly like the maps in the range report, I thought they should offer me an apology. If on the other hand our survey failed to agree with the maps in the range report, I would make a public apology to them on behalf of the Forest Service. I said, "Is that a fair proposition or not? Is that a better way of settling this argument than getting up here and cussing each other out?" The chairman of the meeting jumped up and said, "Hell, let's go to lunch. Let's quit this talking." And that was the end of all that.

ERM: Did they accept your challenge?

McA: No.

ERM: They never took you up on the challenge?

McA: No, they didn't take us up. They knew our maps were right. We had gone about writing the report the wrong way. If we had written the report to show that they were getting only a half or a fourth or a third of what they could get from the range and then had given some suggestions for improving range conditions, we would have spiked their guns for complaint in the first place, and in the second place, it might have persuaded some of them to adopt our recommendations. But just to show how poorly they were managing their land, of course, made them angry. I can't very well blame them. I visited with a number of these people at the barbecue lunch we had after we left the theatre and know this is true because this is what many of them told me. I did not, however, tell them what I had tried to get Clapp to do. I gained a large number of good friends from that meeting but I don't think I would have gained them if I had left for the bathroom and hadn't come back. I can think of another story that ties in with the range report but I don't know whether we should take up the time and tape to do it.

ERM: That's all right. You go ahead. I think that you are getting into such a good swing on this I'd just like you to spin it out.

McA: Well, all right. You toss it out after you get it if you don't want it. This Senate Document 199, "The Green Book" as it was known, did

arouse a lot of controversy for a while. I doubt if very many livestock operators in the West even remember it anymore and probably most present-day Forest Service people don't know about it. But for a while after the publication of this booklet, controversy was rather vigorous.

One day I started out to visit the current president of the state livestock association of one of the states in my area (and that's as definite as I'm going to be on this) to take him one of the reports. It seemed to me that so many of the people who were criticizing the report had not even read it and I thought if they read it, there was so much in it of value besides this one chapter which had to do with range depletion, that their attitude might tend to change. When I drove up to this rancher's wind-beaten house it seemed deserted. This was not a large ranch; it was a one-man affair. I parked my car, stepped on the porch and knocked. No answer. I knocked again and a woman's voice, very weak, said, "Come in." The rancher's wife was rather ill, in bed. Her little three-year old boy, as you might expect, had gotten into everything. His face was covered with raspberry jam or something of the kind and things were rather mixed up. It turned out from what she told me that her husband had gone in search of the doctor and I found out later the doctor wasn't in town at his office but had gone out on some visits to various ranches and the rancher had been running him down all day. This was late in the afternoon.

I tossed aside my mission of presenting a copy of this report to the rancher and asking him to read it, and did what any neighbor would do. There was a cow standing outside at the gate, lowing, and obviously needing to be milked. This was one of the few ranches that I ever saw that had a milk cow, incidentally. I milked the cow. I straightened up the house. I washed the jam off the youngster's face and fed him and about 8 o'clock that night, there was a step on the porch and here comes the rancher and the doctor. When they came in, the wife had passed the crisis and was sleeping. The lamp was turned low, the kettle was on the stove sort of sizzling a little bit. The youngster was asleep in my arms. I was rocking him, had told him some stories, and everything had turned out all right. I put my bedroll down in the hay mow and spent the night.

The next morning I told the rancher why I was there and he said, "Well, I'm all for you in this. The Forest Service is absolutely right." I said, "Now wait a minute. I've got you over the barrel because you feel indebted to me and I don't want you to feel that way. If I leave you a copy of the report will you read it and then maybe in a

month or so I'll drop back and we'll talk about it." He said, "Yes, I'll do that." I said, "That's all I want and that's all I intended to ask when I came here."

He afterwards became one of our strongest supporters, I don't think because I washed the jam off his youngster's face, or milked his cow, or because he felt indebted to us, but because he approached the reading of the report not in an antagonistic attitude, but in a friendly attitude because I had demonstrated that I was a good neighbor. You know, Woody, we talk a lot about Orientals needing to save face, but Occidentals need to save face too. One of the aspects of this matter of ability to deal effectively with people outside your own organization is your ability to leave a way for your opponent when you've convinced him to back out gracefully to save face. If you don't do that, if you triumph over him you are not getting anywhere. Let me hurry on, I'm wandering.

A sixth characteristic that bosses look for, at least in my experience, is the ability of the employee to grow and develop. In many respects, to me, this is the most important quality of all. You know, most of the people enter the organization on the bottom rung of the ladder but no boss wants to hire or keep a person who's going to be content to stay forever at the bottom of the ladder. He doesn't want a person who is too lazy or too indifferent or just plain unwilling to do what's necessary to climb to a higher rung. No organization can consist exclusively of bottom-rung people. No organization can be dependent on filling the top rungs by bringing in people from outside. This movement from one rung to another isn't, or at any rate, shouldn't be automatic. It doesn't depend on keeping your nose clean and continuing to breathe. I used to hear some of my army friends say that that was all that they needed for advancement. If they'd keep out of trouble and just continue to breathe, their promotions would come along automatically. That may or may not be true but they did not come along automatically in the Forest Service.

As you well know, the intellectual capital that a young person acquires prior to entering an organization is simply not going to be adequate in a very short time, a year or less. This person must add to this intellectual capital. As he goes up the ladder and gets into managerial positions his role and his responsibilities usually change. Sometimes they change very materially. This person faces new requirements for knowledge, for understanding, for ability, and all of this that I'm talking about now is add-on knowledge and ability. I'm not talking about keeping up professionally with a technical specialty. I'm talking about these other characteristics

that I've been mentioning – self reliance, leadership ability, ability to work as a part of a team, ability to deal effectively with people outside of his organization, all of these have to be added on. You don't discard what you've already learned. You keep it. You add new knowledge, new skills, new understandings.

The ability to grow with the job was one of the things that I looked for in the Forest Service. I wanted people who would learn to understand better the society that the Forest Service was seeking to serve, our customers, so to speak. This has to be done if the work is going to be effective. This is only one of the many additions that I'd say are involved in enlarging a person's intellectual capital. There aren't any standard answers to problems that trouble most of us. You have to figure out your own answers based on what you know and what you understand. I often wished that I had a neat little book with tabs on the side that I could turn to when I had a difficult problem and there I would find a workable answer. But there isn't any such book and there never will be any such book. You get adequate answers only as you add on to your intellectual capital, your understanding, and your knowledge of the society that you are trying to serve.

When I talk about ability to grow and develop, I want to emphasize that an organization has responsibility to provide training for the job at hand and for the job ahead but many organizations do not recognize that they have this responsibility. The Forest Service did recognize it and I think still does. The organization can provide opportunities for further growth and further development in various ways, through formal training courses, on-the-job training, job rotation. You asked a question in this interview, I think, about moving people around. One of the purposes in that is to expand his understanding and his knowledge. An organization also can encourage people to have more university training or bring university people in to run seminars. The general attitude of an organization comes into play here – whether an organization simply permits suggestions for agency betterment or whether the organization expects, insists that there will be suggestions. If the agency sets these standards and lets it be known that people in the organization must come up to them, then they are likely to do so. If the agency is indifferent to setting these high standards then the workers in the organization are likely to conform to that indifference.

But training by the organization cannot be sufficient of itself and I don't know how to emphasize that enough. The new skills, the new knowledge, the new understandings that must be acquired, must be

acquired mostly by the employee himself on his own initiative, on his own time, and frequently at his own expense. What he needs to do is not only to add to this technical knowledge and keep up-to-date. He must grow and develop in other directions, too. Topside people must be broad-gauge folks. They can't be narrow between the eyes. They should have intellectual curiosity, a desire to learn more, not to be content with what they already know. What I'm talking about has to be largely self-education and perhaps most of it probably has to be acquired through reading. But this reading should be purposeful.

Had I known we were going to get off on this subject I would have brought Charlie Kellogg's reading list with me.<sup>78</sup> Kellogg was in the Department of Agriculture for many years, in charge of soil surveys. I would call him one of the outstanding soils men in the world. He took a great interest in the development of the young soils specialists who came to work for him, and he had a list of suggested reading that he gave to these young men which not only covered soils work but branched out into a wide variety of other things aimed at making these people broad-gauged folks, of stimulating their desire to know more than just soils. I wish I had that list with me. I think you'd be impressed with it. Maybe I can find it and send it to you. But this illustrates the kind of purposeful reading that I'm talking about. You can give a person one of these lists. You can't force him to read it. This illustrates the point that I'm trying to make that it has to be done on his own initiative. I never required anybody to read books but when I was in a person's home I looked at the books he had on his shelf, and I found out later if he simply put them there for show or if he had actually read them.

I'm going to end all of this right now. It's been much too long. I'm going to say that in this matter of ability to grow and develop, one can never stop learning, can never stop growing. In the old-growth Douglas-fir forests in Oregon and Washington, in the days when I used to be out there, you'd notice many over-mature trees, trees with spike tops, which showed that they were dying at the top. There are just too many people in every public and private organization who, as they get older, get to be like the over-mature Douglas-fir tree and start dying from the top down. This is something that should not be allowed to happen.

<sup>78</sup> USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Reading for Soil Scientists, Together With a Library, by Charles E. Kellogg (Beltsville, Md.: Soil Conservation Service, 1962).

## Employee expectations

ERM: You have talked at some length now about what the boss expects of an employee, what he looks for in an employee. I wonder if you might talk for a little while on what employees expect of a boss.

McA: I'll try. I've been on both sides of this fence. I've been a boss and I've been a worker in the vineyard too, exposed to a good many bosses. So partly what I'm going to say is based on my own experience and partly based on the discussions I've had with people I was trying to boss. I think folks judge or evaluate or appraise (I'm not sure just what word I should use here) at any rate, they appraise bosses in at least three ways. They judge the boss by what he knows, his competence. They judge the boss by what he does, the way he operates. They judge the boss by what he is, his personal qualities.

Let me see if I can enlarge on these three points. There may be other points but these are the three that occur to me at the moment. With respect to what the boss knows, his ability, his competence, his knowledge of his job, his capability in dealing with people, are all a part of this picture. I think the boss is also judged by the opinions that are held of him outside his own organization by other organizations. If he is considered by other organizations to be capable, a good boss, his own people are likely to agree. If other organizations don't have a high opinion of him, either because of his competence or his integrity, or some other characteristic, it's inevitable that the boss's own people will be affected by the adverse opinions.

Second, I said the boss is judged by what he does. I think I mean how he applies what he knows. Does he practice what he preaches? Is he willing to give authority and responsibility to others? That is to say, is he willing to give others a chance to grow and develop? Does he back up his people? Does he go to bat for them? Does he recognize achievements, good work? Is he receptive to ideas offered by others? Does he recognize and protect the dignity of the individual? You know, there are a lot of big wheels in an organization that won't turn unless some of the smaller wheels in the chain of gears are also turning. The dignity and usefulness of little wheels is important, too. I could talk a whole afternoon on this but I'm not going to. Does the boss respect the chain of command? Or does he short-circuit the foreman and the other intermediate supervisors by giving orders directly before everybody else and embarrass not only the local supervisor but the worker? Do the

employees feel that the boss will give them a square deal if they get into trouble? Does the boss keep in touch with his people? Is he accessible?

I once knew a very good mechanic who was so competent that his work increased and he hired an assistant. Then he invented something that turned out to be in considerable demand, and so over the years he had to hire additional people. At the time when he had only one or a few assistants, they ate lunch in the shop together. They knew each other's families and the names of their kids, even the names of their dogs, I think, but as this little organization got to be a big organization the man I knew became more remote. The little shop became a fairly good-sized factory and off to one side was a brick building where the offices were, where the former mechanic, now the president of the company, hid himself away. It got so big that he no longer had any dealings with his own people. He had a personnel manager who met with the union. In fact, his workers had to organize a union to protect themselves, so they felt, against their employer. He had gotten completely away, lost touch, from his people, and this is one of the things by which people judge their bosses. That's why I tried to keep my door open at all times, even when not convenient. It was why I sought to make myself available when I went around outside of Washington.

Let me go on. Does the boss drive? Or does he lead? Does he force people to do work by bawling them out and so on? Or does he inspire them to do a good job? Does he concern himself with employees' safety? Is he at all interested in whether or not they get hurt? At one time the Forest Service, on the average, was killing a man a month. Sounds terrible, but it was true.

ERM: How long ago was that?

McA: Quite a long while ago.

ERM: Before your time, or during it?

McA: During my time, and I made myself concerned with safety and I passed this feeling along to regional foresters and others. I simply said, "If you can't make these people safer, work more safely, make them obey safety rules, I'll just have to get somebody in your job that can."

Does the boss provide direction and purpose for workers in an agency? Does he have vision and imagination? Does he recognize that the needs of the future have much to do with determining the

policies of today, and does he seek to bring people in his organization in on the determination of these policies?

The third point that I mentioned that I think people use in judging bosses is based on what he is, his personal qualities. The chief of these is integrity. I am tempted to get off at great length on this subject, but I think I'll just let it stand by itself and in that way try to indicate its importance. If the boss does not have integrity the agency will not have integrity and the workers will feel unclean. I think that is too strong an expression, but maybe not. Whether or not the boss has courage is important, too. If you get a boss who flees at a shadow, who is excitable, who can't stand firm, then what point is it for the workers to have courage? If they have courage and the boss runs away, then their courage is wasted. If the boss has high personal standards, the agency is likely to have them too, particularly if the boss insists that the agency have high standards.

I've often thought that at the time that I came into the chief's position, I had precisely what was needed at that time. I had not had national forest experience, but what we needed at the time I became chief was someone who had had experience in dealing with other organizations, with people outside of the Forest Service, and I had this from my work being in charge of State and Private Cooperation. We also had need at that time for someone imbued with high standards for thoroughness and accuracy. At one time what the Forest Service said and did was pretty much the forestry law in this country. And I use law not in its legal sense. We were the only experts on forestry. It was necessary for people to take our word or take nothing. But when I came into the chief's job there were many experts in forestry. Many other public organizations had foresters. There were more foresters in private employ than there were in public employ. Many private organizations were becoming competent to deal with forestry resource problems, not just the Forest Service alone.

ERM: Was that indeed true when you came into the role of chief, that there were at that moment more foresters in private service than in public?

McA: Yes, I looked it up.

ERM: By what percentage was there a difference?

McA: I can't remember the precise figures but there were at least a third more.

ERM: Is that right?

McA: It could have been that there were half again more. A figure that sticks in my mind is 8,000 private and 4,000 public. That is probably wrong. I am talking now about people with professional forestry degrees. One of the things that I noticed immediately and had noticed, as a matter of fact, before I even went to the chief's job, is that so many people in the Forest Service continued to do their work at about the same standard of excellence that they had always done it. We had reached the stage where a job which was first class ten years ago, or even five years ago, was no longer first class. It was fifth class or lower because we were in competition with other agencies in our work, in our publications, in everything that I could think of. One of my main jobs was to seek to raise the standards of work in the Forest Service, to insist on better work. My research training prepared me for that kind of effort.

ERM: To what extent do you believe that goal has been achieved?

McA: I don't know because I'm not well enough acquainted with the Forest Service today to comment on it.

ERM: How would you have measured accomplishment at the end of your time in office?

McA: It would have to be a matter of personal opinion. I think that there was an improvement. It wasn't as much as I had yearned for but it was better than it was to begin with.

Let me go on and wind this up. When we are talking about what a boss is, we have to talk also about his willingness to admit when he's wrong. We have to talk about his willingness to take criticism and lots of bosses can't do this. I think workers also judge a boss by whether or not he's a stuffed shirt, whether he has any human characteristics. I could tell you a few stories on that but the hour grows late. They'll be closing this place up in a moment.

Concluding remarks

ERM: Yes. We have about ten more minutes here that we can keep on the tape before they lock the doors on us but I want to express to you my

very sincere appreciation for your wonderful good help in this interview and in the very frank way in which you have unfolded some of your memories of days in the Forest Service and some of the philosophy both of management and life itself that you have been willing to spin out for us here. I think this has been, to me at least, a very rewarding experience and I hope that you perhaps share a little bit in that feeling.

McA: I'm one of those people, Woody, who thinks of the most brilliant repartee at about the time he falls asleep at night. I'm sure that about the time I fall asleep tonight, I'll think of all of the illustrations, all the things I should have thought of this afternoon. It's too late now.

ERM: If you do, scribble a note to yourself on your bed table and when the transcript comes back to you to be reviewed, you'll have a good opportunity to crank that brilliant thought in,

McA: If it's only one sentence long I'll probably do it, but if it's longer than that I'm too blasted lazy. What do you want now?

ERM: I just want to ask you one more thing. In all of this we have been talking about – what people want out of life, what they expect of their bosses, what bosses expect of them – makes me wonder what role you see the writing, the gathering, the making of a written history for all of these people? What is its worth as far as you are concerned?

McA: It's hard for me to judge this question. I'm beginning to feel that I'm a long, long distance away from the Forest Service. I suppose I shouldn't feel that way but unless you are active day to day, you do tend to get out of touch and I don't know how much the people of the Forest Service today are acquainted with the traditions, the philosophies, and so on, that used to prevail. In my younger days we got much of this indirectly simply by discussions on field trips, around the campfire, or in ways that we don't have so much anymore. I don't know how much they are getting and how much they are not getting. I wish there were some way that Forest Service traditions could be imparted to new people in the outfit. I know I'm not answering your question very well.

ERM: I am going back to something you said there towards the end of your remarks today and that is that as organizations grow larger and larger, the individual participant in the big organization tends to lose contact with the original spirit perhaps and purpose or concepts

that were involved in the thing when it was smaller. How can you convey this to the members of a larger and larger organization unless there is some way of putting in their hands or into their heads some exciting revelation of their tradition that they can read or see or hear and thereby absorb? It's part again of that intellectual growth that you said is such an important part of each person's life. He's got to grow. He's got to be constantly expanding his intellectual resources and a part of that involves making himself better aware of the whole story of which he has become a part. The person then, perhaps, will see where it all fits into the mainstream of history. Where does it all fit together? If he gets a better concept of that, it seems to me he is going to be a better man, a better employee.

McA: No question about it. I agree with you. Your original question had to do with how you accomplish that. I'm not sure I know. You don't do it with any one device. The story of the organization of the past, yes, is helpful but we have to recognize that the job that the Forest Service of today faces is quite different than the job that the Forest Service of Pinchot's time had to face. For example, in Pinchot's time, there were practically no timber sales. Today they are a troublesome problem in more ways than one. Recreation was not a problem in Pinchot's time. It's a tremendous part of Forest Service activity today. Water was not a problem in those days except when rivers flooded and caused damage but today adequate water, useable water coming at a time and in the quantity needed, is a big problem. John McGuire and all his people face a different set of resource management problems than Pinchot did or I did.

ERM: I quite agree. What I'm getting at is that it's not that you learn necessarily the answer to a specific problem that is currently troubling, but rather that having a historical knowledge or historical sense of your organization gives you perspective. It teaches you that things do change and that problems change but that sometimes there are things to be learned from history.

McA: I suspect you'd like me to say that recording of Forest Service history would be very valuable. I would have no question about that but I was trying to say that that can't be the only answer because these people face different problems today than their predecessors did. I used to get a little upset with certain of our preservationist friends who seemed to think that I should start some sort of a crusade for preservation of forest conditions. I could no more start a new crusade such as they wanted than I could re-discover America. We had passed into a different situation and had new and very different

problems to meet. I was not unaware of what they were talking about or unwilling to consider their thoughts on the subject. It was just that to meet today's problems and the likely future problems, I, of course, had to consider what had gone on in the past but I couldn't be guided 100 percent by what had been done in the past.

ERM: I don't equate what I've been talking about with that appeal that was made to you by the preservationists because what I am asking you has nothing to do with mounting a crusade. I'm concerned when I look at government today. It seems to have lost its bearings. And, perhaps, that's true of our society. There seems to be a lag between what we accomplish in a technical, scientific way and what we are able to do to enhance our humanity. I think that's where history comes in. Knowing the record of past successes and failures helps to give anyone balance. Historical concerns don't slow down technical development or compete with it. Rather they help consolidate the true gains made by science. This is something that I wish the government agencies of all kinds might take under advisement and get down to study their history in a serious way. Our history is a resource just the same as the trees are.

McA: I'm not disagreeing with you. I readily agree that history is an integral and important part of trying to keep organizations alive and alert to their mission in life and what they ought to accomplish. We shouldn't forget what's gone on in the past. To a large extent we can be guided by it but not completely.

ERM: Oh, no. History is no panacea. I'm not suggesting that.

McA: One other thing that perhaps bears on your thought about the importance of history. I think it becomes more important as an organization gets older and bigger that we shouldn't lose sight of the ideas, the ambitions, the aims, the goals, the people had who started the organization. What I'm trying to say is that you don't develop a whole new historical background for an agency every time the Forest Service gets a new chief. That does not, certainly should not, mean that the Service abandons the ideals that the outfit started out with. We may need to modify them, change them a little bit, but everybody in the organization ought always to keep those original high goals and standards in mind. It helps create pride in the organization, helps to build esprit de corps. A historical record, especially if it's at least halfway human, can help immensely to accomplish that.

ERM: We're going to have to get out of here; they are locking up for the night.

## APPENDICES

*An Introduction:***Why We Needed The  
MULTIPLE USE BILL**by **R. E. McArdle***Former Chief, U.S. Forest Service*

**A**MERICAN FORESTS is fortunate in being able to persuade Dr. Crafts to tell the story of shepherding forestry legislation along the difficult and often complex path from inception of an idea to Presidential signature on completed legislation. I know of no one better qualified to tell this story.

Editor Craig has asked me to comment, for the particular legislation described by Dr. Crafts, as to how the process looked from where I sat as Chief of the Forest Service at that time. Obviously, from my vantage point some features would seem to be more prominent or perhaps appear in a different light than they would from the viewpoint of someone else. To keep my comment within reasonable bounds I will restrict it to the reasons leading up to my decision to seek this particular legislation.

When I became Chief of the Forest Service in 1952 it was already plain that use of the National Forests was increasing at a rapid rate. Measured in dollars received from sales of products and services (mostly from sale of timber) it took the Forest Service more than half a century to get the first billion dollars of receipts but only eight years to earn the second billion and, I note, has taken even less time to earn the third billion. Recreational use of the National Forests was growing by leaps and bounds and when I left the Service in 1962, for example, was four times greater than when I became Chief ten years earlier. In the early fifties, tens of thousands of mining claims, many by uranium seekers, were being pegged out on western National Forests. Water for domestic use and for irrigation was steadily becoming needed in larger quantities, a

matter of vital concern to the Forest Service since more than half of the water in western United States originates on National Forest lands.

Plainly evident also was growing conflict among these various National Forest uses or, rather, among user groups. These conflicts were leading to strong pressures from user groups to obtain priority or, preferably, exclusive privilege to use National Forest lands for particular uses. Some of these pressures were administrative, some in the form of proposed laws. Early in 1953, for example, National Forest grazing permittees had legislation introduced to give grazing use priority over all other uses and grazing permittees special privileges in management of the Forests. Although this proposal was not enacted into law, pressure to achieve those objectives continued. Wilderness enthusiasts made similar proposals for their particular use, the first wilderness bill being introduced, as I remember it, in 1955. I doubt if any month passed without some group of town fathers exerting pressure to set aside several hundred thousand acres of National Forest for exclusive use as municipal watershed. Clearly we needed stronger administrative and legislative tools to use in resolving these conflicts among user groups.

Along with increased use and pressure to give priority or exclusive rights to particular uses on enormous acreages, there was an ever-increasing pressure to over-use National Forest resources. It was Forest Service policy (but not a legal requirement) to practice sustained yield of all resources. This policy had been set aside to allow over-grazing during the first World War and although this was intended as a

*(Turn to page 59)*

temporary departure, grazing over-use was still prevalent in many places four decades later with strong pressures to depart even further from sustained yield management of the grazing resource. Similarly, those who wanted to buy National Forest timber were pushing us to increase the "allowable cut" in places and in ways that inevitably would have upset sustained yield management of timber resources. Even wilderness areas were being over-used in some places. There was no lack of evidence that existing authority to practice sustained yield management needed to be greatly strengthened and, in addition, it seemed desirable to have a specific directive requiring the Forest Service to manage resources for sustained yield.

To further complicate the situation I faced during my early years as Chief came more frequent question as to our legislative charter for allowing some uses of the National Forests, specifically grazing, wildlife management, and recreation. The best legal advice I could get was that although specific enactments comparable to those for timber and water might be lacking, there was adequate evidence of Congressional intent for having those uses—more than enough evidence, these experts believed, to defeat any court challenge that might be raised. Nevertheless, the lack of clear-cut, specific authority caused us some concern.

In short, the situation confronting me was characterized by drives for single use, conflict among user groups, and by attempts to over-use National Forest resources. There were some other sides to the situation, some concerned with administration of the Forest Service and some external to the Service. But these three aspects seemed most important so far as my responsibilities as Chief were concerned. From where I sat, I saw a situation that required correction if we were to manage nearly 200 million acres of public land effectively and in ways that would bring the greatest good to the largest number of citizens in the long run.

The question facing us—facing me, really, because only I could make the decision—was what course of action to recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture. As I recall it, I had rather more advice than I could use in trying to decide how best to meet the situation I have described. Some of my advisors favored administrative action only (as, for example, by Secretarial regulations). Others were convinced that only legislative action would provide the tools

needed to cope with the situation. Some proposed a combination of administrative and legislative actions.

There were advantages and disadvantages to any course of action. A number of retired Forest Service people whose judgment I valued highly urged me to rely on administrative action and not to seek new legislation because they were sure that if our legislative effort should fail we would be worse off than at the start. Other advisors were just as plain spoken in telling me that an administrative course of action, though possible to attain fairly fast, would simply not be effective. Some may have thought that we should take no action at all and that somehow, someday, sometime, everything would come out all right. Most of us, however, were convinced that we were dealing with a situation that required remedial action.

Notes I made at the time confirm my vivid recollection of those days. I shall not attempt to describe all the considerations that went into my eventual decision to recommend a legislative course of action with necessary administrative follow-up to put the legislative directives into actual practice on the ground. My more difficult decision was what course of action to take. Once the decision was made to go in a certain direction it was easy to decide to start moving at once. I might add that after my decision was made known the diverse opinions of Forest Service people were discarded and I had full support from the entire organization.

I want to avoid giving the impression that anyone in the Forest Service expected enactment of this legislation to solve all problems of National Forest administration or even all aspects of those few problems I have so sketchily described. Pressures to over-utilize resources still prevail, conflicts among user groups to obtain priority for particular uses continue and sometimes seem to have increased. This legislation was not expected to eliminate those problems. The purpose was to strengthen the administrative arm of the Forest Service in dealing with these problems. Any qualified observer looking back on almost ten years of experience with the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act (about half as many years of actual application) is bound to agree that this legislation has done just that. I have two personal opinions: I think the Act will be even more useful in the years ahead and, in retrospect, I think I made the right decision in recommending that we take this course of action. ■

APPENDIX B

 2907 Rittenhouse Street, N. W. - Washington, D. C. - 20015 -

*Richard E. McArdle*

5110 River Hill Road  
Washington, D. C. 20016  
August 4, 1974

Mr. Elwood R. Maunder  
Forest History Society  
Santa Cruz, California

Dear Woody:

It occurred to me last night that one rather significant event in the course of getting the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act probably hasn't been touched on. I don't have copies of American Forests here to check Crafts' account beginning in the June 1970 issue (don't trust my memory on that date) but I don't remember that he mentioned it either in the printed version or the earlier typed version. I am quite sure that I did not mention it in my American Forests story which was deliberately made very short. I know it is too late to incorporate this story in the manuscript you folks are now typing but I will look at the ceiling for a few moments and tell it to you anyway.

You may recall that early in our interview you asked me if I had anything to add to this MU-SY story. Your question referred to my American Forests story I think. I said I had nothing more to say. (At that time I was expecting to wind our interview up in short order and had no desire to expand on my AFA account.)

I think what I am now about to tell you is significant because it may well be that we would not have had a MU-SY law otherwise. I could be wrong, but looking back it seems to me that the chances were against it.

On June 6, 1960 (I have checked this date in my diary) I was at Grand Rapids, Minnesota to make the principal speech at ceremonies dedicating completion of buildings for what was then called the Grand Rapids

Research Center (now called the Northern Conifers Laboratory or some such name). Zig (Zigmond A.) Zazada, the local research center leader, had rigged up a large flatbed truck as a speaker's stand and had placed this at one side of a pretty little meadow near the research center buildings. Out in front were hundreds of folding chairs that he had gotten from various places. The high school band was present and a big crowd of people, more than he had chairs for.

I made my talk and when I turned from the speaker's stand to resume my seat I noticed that Senator Hubert Humphrey had arrived on the platform while I was speaking. While I was greeting Senator Humphrey I had one ear pointed toward Zazada to see how, as master of ceremonies, he would recognize Humphrey. Humphrey had just told me that he had hired a plane to get from Washington to Grand Rapids especially to be present at this dedication.

Zazada told the people present that they undoubtedly had noted the arrival of Senator Humphrey and asked Humphrey to stand and take a bow. Zazada then began announcing the next event on the program. At that point I took the program away from Zig and told the audience that Humphrey had made the trip from Washington to Grand Rapids solely to be present on this occasion. I said I knew they would want him to have more of a part in the ceremonies than just to stand up and be recognized. I went on to say that as bureaucrats we saw members of Congress come and we saw them go and we had our own private opinions about their achievements especially in their achievements in resource conservation. I had always admired Hubert Humphrey's sound ideas on conservation and I took this opportunity to say so. I mentioned some of his efforts to promote the cause of conservation and ended by saying that I felt sure I spoke for his Minnesota friends in suggesting that Senator Humphrey give us whatever comments he cared to make on this occasion so important to resource conservation in Minnesota. Humphrey spoke briefly and to the point obviously having intended to have a part in the program.

After the ceremonies were over and Humphrey and few others were having coffee with me he asked me if I was having any particular worries in Washington. I said I certainly was having some super worries at the moment and the chief worry was how to get the MU-SY bill enacted. I explained why this proposed legislation was urgently needed and that it would be almost disastrous to the FS if not enacted. I described the long struggle we had had getting it through Congress and that the struggle was about over. But the situation looked pretty dark to us right then because the bill had struck a snag. Humphrey asked where bill was at that time and what the snag was. I said the bill was hung up in the Senate. It was through committee with a favorable recommendation but we couldn't seem to get it out on the floor for a vote.

From here on the story is what I learned from Spencer Smith of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. He told me that he was in Humphrey's office when Humphrey returned from Grand Rapids. Humphrey invited Spencer to accompany him to see Lyndon Johnson, then majority leader of the Senate. Smith said Humphrey barged into Johnson's office without ceremony and demanded (expletives deleted) why Johnson was holding up the MU bill. Johnson said there were objections to the bill, by one Senator especially. (I know who this was but see no reason to say so here.) Anyway, the long and short of it is that Humphrey

Maunder

blasted the bill loose. It came up for a vote, was passed and ~~then~~ President Eisenhower signed it June 12.

We might have been able to get this bill to a vote without Hubert Humphrey's assistance but looking back on the situation I am by no means certain that we could have done it. Humphrey came to our aid at a crucial time. His help was effective. When boquets are being hand out for credit in getting the MU-SY legislation enacted I don't want Hubert Humphrey forgotten. Without his help maybe there wouldn't have been a MU-SY Act today.

Another aspect of the MU-SY legislation that should be covered sometime by somebody is how the definitions got into the Act. Maybe Crafts told about this. The definitions were not in the draft legislation when we sent it to Congress and were not in our letter of transmittal. Senator Hart was the person mainly involved in this. The FS wrote the definitions for him.

Sincerely,





*Fifth* WORLD FORESTRY CONGRESS  
*Cinquième* CONGRES FORESTIER MONDIAL  
*Quinto* CONGRESO MUNDIAL DE SILVICULTURA

Seattle, Washington • August 29-September 10, 1960

GS/P/12-U. S. A.

THE CONCEPT OF MULTIPLE USE OF FOREST AND ASSOCIATED  
LANDS - ITS VALUES AND LIMITATIONS

by

Richard E. McArdle  
Chief, Forest Service  
U. S. Department of Agriculture

It is a great honor to address this first general session of the Fifth World Forestry Congress. My subject is the same as the theme of the Congress -- the multiple use of forest lands. This theme is an appropriate sequel to the Fourth World Forestry Congress at Dehra Dun in 1954. There the theme was the role of forested areas in the land economy and economic development of a country.

In reporting on the Fourth World Forestry Congress, the FAO said: "There are few countries in which production in the forest is limited to timber alone. It is in fact by no means certain that specialized single-purpose land use, particularly on a permanent basis, is ideal. In some social and economic environments, such specialization would certainly not help towards reaching the desired goal of deriving the maximum yield from the land for the benefit of the community as a whole. This the Congress implicitly recognized by accepting the principle of 'multiple use' of the forest."

Multiple use is a familiar term to foresters of the United States. Its meaning was symbolized on this stage in the opening pageant yesterday. Pictured were the five major uses of forest land -- for wood production, use as watersheds, grazing by domestic livestock, the forest as habitat for wild game and fish, and use of the forest for outdoor recreation.

Although "multiple use" may not be a customary term everywhere, the practice of multiple use has been long established in some intensively managed forests of other countries. Later, in this Congress you will hear papers reviewing multiple use here and in other countries and in various kinds of ownerships. Some of the Congress tours will enable you to observe the practice of multiple use on forest lands in the United States.

As FAO noted, management of land to serve as many uses as possible is everywhere becoming more essential. When there is abundance of natural resources and few people, there is little need for multiple-purpose land use. But when increasingly large numbers of people must rely on an unchanging or diminishing resource base, they must make the most effective use of the resources they have. Multiple use of renewable land resources thus is a necessity born of scarcity of resources and abundance of people who need these resources.

Competition for the use of land is growing throughout the world. This competition will not decrease but will increase as world populations increase. World population is now about 3 billion persons. It has increased as much in the last two decades as was the total growth of population up to the year 1750. In 1800 my own country had 5 million people. One hundred years later we had 76 million. In the next 50 years our population doubled. The census now being made in the United States indicates an increase in our population from 5 million to 180 million people in 160 years. And U.S. population is expected to nearly double again by the end of this century.

It will not surprise you who come from older countries to hear that in the U.S.A. we are now feeling the impact of a dynamic population growth on a static land base. Older countries already have had this experience. A few countries represented here today still have abundant natural resources, more than adequate for their present populations. Inevitably, however, as their populations increase, their need for resources will increase, and competition for the use of land in those countries will become more intense.

As the people of the world become city dwellers, they tend to lose sight of their dependence on natural resources. Most of these are products of the land. My forefathers and yours lived close to the land. They knew their dependence on the land for food, for clothing, for shelter, and for fuel to warm the shelter.

To these basic necessities of life we must add today our dependence on natural resources for all the raw materials of industry. The history of mankind is the history of man's competition for land, of man's struggle to obtain adequate natural resources -- and of man's over-utilization of resources.

I realize that these are facts well known to this audience. Foresters are trained to take a long look ahead. We also are required to live close to the land. Thus we understand the dependence of people on natural resources produced by the land. We are aware, too, that our stewardship of a large part of the earth's surface imposes upon us great responsibility to obtain full productivity of these lands for the benefit of our fellow man, whom we serve. This is why we, the foresters of

many nations, propose to dedicate our discussions at this Congress to sharing our knowledge and experience so that we may improve policies and practices relating to wise use of forest lands.

The wise use of forest lands, however, cannot be considered in a vacuum. It must be considered in relationship to the fullest possible yield of all the products and services that forest land provides for people.

In past years many of us have thought that we had enough land in forest in the U.S.A. to meet all foreseeable needs for wood and other products and services of forest lands. Today we are not so sure. We think our earlier estimates were too conservative. We are now genuinely concerned. Much forest land is being taken for other uses. Competition for land is becoming intense in the United States.

For example, wherever you may travel in this country you will see great expansion of urban areas. This is taking land which heretofore was included in our estimates of available forest area.

Superhighways, new airports, transmission lines for electrical power, oil, and natural gas, and construction of dams and reservoirs are taking many millions of acres of forest land. Forest land will continue to be taken for national-defense purposes.

Large pressures are developing to set aside additional forest lands exclusively for recreational use. Conversion of land from forest to food production, inevitable in the next few decades, will include substantial portions of our most productive forest land.

The diversion of forest lands to other purposes could, in another 40 years, total about one-fourth of the present U.S. commercial forest land area, equivalent to one-third of our timber-growing capacity.

I do not condemn single use, primary use, one-purpose use, or exclusive use of land for one major purpose by whatever name may be applied. Some of these individual uses are as essential for the benefit of people as is the use of forest land for multiple purposes. For some purposes, superhighways, for example, the land obviously must be devoted exclusively to that use. There is nothing we can do to make such land serve more than that one purpose.

The consequences, however, of large-scale diversion of forest land to single-use purposes are now so serious in the United States as to justify careful consideration. Every acre of forest land diverted to non-forest use adds to the lands remaining in forest an additional burden of productivity. By the end of this century, a short 40 years away, need for wood in the U.S.A. will be double our requirements today. We will

be hard pressed to meet future wood requirements even if no more of our present forest land is diverted to other uses.

In addition to meeting greatly expanded requirements for wood production, forest land management in the United States faces greatly increased demands for the other products and services which forests provide. For example, exclusive of Alaska, more than one-half of all the water of the western United States originates on the national forests, although these publicly owned forests comprise only one-fifth of the total area in this part of our country. Maintenance of a forest cover on this land protects water quality. Protection alone, however, will not produce the large increases in quantity of water needed by greatly increased numbers of people, by agriculture, and by industry. These requirements have doubled in the last 20 years and are expected to double again in another 18. To increase water yield, manipulation of the forest cover is essential. If your tours take you to some of our experimental forests, you will see how the methods used in timber harvesting can serve also to increase water yield.

Many coniferous U.S. forests and intermingled grasslands are used for grazing of domestic livestock. In this country, as in yours, forests also provide the habitat for many kinds of wild game. These uses are increasing.

Recreational use of national forests has tripled in the past 12 years.

Use of forest land for these several purposes is nothing new. In every country and for centuries forest land has been so used.

What is new is the rapidly growing awareness of the need to apply multiple-use management more widely and more intensively. This comes not only from the obvious need to make forest lands more fully useful to the people but also to lessen the pressures to divert forest lands from a combination of uses to some one exclusive use. In most instances forest land is not fully serving the people if used exclusively for a purpose which could also be achieved in combination with several other uses.

Multiple use of forest lands in the United States did not spring into full flower overnight. While the term has become commonplace only in the last two decades, the practice of multiple use in the United States goes back to the origin of the national forests more than half a century ago. National-forest policies from the very first have emphasized resource use. The first Forest Service manual, significantly termed the "Use Book," recognized a multiplicity of uses. Even before this, the Forest Service had been instructed by the Secretary of Agriculture that national-forest land was to be devoted to its most productive use

for the permanent good of the whole people, that all of the resources were for use, and that decisions would always be made from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. These instructions have constituted Forest Service doctrine from the beginning. They are the genesis of multiple use.

Full recognition of the multiple-use principle of land management was given by the Congress of the United States about two months ago. The Act of June 12, 1960, directs that the renewable resources of the federally owned national forests, some 181 million acres, shall be managed for sustained yield and multiple use. General legislative authority to manage these public properties for use of their watershed, timber, forage, outdoor recreation, and wildlife and fish resources was provided many years ago. The significance of the recent legislative enactment is, first, legislative recognition of multiple-use and sustained-yield principles of management; second, a clear-cut directive to apply these principles on the national forests; and third, naming the basic renewable resources for which the national forests are established and administered and assuring them equal priority under law.

Although this law applies to only one class of publicly owned lands, the principles involved have wider application. On the federally owned national forests the objective is to meet the needs of all the people. On State lands, the objective would be to best meet the needs of the citizens of that State. On privately owned lands the objective would be to best meet the needs of the owner. He would express those needs in whatever terms he might choose. These private-owner criteria usually tend to be economic ones.

The Act spells out definitions of multiple use and sustained yield as these principles are to be applied to the national forests. Since the general objective is to manage these lands so that they best meet the needs of the American people, the Act and the accompanying legislative reports require that the five basic renewable resources shall be utilized in the combination that will best serve the people. Emphasis is on utilization, not preservation.

The legislative definition requires that management decisions are to be based on the relative values of the various resources and not necessarily on economic factors only. Intangible values which are difficult to express accurately in monetary terms also are to be considered. The definition does not require maximum production for all resources or for any one resource.

The legislative history of this Act directs that in making application of the principle of multiple use to a specific area equal consideration is to be given all of the various renewable resource uses, but this does not mean using every acre for all of the various uses. Some areas

will be managed for less than all uses, but multiple-use management requires that there be more than two uses.

An essential of multiple use is positive, affirmative management of the several uses involved. Haphazard occurrence of these uses on some particular tract of land does not constitute multiple-use management. Multiple use is not a passive practice. On the contrary, it is the deliberate and carefully planned integration of various uses so as to interfere with each other as little as possible and to supplement each other as much as possible. Multiple use is by no means an assemblage of single uses. It requires conscious, coordinated management of the various renewable resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land.

Multiple use must be over a period long enough to experience the cycle of the seasons; that is, a year or more. It does not require that all uses involved must be practiced simultaneously at the same instant.

Size of area is a key factor in multiple-use management. Application must be to areas large enough to give sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions. On the national forests we normally think in terms of our smallest administrative units, which at present average about 200,000 acres. On large private holdings similar acreages might be applicable, but for small private ownerships the unit areas would, of course, be much smaller. They might be as small as 40 acres.

Multiple-use management of the renewable surface resources obviously requires control of all uses on the same land by one authority. Such management is not possible if several coordinate authorities are each trying to direct different uses on the same land. Central decision making is a prerequisite.

In brief, multiple-use management as we practice it on the national forests requires us to consider all of the five basic renewable resources, although on any specific area we may not have all of them in operation at any one time. It obliges us to coordinate these various uses even though doing this results in less than fullest possible productivity of some uses. The requirement for sustained yield applies to all renewable resources and is aimed both at getting a high level of productivity and at preventing over-use of any resource or impairment of productivity of the land.

Multiple use is not a panacea. It has limitations, but it also has overriding advantages. I am convinced of the distinct advantages of applying multiple-use management to the great bulk of our forest land.

First of all multiple use helps to overcome problems of scarcity. It tends to reduce or resolve conflicts of interest and competition for resources. It promotes balance in resource use. It impedes the ascendancy of single-interest pressures. Properly applied, multiple use involves consideration of both esthetic and economic criteria in arriving at management decisions. It offers balance between materialistic and nonmaterialistic values.

Multiple use properly understood and properly applied is now, and will continue to be, the best management for most of the publicly owned forest lands of the United States. It will gradually become the best management for many of the large private holdings. It will always have less applicability to smaller private properties, but many of these owners will in time find it to their own best interest to practice some degree of multiple use.

Finally, the overwhelming advantage of multiple use is that through it foresters can make forest lands contribute their utmost to society. The basic purpose of forest conservation is a social one -- to satisfy the intangible as well as the materialistic needs of people. In this way, I believe foresters can make a major contribution to human betterment and perhaps even to world peace.

And now a closing word to you as eminent leaders in a respected profession. Multiple-use forest management is a challenge to foresters to broaden their vision. We must be forest land managers instead of primarily timber growers. The thinking of foresters is believed to be preoccupied with timber and dominated by silviculture. To some extent this criticism is justified. But multiple use, when properly applied, eliminates this bias. The future success of foresters and the contribution of the forestry profession to the welfare of our countries may depend on our response to the need for a balanced use of forest land resources. May we now and always perform in the best interests of the countries we serve.

APPENDIX D

Mining

Bills introduced in 1955

HR 110	Hope	January 5.
HR 230	Young	January 6.
S 687	Anderson	January 24
HR 3414	Cooley	February 2
HR 5561	Dawson	April 14
HR 5563	Fjare	"
HR 5572	Young	"
HR 5577	Ellsworth	"
HR 5595	Cooley	April 18
HR 5742	Hope	"
*HR 5891	Rogers	April 27
* S 1713	Anderson	April 18
HR 6233	Udall	May 12
HR 6307	Budge	May 17
HR 5609	Engle	May 19

\* The two key bills

Notes on wilderness legislation

Notes on 84th Congress and 88th Congress checked January 1974 against House and Senate Interior Committees calendars. Notes on other Congresses not checked against committee calendars.

84th Congress (1955-56)

Senate

S 4013 Humphrey (with 9 others) June 7, 1956 First wilderness bill

House

HR 11703 Saylor First bill in House  
HR 11751 Metcalf  
HR 11791 Reuss  
HR 11806 Miller

All of these bills believed to be same as Zahniser draft.  
Agriculture not asked for report on any of these bills.  
Interior asked for report by both Senate and House committees.  
No public hearing and so far as known no committee meetings.

85th Congress (1957-58)

Senate (1957)

S 1176 Humphrey (with same cosponsors as in 84th Congress) February 11, 1957  
S 3619 Neuberger

House (1957)

HR 361 O'Hara  
HR 500 Saylor 1/3/57  
HR 540 Baldwin  
HR 906 Reuss  
HR 1960 Metcalf 1/5/57  
HR 2162 Miller  
HR 7880 Porter

All of these bills essentially same as in 84th Congress "with some improvements and clarifications".  
Agriculture asked to report on S 1176 (Humphrey) - recommended against enactment but urged consideration of substitute language sent with report.  
Interior and Budget recommended against enactment.  
Hearings by Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands June 19-20, 1957. McArdle testified for Agriculture and C. Wirth for Interior on 6/19/57.  
House hearings were on HR 1960 (Metcalf) and related bills June 20-22, 1957. Agriculture did not testify (Committee decided to use Senate report and testimony). House hearings not printed.

Senate (1958)

S 4028 Humphrey (with Neuberger and Douglas) June 18, 1958

House (1958)

HR 13013 Saylor June 18, 1958

HR 12074 Metcalf " "

HR 13100 O'Hara

HR 13144 Reuss

HR 13187 McGovern

Agriculture asked to report on S 4028 (Humphrey) -- sent it up 7/23/58. Recommended enactment if amended.

Hearings held by full Senate Interior Committee. Crafts testified for Agriculture. No action by corresponding House Committee.

Hearings by full Senate Interior Committee November 7, 10, 12, 14, 1958 in Bend, Oregon San Francisco Salt Lake City and Albuquerque.

86th Congress (1959-60)

Senate

S 1123 Humphrey (with 17 co-sponsors) 2/19/59

S 3809 Murray 7/2/60 Identical to HR 12951 (Saylor) bill

S 1123 O'Mahoney and Allot amendments 4/4/60 -- amounts to a substitute /

House

HR 713 Baldwin This and next 7 bills 1/7-12/59

HR 1867 G. Miller

HR 1873 O'Hara

HR 1885 Reuss

HR 1929 Metcalf

HR 1960 Saylor

HR 2187 McGovern

HR 4367 Gubser

HR 5523 Anderson and next 5 bills 2/19/59

HR 5857 Dingell

HR 8018 Bennett

HR 10621 C. Miller

HR 12167 Fulton

HR 12288 Cohelan

HR 12951 Saylor 7/2/60 Identical to S 3809

Most of these bills essentially same as those introduced in previous Congress. S 1123 similar to bills introduced in House by Anderson, Dingell, Fulton and Cohelan.

Hearings by Senate Interior Committee on S 1123 held 3/30-31 and 4/2/59 in Seattle and Phoenix.

Agriculture asked for report on S 1123 -- sent up 6/19/59, favoring enactment if amended. Included related House bills in this report.

HR 8018 by Bennett of Florida is first bill to omit provision for a Wilderness Preservation Council. Agriculture reported on this bill 5/24/59 recommending enactment with some amendments.

Senate Committee met in executive session 8/4, 14, 18/59 to mark up S 1123. Crafts met with Committee at their request.

Committee Print #2 of S 1123 reported on by Agriculture 8/27/59 --recommended enactment with one perfecting amendment.

Senate Committee met in executive session 2/16/60 to consider Committee Print #3 (2/9/60) of S 1123. No position taken, bill not reported out.

Senate Committee met in executive session 5/3 and 19/60 to consider S 1123. Took no final action.

S 3809 (Murray) and HR 12951 (Saylor) have first acceptable definition of wilderness.

#### 87th Congress (1961-62)

##### Senate

S 174 Anderson (with 14 co-sponsors) 1/4/61

##### House

HR 293 Baldwin This and next 6 bills 1/3-6/61

HR 299 Bennett

HR 496 G. Miller

HR 776 Saylor

HR 1762 Dingell

HR 1925 Cohelan

HR 2008 Fulton

Hr 8237 Inouye Intro. later

HR 1762 and HR 2008 similar to S 174 but not identical. HR 776 like HR 12951 of 86th Congress.

Agriculture asked for report on S 174 -- sent it up 2/24/61, strongly

recommending enactment.  
Hearings on S 174 held by Senate Interior Committee 2/27-28/61. Secretary Freeman, Crafts, Florance, McArdle testified.  
Agriculture report to House Interior Committee on 7 House bills sent up 5/23/61 strongly recommending enactment if amended to conform to S 174.  
Senate Committee met 6/12/61 on S 174 -- took no action.  
Agriculture reported 6/23/61 on Senator Gruening's public land withdrawal amendment - amendment not germane, sent adverse report.  
Agriculture sent up report 6/28/61 on Senator Allot's Administrative Procedures Act amendment to S 174 -- adverse.  
Senate Committee met in executive session 6/28/61.  
Senate Interior Committee met in executive session 7/13/61 - voted to report S 174 favorably but with several amendments.  
Senate Committee Report #635 on S 174 ordered printed 7/27/61.  
Senate voted 9/5/61 to adopt all Committee amendments, considered additional amendments and adopted some.  
Senate passed S 174 by vote of 78-8 with some amendments 9/6/61.  
House referred S 174 as passed by Senate to House Interior Committee 9/7/61/  
House Interior Public Lands Subcommittee held hearings in McCall, Idaho Montrose, Colorado and Sacramento, California October 30-31 and November 1 and 6, 1961.  
Agriculture asked to report on S 174 as passed by Senate to House Committee -- sent it up 4/5/62, strongly recommending enactment with some further amendments.

(This ends my personal association with  
wilderness legislation -- retired 3/17/62 -- McA)

88th Congress (1963-64)

Senate

S 4 Anderson (with 24 co-sponsors) 1/14/63

House

HR 295 Bennett	HR 7877 Lindsay
HR 930 Saylor	HR 9070 Saylor
HR 991 Cohelan	HR 9101 Quie
HR 1023 Baldwin	HR 9162 Dingell
HR 1114 Reuss	HR 9163 Reuss
HR 2001 Dingell	HR 9164 O'Hara
HR 2530 O'Hara	HR 9165 Bennett
HR 2880 Hosmer	HR 9520 Cohelan
HR 2894 Miller	HR 9558 Udall
HR 3878 Quie	HR 10630 Conte
HR 5246 Shelley	HR 10752 St.George
HR 5808 Wydler	

The key bills are S 4 (Anderson) and HR 9070 (Saylor).

Action on S 4 and HR 9070:

2/19-20/63 Hearings, Senate on S 4.

2/20/63 Amendments to S 4 proposed by Allot and 14 others.

2/21/63 Agriculture and Interior reported on S 4 favoring enactment with amendments.

2/28 and 3/1/63 Hearing by full Senate Interior Committee on S 4.

3/27 Executive session on S 4, full Senate Interior Committee, voted to report favorably with amendments.

4/3/63 Reported S 4 to Senate - Senate Report #109.

4/8/63 Senator Allot with 14 others proposes amendments to S 4.

4/9/63 S 4 passed Senate with amendments by vote of 73-12.

7/2/64 HR 9070 with amendments reported favorably to House (Report #1538)

7/30/64 S 4 (with amendments) passed House in lieu of HR 9070 by vote of 373 to 1.

## INDEX

- Adams, Sherman, assistant to the president, 73
- Adirondack Preserve, 147
- Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 72, 86-7, 101, 103-4, 106, 108, 111, 141, 175-6, 188, 211  
 budgets, 81-2  
 Forest Service appropriations moved to Interior, 93-5  
 mining issues, 84-8, 117, 122, 130  
 publications of, 13n, 28n, 39n, 49n, 65n, 90n, 123n  
 wilderness legislation, 145, 153-4  
see also Extension Service, U.S.; Forest Service, U.S.; Soil Conservation Service, U.S.; names of individual secretaries of Agriculture
- Aiken, Senator George D., 122, 196
- Aircraft Warning Service, 49
- Al Sarena mining case, 124-9
- Alabama, 125-6
- Alaska, 63-4
- American Forest Products Foundation (changed names 1958), see Forest History Society
- American Forest Products Industry, 42
- American Forestry Association, 40n, 54, 72, 92, 141, 156  
 and mining claims on national forests issue, 120, 122, 129-33  
see also American Forests
- American Forestry Congress, 141
- American Forests, 30, 32, 91, 120, 123, 126, 130, 147n
- American Mining Congress, 128-30  
see also Al Sarena mining case
- Anderson, Senator Clinton P., mining claim issue, 122, 128, 134  
 wilderness legislation, 153, 157-8
- Andrews, Horace, Forest Survey, 3
- Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 39n
- Appalachian Forest Experiment Station, 44, 47, 51-2, 65, 188, 190-1
- Appalachian mountains, 85, 139
- appropriations, Forest Service, U.S., for uses on national forests, 67-71, 81-3  
 for research, 13-4, 191-2  
 moved to Interior, 93-6
- Arant, John, American Mining Congress representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130

- Arizona, 95,108
- Army, U.S. Department of, 196-7
- Audubon Society, 122
- Aztec Land and Cattle Co., 108
- Barrett, Leonard, 65
- Bartlett, Harley, 6-7
- Beadle, Chauncy D., general manager, Biltmore Estate, 138-140
- Bennett, Elmer F., Interior representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Benson, Ezra Taft, Secretary of Agriculture, 73,103
- Besley, Lowell, AFA spokesman on mining legislation, 123,129-30
- Biltmore Forestry School, 137-9,142
- Blue Eagle, 43
- Boston, Orlan, 4
- Boston, Stella Roth, 4
- Boykin, Congressman Frank W., 125
- Bradshaw, G.R., Interior representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Brandis, Sir Dietrich, inspector general of forests, India, 138
- Brannan, Charles F., Secretary of Agriculture, 188
- Breaking New Ground, 138
- Brown, Nelson C., coauthor, Elements of Forestry, 3
- Brownlow, Louis, on Harold Ickes, 100-2
- Budget, Bureau of the, (changed names), see Management and Budget, Office of
- Bureau. For all government bureaus, see under the names of the subjects with which they deal: e.g., Land Management, U.S. Bureau of
- Byram, George, Forest Service research, 190-1
- CCC, see Civilian Conservation Corps
- California, 134,142,147,202 see also Oregon and California Railroad lands
- Cannon, Congressman Clarence, 93-4
- Carhart, Arthur H., wilderness advocate, 162
- Carson National Forest, 196
- Chamberlain-Ferris Act (1916), 105n
- Chattahoochee National Forest, 17

- Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 151
- Civil Service System, U.S., 17-8, 109
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 20, 77
- Clapp, Earle H., 10, 65, 205  
forestry research, 13-4, 49, 188  
publications of, 48-9  
advocate of regulation, 42-4,  
47-50, 54-5, 61-2, 198
- Clarke-McNary Act (1924), 43, 52,  
54, 59
- Clepper, Henry, author, 91
- Cliff, Edward P., Forest Service,  
31, 56-7, 130, 167, 189
- Coke, James Earl, Secretary of  
Agriculture  
strip mine issue, 84, 86-7
- Collins, Chapin, American Forest  
Products Industries, 42
- Colorado, 16, 19, 146, 167, 190, 205
- Committee on Interior and Insular  
Affairs, 117n
- Congressional Record, 95
- Connecticut, 66
- Conover, Julian, American Mining  
Congress representative to  
AFA meeting on mining issue, 130
- conservation  
public interest in, 33-6, 160
- Cooley, Congressman Harold D.  
mining claim legislation, 122, 128
- Cooperative Farm Forestry Act  
~~see~~ see Norris-Doxey Farm Forestry  
Act
- Cooperative Forest Management  
Act (1950), 59
- Cooperative Forest Management  
Manual, 204
- Copeland Report, see National  
Plan for American Forestry
- Cordon, Senator Guy  
Oregon and California lands  
controversy, 106-9
- Cornell University, 137, 203-4
- Council of Conservationists, 151
- Crafts, Edward C., Forest Service, 30  
mining claims legislation, 115, 130  
regulation issue, 57, 166-7  
wilderness legislation, 150, 154
- Cumberland National Forest,  
strip mining on, 84
- Dana, Samuel T., 188  
contributions to Forest Service,  
89-92  
publications of, 4, 87n, 90  
Outdoor Recreation Resources  
Review Commission, 72  
University of Michigan, School  
of Natural Resources  
7, 89-91
- Davis, Clarence, Interior, 125-6
- Davis, Clint, Forest Service, 101
- Dawes, Charles, 102
- Delano, Frederic, 100

- Department. For all departmental level government organizations, see under the names of the subjects with which they deal: e.g., Agriculture, U.S. Department of
- D'Ewart, Wesley, Agriculture representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- disease control  
on national forests, 48, 50, 162
- Douglas-fir yield study, 11, 14, 43, 190
- Dryfoos, Marian, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 73
- Dworshak, Henry I., American Mining Congress representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Eisenhower, President Dwight D., 59, 121, 134, 157, 201-2
- Elements of Forestry, 3
- Ellsworth, Congressman Harris, 125  
Oregon and California Railroad lands controversy, 106-9
- Engle, Congressman Clair, 122
- Executive Branch, 153, 157, 168  
see also Management and Budget, Office of
- Extension Service, U.S., 103
- Federal Register, 111
- Fernow, Bernhard Edward, 140-1  
Cornell University Forestry School, 203-4
- Fifth Biennial Wilderness Congress, 147
- Fifth World Forestry Congress, 30-1  
speech by McArdle, 225-31
- fire control  
on national forests, 48, 50, 162, 173, 187  
on private land, 52, 54, 78, 162, 187  
research in, 187, 190-1
- First Book of Forestry, 3
- Flood Control Act (1936), 49
- Florance, Reynolds G.  
Forest Service representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130  
wilderness legislation, 150, 154
- Florida, 94
- Ford Foundation, 100
- Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (1974), 83n
- Forest History, 39n
- Forest History Society, 30, 66n, 139, 167n, 185  
see also Forest History
- Forest Lands of the United States, 48
- Forest Pest Control Act (1947), 59
- Forest Products Laboratory  
(Madison, Wisconsin), 49
- Forest Regulation, 41

- Forest Service, U.S., 3, 7-10, 65, 103-4, 141, 163, 166, 168, 209, 215, 217  
 chiefs, papers of, 97-102  
 contributions of Sam Dana, 89-92  
 decentralization of power, 168-71, 173-9  
 decision making, 111-4  
 educational opportunities, 12  
 expansion problems, 180-3  
 general integrating inspections, 176  
 oral history interviews, 127  
 personnel, 23-7, 35, 176-9, 180-1, 194-9  
 relations with public, 26, 33-4, 111, 200, 202-3, 206-9, 214  
 staff development, 178, 200-1, 210  
see also names of individual divisions, experiment stations, national forests, persons, and wilderness areas
- Forest Service Manual, 171
- Forest Service Reappraisal Report, see Forests and National Prosperity
- Forest Service Researcher and Congressional Liaison: An Eye to Multiple Use, 30, 167
- Forest Service Research Scientist and Administrator Views Multiple Use, 30
- Forest Survey, 3, 49, 51
- forestry education, 12, 19-21, 100, 200-1  
 Carl Alwin Schenck and Biltmore Forestry School, 137-9, 141-2  
 contributions of Sam Dana, 89-91  
 schools of forestry, 137, 203-4
- Forests and National Prosperity, 65n
- Forman, Jonathan, National Forest Advisory Council, 119
- Fourth American Forestry Congress, 123
- Freeman, Orville, Secretary of Agriculture, 154, 157, 167
- General Accounting Office, 177
- Georgia, 17, 172
- Germany, 41-2, 140, 195
- Gila National Forest, 146
- Government Employees Training Act (1958), 12
- Grand Canyon National Park, 117
- Granger, Christopher M., Forest Service, 10, 56, 120
- Graves, Henry S., chief, Forest Service, 141  
 on regulation, 40, 42-3, 62
- grazing, 166, 176, 178, 190-1, 196  
 and mining issue, 156  
 on national forests, 35, 48, 160-1  
The Western Range, reaction to, 205-8
- Grazing Service (changed names), see Land Management, Bureau of
- Greeley, William B., chief, Forest Service, 14  
 regulation issue, 39, 42-3  
 West Coast Lumbermen's Association head, 14-5
- Grover, Frederick W., Forest Service, 30n

- guayule rubber project, 49
- Guernsey, William G., Interior representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Hamilton Lawrence, author, 39n
- Hanzlik, E.J., Forest Service, 11
- Harper, Verne L., Forest Service, 30n, 56-7
- Harvard University, 140
- Hayden, Senator Carl, 95
- Higgins, John, 73-4
- History of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, 13
- Hobbs, W.H., 6-7
- Hoffman, Lewis E., Interior representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Holbrook, Raymond B., mining industry lawyer to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 131-2
- Hope, Congressman Clifford, mining claim issue, 121-3
- Hopkins, Howard, Forest Service, 56-7
- Horning, Walter, Interior representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Humphrey, Senator Hubert  
152, 158, 161, 223-4
- Ickes, Harold, chief, Forest Service,  
diaries of, 100-1
- Idaho, 24, 195
- Indian Affairs, Bureau of, 147
- insect control  
on national forests, 48, 50, 162
- Interior, U.S. Department of the,  
39n, 72, 167, 206  
Forest Service appropriations moved from Agriculture to, 93-5  
mining issues, 88, 122, 125-6, 130  
Oregon and California Railroad lands controversy, 105-6  
wilderness issue, 147, 153-4, 157-8  
see also Grazing Service; Indian Affairs, Bureau of; Land Management, Bureau of; Mines, Bureau of; National Park Service
- Iowa, 119
- Izaak Walton League of America, 72
- Jackson, Senator Henry M., 61
- Japan, 63
- John D. Rockefeller Foundation, 7, 33
- Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, 48n, 128
- Journal of Forestry, 40, 91, 120
- Justice, Department of, 142

- Kansas, 121
- Kauffman, C.H., 6-7, 15
- Keller, mining industry lawyer  
to AFA meeting on mining  
issue, 131
- Kellogg, Charlie, Forest Service, 211
- Kennedy, President John F., 28, 157  
and National Forest Development  
Program, 76, 83
- Kentucky, 34, 84-5, 87, 90
- Keyser, C. Frank, author,  
The Preservation of Wilderness  
Areas-An Analysis of the problem,  
150
- Kircher, Joseph C., Forest Service  
54
- Kirwan, Congressman Michael,  
93-4
- Knowland, Senator William F., 202
- Knutson-Vandenburg Act (1930), 69
- Kotok, Edward I., Forest Service, 56
- Kraus, E.H., 7
- Land Management, U.S. Bureau of,  
117, 125, 136, 206
- Land Office, General (changed  
names), see Land Management,  
Bureau of
- Lanigan, Jim, Interior representa-  
tive to AFA meeting on mining  
claim issue, 130
- Larson, Edwin vH., author, 13n
- Lee, Katherine Jackson, Outdoor  
Recreation Resources Review  
Commission, 72-3
- Leopold, Aldo, wilderness advo-  
cate, 162
- Lewis, Orme, Assistant Secretary  
of Interior, 130
- Library of Congress, 150
- Lindh, Otto, Forest Service, 197
- London School of Economics, 7
- Louisiana, 26
- Loveridge, Earl W., Forest Service,  
56-7
- Lumber Code Authority, 43
- McArdle, Dorothy Coppage, 15-6
- McArdle, Richard C., 15
- McArdle, Richard E.  
education, 1-9, 12  
works Roper Lumber Co., 3, 40  
Pacific Northwest Forest and  
Range Experiment Station, 10-2,  
14-5, 190, 5, 47  
dean, University of Idaho School  
of Forestry, 16, 19-21  
director, Rocky Mountain Forest  
and Range Experiment Station,  
16, 19, 47, 190, 205-9  
director, Appalachian Forest  
Experiment Station, 44, 47, 51-2,  
65, 188, 190-1  
assistant chief, State and  
Private Forestry Cooperation,  
55, 187-9

- chief, U.S. Forest Service  
   appropriations, 67-9, 93-6  
   centralization in government,  
     168-179  
   decision making, 111-4  
   legislation during, 28-32, 115, 121-4,  
     133, 139-40, 150-9  
   mining issues, 84-8, 108, 115-36  
   National Forest Development  
     Program, 75-83  
   Oregon & California lands con-  
     troversy, 105-10  
   papers of, 97-9  
   regulation issue, 44-5, 47, 51-2, 56-61  
   relations with employees, 23, 172,  
     177-8, 180-1  
   selection as chief, 187-9  
   wilderness, 163-4, 147, 150-9  
   work with John D. Rockefeller  
     Foundation, 7  
   executive director, National Institute  
     Public Affairs, 100  
   on employer-employee expectations,  
     183-5, 192-215
- McConnel, mining industry lawyer  
   to AFA meeting on mining claim  
   issue, 131
- MacDonald, G.B., National Forest  
   Advisory Council, 119, 123
- McGuire, John, chief, Forest Service  
   97, 217
- McNamee, Charles, general manager,  
   Biltmore Estate, 140
- McSweeney-McNary Act (1928), 13,  
   49, 59  
   see also research
- Maine Forest Forum, 33
- Macy, John, 100
- Malone, Senator George W., 134
- Management and Budget, Office of,  
   68-70, 81-3, 153-4, 168, 173-4, 176
- Marsh, Raymond, Forest Service,  
   10, 57
- Marshall, Robert, Wilderness  
   Society, 162-4
- Mason, David T., forester, 10-1
- Materials Disposal Act (1947), 135  
   see also mining
- Maunder, Elwood R., executive  
   director, Forest History Society,  
   13, 30n, 222
- Merck, George, 141
- Merriam, Charles E., 101
- Michigan, 41
- Michigan Alumnus Quarterly  
Review, 4n
- Miller, Alan, Forest Service, 134
- Mines, Bureau of, 126
- mining  
   and wilderness legislation, 156, 159  
   claims on national forests, 116-36  
   legislation on, 29, 115-36, 232  
   Stearns Co. strip mine issue,  
     84-8, 90, 108  
   see also Al Sarena mining case;  
   American Mining Congress;  
   Multiple Use Mining Act
- Minnesota, 41, 146, 152
- Minnesota Historical Society, 139

- Mississippi, 93
- Missouri, 93
- Moffett, Harry, American Mining Congress representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- Monongahela National Forest, 87
- Montana, 24
- Montana State University, 119
- Moon, Frederick, coauthor, Elements of Forestry, 3
- Morse, True D., Agriculture Under Secretary, 117
- multiple use, 42  
 McArdle speech at Fifth World Forestry Congress, 225-31  
 National Forest Development Program, 75-83  
 publications on, 30-1  
see also Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act; national forests
- Multiple Use in U.S. Forest Service Land Planning, 30n
- Multiple Use Mining Act (1955), 29n, 115-36, 126
- Multiple Use and the U.S. Forest Service, 1910-1950, 30n
- Multiple Use of the National Forests, 30n
- Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act (1960), 28-32, 160-1, 167, 220-4
- Munger, Thornton T., Forest Service, 10-1, 14, 17, 19, 43, 182
- Murray, Thomas J., 122
- Mynatt, Edward F., Forest Service representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130
- National Archives, 98
- national forests  
 administration of, 48, 50, 112-3, 170, 176, 188-9, 202-3  
 insect control on, 48, 50, 162  
 mining on, 84-8, 115-36  
 multiple uses of, 28-32, 35, 48, 59, 67-8, 71, 116  
 legislation affects, 28-32  
 summer homes on, 116-7, 202-3  
see also Forest Service, U.S.; names of individual national forests and regions; National Forest Development Program; Oregon & California Railroad lands controversy
- National Forest Advisory Council, 119
- National Forest Development Program, 28, 75-83
- National Institute of Public Affairs, 100, 183
- National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 55
- national parks, 85, 147-8, 154, 158-9
- National Park Service, 154, 158-9  
see also names of individual parks
- National Parks Association, 122
- Natural Resources Council, 126

- National Plan for American Forestry, 48
- National Recovery Act (1933), 43
- National Recovery Administration, 43
- Nelson, DeWitt, AFA director, meeting on mining claim issue, 130-1
- Neuberger, Senator Richard L., 134
- Nevada, 134
- New Hampshire, 72
- New Mexico, 23, 122, 146, 153, 196-7
- New York, 147, 163, 203
- New York Times, 73
- Norris-Doxey Farm Forestry Act (1937), 49
- North Carolina, 40, 44, 47, 51, 65, 142, 163, 188, 190  
Biltmore Forestry School, 137-8
- Northern Cascades, 158
- Northeastern Forest Experiment Station  
A History of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, 13n  
and Samuel T. Dana, 89-90
- ORRRC, see Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission
- Ohio, 86, 93  
Ohio State University, 119
- Olympic National Forest, 158
- Olympic National Park, 158
- Olympic Wilderness, 158
- Operation Outdoors, 28
- Oregon, 5, 20, 41, 43, 55, 73-4, 103, 125-6, 137, 163, 174, 190  
see also Oregon and California Railroad Lands controversy
- Oregon and California Railroad Company, 105
- Oregon and California Railroad lands controversy, 105-10
- Orell, Bernard L., Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72
- Outdoor Recreation, Bureau of, 167
- Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-4, 91, 154
- Outdoor Writers Association, 120
- Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, 5, 10, 15, 17, 19, 47
- Parkinson, mining industry lawyer to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 131
- Parkinson, Dana, Forest Service, 54
- Pearson, Drew  
and the Al Sarena mining case, 126
- Peck, Allen, Forest Service, 205
- Peirce, Earl S., Forest Service, 30n

- Penfold, Joseph W., Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-3
- Pennsylvania, 152
- Peterson, Ervin L., Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, 76, 103-4, 110, 130
- Pinchot, Gifford, chief, Forest Service, 102, 217  
decentralizes Forest Service, 170  
"fight" with Schenck, 140-1  
opinion on regulation, 39-40  
publications of, 39n, 138
- Pisgah National Forest, 138
- Politics of Conservation, The, 101
- Polson, Robert, 52-3
- Preservation of Wilderness Areas-  
An Analysis of the Problem, 150
- Price, Overton, 102
- Proceedings of American Forestry  
Congress, 1905, 40n
- Programs and Legislation, Forest Service, 57
- Program for American Forestry, 123
- public domain, 88, 139, 148
- Pulaski, Ed, Forest Service, 195
- Pyles, Hamilton K., Forest Service 30n
- Rayburn, Sam T., Speaker of the House, 94-5
- recreation, 9, 42, 48, 59, 85, 116, 217  
National Forest Development Program, 75-83  
on wilderness areas, 149, 154, 156  
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-4  
see also Operation Outdoors;  
Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act
- Reclamation, Bureau of, 94
- Regional Forester's View of Multiple Use, A, 30n
- regulation of timber cutting, 37-8, 43, 46, 54, 64  
opposition to, 45-8, 50-1  
origins of, 39-42  
position of industry, 45-7  
position of Forest Service, 39-40, 42-8, 55-62, 64
- Renne, Roland R., National Forest Advisory Council, 119
- Report of the President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment, 70n
- Report on the Problem of Mining Claims on the National Forests, 123n
- Republican Party, 73-4, 121
- research, Forest Service, 11-2, 170, 187-91  
appropriations for, 13-4, 191-2  
contributions of Sam Dana, 89-90  
Douglas-fir yield study, 11, 14, 190  
McSweeney-McNary Act (1928), 13  
National Forest Development Program, 75-83

- Rockefeller, Laurance, Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-3
- Rocky Mountains, 159
- Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, 16, 19, 190, 205
- Rogue River National Forest mining claims on, 125
- Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 43, 77, 100-1, 188
- Roosevelt, President Theodore, 40
- Roosevelt National Forest, 16
- Roper Lumber Company, 3, 40
- Roth, Filibert, 8, 141  
"Filibert Roth--Master Teacher," 4  
publications of, 3, 41  
University of Michigan Forestry School, 2, 4-5, 20
- Rothrock, Joseph T., forester, 141
- Santa Fe National Forest, 196
- Sargent, Charles Sprague, forester, 141
- Saylor, Congressman John, 152
- Schenck, Carl Alwin, 137-43
- Schrepfer, Susan R., author, 13n, 30n, 167n
- Schurz, Carl, Secretary of Interior, 39
- Seaton, Fred A., author, Report of the President's Advisory Panel on Timber and the Environment, 70  
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-4
- Shepard, Ward, Forest Service, 35
- Sherman, E.A., 162
- Sieker, John, Forest Service representative to AFA meeting on mining claim issue, 130  
wilderness advocate, 162
- Sierra Club, 42, 61, 68, 122, 150-2, 161
- Silcox, Ferdinand A., chief, Forest Service, 84, 163, 188  
and regulation, 43-4
- small forest landowners, 51-3, 62, 64-6
- Smith, Frank E., author, The Politics of Conservation, 102n
- Smith, M. Frederik, lobbyist, 73
- Society of American Foresters, 40, 45, 122, 137, 156
- Soil Conservation Service, U.S., 103
- South Carolina, 23
- Southern Forest Resource Committee, 66
- Spencer, John W., author, 147n
- Sports Afield, 120
- Spurr, Stephen H., author, 91
- Squires, John W., author, 66n

- state and private forestry cooperation, 48, 55-6, 76, 170, 187-8
- State and Private Forestry Cooperation, Forest Service, 48, 55-8, 189, 204, 214
- Stearns Lumber and Coal Co., strip mine issue, 84-8
- Stone, J. Herbert, Forest Service, 30n
- Stuart, Robert Y., chief, Forest Service, 43
- Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill see Forest Reserve Act
- Superior National Forest, 146
- Swingler, William S., Forest Service 57
- Taft, Charles P., lawyer, Stearns strip mine issue, 86-7
- Taft, President William Howard, 86
- Taylor, Ray, Forest Service, 194
- The South's Third Forest... How it can meet future demands, 66
- Tennessee Valley Authority, 85, 101
- Timber Growing and Logging Practice in the Northeast, 90
- timber management, 42, 51, 78-9, 160-1, 176  
and strip mining, 84-8, 125-6  
cutting on private land, 39-41, 51, 42-62, 64  
planting, cutting and sales, 67-71, 106-8, 116, 163, 172, 187, 217
- see also National Forest Development Program
- Timber Production War Project, 49
- Timber Resource Review, 49
- Timber Resources for America's Future, 49
- Time magazine, 140-2
- Udall, Stewart, Secretary of Interior, 157
- uranium boom (1950s), 116-7, 135
- United States. For all federal departments and bureaus, see under the names of the subject with which they deal: e.g., Forest Service, U.S.
- U.S. Congress, 28, 48, 103-4, 139, 142, 177, 188, 192, 205  
appropriations, 67, 69-70, 81-2, 93-5  
mining, 117-8, 120n-2, 125-6, 128, 133-4  
Oregon & California Railroad lands controversy, 105-6, 108-9  
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 72-3  
regulation issue, 58, 60-1  
wilderness, 147-8, 150, 152-7, 160-1  
see also names of individual legislation
- U.S. Supreme Court, 108
- University of Idaho School of Forestry, 12, 16, 19-21, 190
- University of Maine, 33

- University of Michigan, 6-7, 15  
 School of Natural Resources,  
 2-5, 40, 72, 86, 89-92, 137  
 Filibert Roth, 2, 4-5  
 Samuel T. Dana, 7, 86
- Vanderbilt, George, 138-9, 143
- van Dresser, Cleveland  
 publications on mining claim  
 issue, 120, 123
- Vermont, 196
- Wallace, Tom, author, 87n
- Washington (state of) 20, 30, 41,  
 43, 52, 163, 174, 188
- Washington, D.C., 34-5, 40n, 49n,  
 55-6, 63, 103, 112, 118, 125-6, 134,  
 137, 163, 169-71, 183, 189, 192
- Washington Post, 168
- Washington University, 7
- watershed management, 42, 160-1,  
 190-1, 217  
see also National Forest  
 Development Program; Multiple  
 Use Act
- Watts, Lyle, chief, Forest Service,  
 188  
 Oregon and California Railroad  
 lands controversy, 106-8  
 mining claims, 115, 119, 121, 125  
 regulation issue, 44, 49, 55-8, 62
- Wenley, Professor, 6-7
- Wertz, June, Forest Service, 10-1, 25
- West Coast Lumbermen's Associa-  
 tion, 114
- West Virginia, 87
- Western Range: A Great but  
 Neglected Resource, 49, 205-8
- White House Conference of  
 Governors (1908), 40
- White River National Forest, 146
- Whitten, Congressman Jaimie, 93-4
- Wickard, Claude, Forest Service,  
 55
- wilderness, 144, 147, 159, 160-1  
 definition of, 144-6, 161  
 designation of areas, 146-9,  
 151, 161-4  
 legislation affecting, 149-62,  
 233-7  
 USDA regulations, 145-7, 159,  
 164  
see also Wilderness Act; names  
 of individual wilderness areas;  
 Wilderness Society
- Wilderness Act (1964), 144, 146-8,  
 152-3, 155, 159
- Wilderness Preservation Council,  
 153-4
- Wilderness Society, 68, 146, 150-1,  
 155, 163  
see also Robert Marshall
- wildlife management, 42, 48, 86,  
 160-1, 190  
see also National Forest  
 Development Program; Multiple  
 Use Act
- Wilhelm, Robert L., 86-7

- Wilson, Chester, Outdoor  
Recreation Resources Review  
Commission, 72
- Wirth, Conrad L., director,  
National Park Service, 154
- Wisconsin, 41, 49, 188
- Woody, William A., Forest Service,  
17
- Work Projects Administration, 77
- World War I, 2, 20, 40
- World War II, 33, 47, 49, 116, 118
- Wormser, Felix E., Interior  
representative to AFA meeting  
on mining claim issue, 130
- Wyoming, 205-6
- Yale Forest School, 43, 91, 137
- Young, Congressman Milton R., 128
- Zahniser, Howard, Wilderness  
Society, 150-2, 157