

Edward C. Crafts

FOREST SERVICE RESEARCHER AND CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON:
AN EYE TO MULTIPLE USE

An Interview Conducted by
Susan R. Schrepfer

Produced under cooperative agreement between the
United States Forest Service and the Forest History Society

Forest History Society
Oral History Office
Santa Cruz, California

1972

Forest History Society, Inc.
P. O. Box 1581
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Copyrighted © 1972 by Forest History Society, Inc.

All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| PREFACE | vi |
| INTRODUCTION | viii |
| PROFESSIONAL OUTLINE | xi |
| THE EARLY YEARS | 1 |
| Introductory Remarks | 1 |
| Childhood through College | 1 |
| A Career in Forestry | 3 |
| Forestry Education in the 1930s | 5 |
| Specializing in Grazing Research | 9 |
| SOUTHWESTERN FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, 1932 to 1939 | 11 |
| Grazing Research | 11 |
| History of Grazing on the National Forests | 12 |
| Wildlife: Competition with Livestock | 14 |
| Political Influences in the Grazing Service | 15 |
| Establishing the Parker Creek Experiment Station | 17 |
| Arthur Sampson | 18 |
| Forest Service Research: Pure or Applied? | 19 |
| Grazing Surveys in New Mexico and Arizona | 20 |
| DEVELOPMENT OF MULTIPLE USE, 1930s and 1940s | 22 |
| Multiple Use and the New Deal | 22 |
| Recreation in the 1930s and 1940s | 23 |
| Relations between the Forest Service and the Park Service | 25 |
| Forest Service Relations with Various Government Bureaus | 28 |
| FOREST ECONOMICS, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, 1939 to 1950 | 29 |
| Division of Forest Economics | 29 |
| Public Regulation of Private Timber Practices | 30 |
| Forest Taxation and Multiple Use | 35 |
| Forest Service Reports | 35 |
| Appropriations, Revenue, and Multiple Use | 36 |
| Multiple Use During the 1940s | 39 |
| Third World Forestry Conference, 1949 | 41 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| ASSISTANT CHIEF, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, 1950 to 1962 | 43 |
| Duties as Assistant Chief | 43 |
| Stockmen's Grazing Bill | 45 |
| Oregon and California Railroad Lands | 46 |
| Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955 | 47 |
| Dealing with Congress | 49 |
| THE MULTIPLE USE-SUSTAINED YIELD ACT OF 1960 | 52 |
| Evolution of the Act | 52 |
| Wilderness and Multiple Use | 57 |
| Pressure Groups and the Multiple Use Act | 62 |
| Relations between the Forest Service and the Park Service | 65 |
| Relations between the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers | 74 |
| Relations between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management | 75 |
| Need for the Act | 77 |
| Impact of the Act | 79 |
| Defining Multiple Use in the Act | 81 |
| Discretionary Powers of the Forest Service | 83 |
| Definition of Multiple Use | 89 |
| The Regional Forester's Role in Legislation | 91 |
| Attitude of Lumber Interests | 93 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 95 |
| Mining: A Multiple Use? | 96 |
| Industrial Use: A Multiple Use? | 97 |
| Sustained Yield in the Act | 98 |
| Administrative Clearance | 99 |
| Reaction of Department of the Interior | 100 |
| Equal Priority for the Multiple Uses | 100 |
| Richard E. McArdle | 101 |
| Wilderness Clause in the Act | 102 |
| "Greatest Unit Output" and "Greatest Dollar Return" | 104 |
| MULTIPLE USE IN ACTION ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS | 106 |
| Dominant Use versus Multiple Use | 106 |
| Technology of Multiple Use | 107 |
| Multiple-Use Decisions and Reviews | 108 |
| Forest Service and Public Opinion | 110 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| POST 1960 DEVELOPMENTS RELATIVE TO MULTIPLE USE | 111 |
| Multiple-Use Advisory Committee | 111 |
| Outdoor Recreation Resources Review | 111 |
| Bureau of Outdoor Recreation | 112 |
| High-Timber Yield Bill | 113 |
| National Environmental Policy Act, 1969 | 114 |
| Bitterroot National Forest Controversy | 115 |
| Consolidation of the Federal Natural Resources Bureaus | 117 |
| Future of the Forest Service | 120 |
| APPENDICES | 122 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR EDWARD C. CRAFTS | 148 |
| SELECTED READINGS ON MULTIPLE USE | 151 |
| INDEX | 174 |

PREFACE

In the spring of 1970 I addressed a formal report to the chief forester and staff of the United States Forest Service which recommended a program of original research, writing, and gathering of documentary evidence that would reveal the history of the Forest Service and the progress of national forest policy. A part of my report called for a fresh and professionally conducted series of in-depth oral history interviews with both retired U. S. Forest Service personnel and with persons currently employed in key positions within the agency.

In February of 1971 the plan had been thoroughly reviewed by chief and staff and by an ad hoc history committee of the Washington office of the Forest Service and several cooperative agreements were written to launch a professional examination of the subject. Among these was one with the Forest History Society of Santa Cruz, California, which provided for six in-depth interviews with Edward C. Crafts, former U.S. Forest Service assistant chief for Program Planning and Legislation and former director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; Frederick W. Grover, former director of the Division of Land Classification; Verne L. Harper, former deputy chief for Research; Earl S. Peirce, former chief of the Division of State Cooperation; Hamilton K. Pyles, former deputy chief for Programs and Legislation; and J. Herbert Stone, former regional forester for Region 6.

This initial oral history series puts its focus upon the origins and development of the multiple-use concept. The interviews are not intended to explore all the possible avenues of information obtained on multiple use but to determine what gaps in knowledge on the subject might be filled by going into the memories of six men who had viewed the developing history from different aspects. Others should now be interviewed, most notably former Chief Forester Richard E. McArdle; director of the Division of Legislative Reporting and Liaison, Reynolds G. Florance; and other key persons such as associate chief, Arthur W. Greeley, and former director of the Division of Budget and Finance, Howard E. Marshall.

The program was set up under the newly-created History Office of the U. S. Forest Service and its chief, Mr. Clifford D. Owsley. I would like to here acknowledge Mr. Owsley's assistance in planning this series of interviews. My thanks are also expressed to John R. McGuire, Gordon D. Fox, Richard F. Droege, Chester A. Shields, and many others

in the Washington office of the U. S. Forest Service who contributed to the planning. Dr. Harold T. Pinkett of the National Archives, Natural Resources Division, Dean Emeritus George A. Garratt of the Yale School of Forestry, and Mr. John F. Shanklin, chairman of the Special Projects Committee of the Forest History Society, made important contributions to the planning of the program.

Special credit belongs to the members of the Oral History Office staff of the Forest History Society for their tireless efforts to research the careers of each man interviewed prior to the making of the interviews and for their dedication to the highest standards of scholarly procedure in transcribing, editing, indexing, and publishing the six volumes of which this is a part. Dr. Susan Schrepfer was the chief figure in this work and was ably assisted by Mrs. Barbara Holman and Miss Claudia Mehl. The end products are, of course, the sole responsibility of their several authors--the respondents and the interviewers. Each interview series has been read and corrected by the authors, and whatever errors of fact may appear here are solely attributable to them.

Elwood R. Maunder
Executive Director
Forest History Society
Santa Cruz, California

INTRODUCTION

From 1950 to 1962 Edward C. Crafts was one of the most influential men in the Forest Service. During this twelve-year period he functioned as the service's liaison with Congress, formulated long-range programs for the service, and worked in policy and general program development. He was in charge of many dealings with other agencies and with the White House. He often functioned as alternate for the chief of the Forest Service when the latter was unavailable. He was the Forest Service's trouble shooter, or to use his own words, he was "in charge of snakes." He kept track of the Forest Service's enemies.

As the Forest Service's key man in legislative affairs during the 1950s and early 1960s, Crafts's position with regard to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was pivotal. He has an insider's view of the impact that Forest Service relations with other bureaus had on the history of multiple use and the service's drive to obtain a congressional mandate to practice multiple use. He recalls the reaction of some of these other bureaus to the idea of such a Forest Service mandate. He can discuss firsthand the decision to go ahead with the act, who agreed and who did not, and how the wording of the act was determined. He vividly describes the reaction of the lumbermen and the wilderness enthusiasts to this piece of legislation. Most directly, however, he remembers the passage of the act, the struggle to get administrative clearance, and the decision to force the bill through in one session. Finally, he reacts to the question, Was the act applied in the manner envisioned by those who formulated it? Crafts's role as congressional liaison is a vital link in the history of multiple use. But this was only one aspect of his lengthy career in natural resource administration.

Edward Crafts joined the Forest Service in the early 1930s. Assigned to the Intermountain and Southwestern Forest and Range Experiment Stations, he focused his attention on grazing and watershed research. He can contribute firsthand information on these uses of the national forests during the 1930s as well as observations on the impact of the New Deal on multiple use and on relations between the Forest Service and other branches of the federal government during this troubled era.

From 1939 to 1950 Dr. Crafts worked in the Division of Forest Economics in both California and Washington. A central problem of this

period was the relationship between Forest Service appropriations and revenue and its multiple-use policy. He relates his views on the impact of World War II on the relative priority accorded the various uses of the national forests by the service.

Dr. Crafts became assistant chief in 1950. In the course of the twelve years that followed he was involved with many legislative matters bearing on multiple use, beyond the 1960 Multiple Use Act mentioned previously. He helped prevent passage of the Stockmen's Grazing Bill, facilitated settlement of the controverted Oregon and California Railroad Lands, and aided in the passage of a multiple use mining act, the Wilderness Bill, and many others. Dr. Crafts's description of how bureau administrators interact with congressmen is perhaps one of the most exciting portions of this interview.

In 1962 the Forest Service lost its troubleshooter. Edward Crafts became director of the newly created, Department of Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. In 1969 he retired from federal service but not from active involvement in forestry and environmental affairs. Since 1969 he has served as special articles editor for American Forests magazine; lecturer at the University of California and Colorado State University; director of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and the Forest History Society; member of the National Camping and Conservation Committees, Boy Scouts of America; and consultant to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Conservation Association, Corps of Engineers, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Natural Resources Council of America. He is consulting forester for the National Parks and Conservation Association and the Environmental Coalition.*

The interview that follows was made with Dr. Crafts in his austere Washington, D. C., office at 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., where he serves as conservation consultant for the Citizens Committee and other clients. These sessions were held on the fourth, seventh, and ninth of August, 1971. As the pages that follow show, Ed Crafts is a man of independent views. As one might guess from his activities as assistant chief, and as he admits, Crafts was never one to avoid the controversies that accompanied any position he held. Thus, as exemplified by his stand on public regulation of private timber practices, Crafts at times made enemies. Not surprisingly his interview contains clearly enunciated opinions. He is able to look at both the Forest Service and its enemies with an objective eye.

*For a more detailed biographical outline of Edward C. Crafts, see below, pp. 11-12.

The interview was fast-paced. Still in the throes of congressional activities and anxious to be off on a trip to Europe, the normally impatient Crafts did not allow the interview to ramble. Rarely was a question finished before the answer was begun. His experience and capability as a testifier before congressional committees is obvious in the transcript that follows.

The rapid-fire style of discussion may also be due to the fact that Ed Crafts is not new to the discipline of oral history. The present interview was his fourth. In 1965 he was taped by Amelia Roberts Fry of the Bancroft Regional Oral History Office on the subject of his activities in the Forest Service. They discussed, at particular length, relations between the Forest Service and other federal land departments. In 1969 he was interviewed by David G. McComb of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Library. In 1969 and in 1970 William Moss of the John F. Kennedy Library recorded sessions with Crafts. The interview with McComb and those with Moss cover Crafts's years as director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.*

The tapes from this interview were transcribed by Barbara D. Holman. As interviewer, I then edited the transcript and sent it to Dr. Crafts for review. With only minor revisions he returned it to the Forest History Society, where it was given a final typing by Claudia Mehl. An index was added by the interviewer. Copies of the manuscript, either in manuscript or microfiche form, can be purchased from the Forest History Society. Use of the transcript is governed by the copyright laws and a signed contract between the Forest History Society and Edward C. Crafts.

Susan R. Schrepfer
Santa Cruz, California
June 14, 1972

*Edward C. Crafts, "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962," tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry, Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library; tape-recorded interview in 1969 by David G. McComb, Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, Austin, Texas; tape-recorded interview in 1969 by William W. Moss, John F. Kennedy Library, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1972; tape-recorded interview in 1970 by William W. Moss, John F. Kennedy Library, Waltham, Massachusetts, 1972.

Edward C. Crafts

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| 1910, April 14 | Born in Chicago |
| 1928 to 1929 | Student, Dartmouth College |
| 1931 | Summer assistant, Range research, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Ephraim, Utah. |
| 1932 | Bachelor of Forestry, University of Michigan |
| 1932 to 1939 | Range, watershed, forest management research, Southwestern Forest and Range Experiment Station, Flagstaff, Globe, and Tucson, Arizona |
| 1933 to 1934 | Studied law for a year, University of Michigan |
| 1936 | Masters of Forestry, University of Michigan |
| 1940 to 1944 | Forest economics, California Forest and Range Experiment Station, Berkeley. |
| 1942 | Doctor of Philosophy, Forest economics University of Michigan |
| 1944 to 1950 | Chief, Division of Forest Economics, United States Forest Service |
| 1949 | U. S. Delegate, Third World Forestry Congress, Helsinki, Finland. |
| 1950 to 1962 | Assistant Chief, United States Forest Service |
| 1962 to 1969 | Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Interior |
| 1968 | Honorary Doctor of Science, University of Michigan |
| 1969 to present | Conservation consultant, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources |

1969 Consultant to the governor of Puerto Rico
Lecturer, Colorado State

1970 Consultant, United States Army Corps of
Engineers

Awards

1960 Distinguished Service Award, United States
Department of Agriculture

1965 Distinguished Service Award, American Institute
of Park Executives

1967 Distinguished Service Award, United States
Department of Interior

1968 Rockefeller Public Service Award, Princeton
University

Professional Memberships

American Forestry Association
American Recreation Society
Forest History Society
Izaak Walton League, former member
National Conference on State Parks
National Parks and Recreation Association
National Parks Association
National Wildlife Federation
Society of American Foresters, fellow
Sierra Club
Wilderness Society

Social Clubs

Cosmos Club
Phi Kappa Phi
Phi Sigma
Sigma Phi
Sigma Xi

Susan R. Schrepfer graduated from the University of California, Santa Barbara, in 1963 with an A. B. in history. From 1964 to 1965 she was teaching assistant in Western Civilization at the University of California, Riverside, where she took her M. A. in history in 1965. She was an instructor in United States history at Mount San Antonio College in Walnut, California, from 1965 to 1966. In 1967 she returned to the Riverside campus as teaching assistant, where she remained until spring 1969. At that time she took a position as researcher for the Save the Redwoods League in San Francisco. From 1970 to the present she has been a researcher and interviewer with the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California; her special project is the multiple use of forest lands. Since 1970 she has also functioned as a historical consultant to the Sierra Club Foundation. In August 1971 she received her doctorate in American history from the University of California, Riverside. The dissertation was entitled "A Conservative Reform: Saving the Redwoods, 1917 to 1940." She has also published in Forest History.

THE EARLY YEARS

Introductory Remarks

Susan Schrepfer: I think we should start with where you were born, when, and where you grew up. You were born in Chicago?

Edward Crafts: Yes. I was born in Austin, Illinois, on April 14, 1910. Austin then was a suburb of Chicago but is now part of the city.

Let me say at the start that I can remember my youth accurately. But when you start getting into questions beginning with my work, which dates back forty years, some of the facts will slip away. There will be some details missing and probably some inaccuracies in what I say. I just hope that whoever may have access to this statement will bear this in mind as they review it. I'll do the best I can, but I'm sure, being an oral interview, that it won't be exactly the same or as well balanced as if I had more time for research and study in its preparation.

The other thing I would like to say is that the final arrangements that are worked out for its use and availability will affect my editing of the interview and degree of frankness and openness. There are some things that are better left unsaid in everybody's experience. There are some people who do not subject themselves to being interviewed just for this reason.

You started out with where was I born. What do you want to know about my boyhood and youth?

Childhood through College

SS: You grew up in Chicago?

EC: I was born in Austin, and I lived there until I was about ten or twelve years old. Then my family moved to the next suburb west, which was Oak Park. I lived in Oak Park, finished grammar school there, went to high school there, and lived there until I went away to college. When my father died, my mother continued to live there up until almost the time she passed away. So I frequently have visited Oak Park, but I've never actually lived there since graduating from high school, which was in 1928.

SS: How did you decide to go to Dartmouth?

EC: [Laughter.] I went to Oak Park and River Forest Township High School. The word township makes it sound small, but it wasn't a small school in those days. There were 492 in my graduating class. Dartmouth was a popular place to go among the graduates of that high school at that time. There were a lot of Dartmouth alumni living in Oak Park. They recruited pretty heavily. They had dinners and gatherings where they interviewed prospective candidates for the school and so on. The local alumni group recommended me. I didn't really know where I wanted to go. My parents sort of wanted me to go there, although they had both gone to the University of Michigan and had graduated from there. My sister was going to Smith, which is, of course, near Dartmouth. I was accepted at Dartmouth and so decided to go there.

SS: What did you major in?

EC: Nothing. I was only there the freshman year and two months of my sophomore year. You don't major in your freshman year. At that time, all Dartmouth offered was liberal arts, so I took a general liberal arts course in my freshman year. I enjoyed it, but there were several drawbacks. You had to work very hard. The work was extremely difficult. Dartmouth at that time was most isolated. You lived in dormitories and ate in commons, which was fine, but you never got out of that little village of Hanover. And there were long, cold winters. I remember one time, over a period of three weeks in the middle of winter, when the temperature never got above zero. While I enjoyed the skiing--I learned that during my year at Dartmouth--and enjoyed the beauty of the area, it got pretty tiresome. Also, it was a man's school. It was not coeducational, so there was no social life.

A Career in Forestry

During that period I was working summers on a ranch in Wyoming. Before that, while I was in high school, I spent my summers in northern Minnesota on Rainy Lake, which is on the Canadian—Minnesota boundary near what are now the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the Voyageurs National Park. I lived most of the time camping out with a group of boys on an island in Rainy Lake. That was really my first outdoor experience. I loved that country and still do.

Then my father, who was general counsel for Armour and Company, got me a job working on a ranch in southern Wyoming near Encampment. This was called the Skyline Ranch. It was sort of a combination of boy's camp and horse-raising ranch. They ran a couple hundred head of cattle, but mainly they raised horses for the dude trade down around Rocky Mountain National Park over the line in Colorado. I worked two or three summers out there as a horse wrangler. That's where I got my first western experience, where I grew to like the West, and where I became interested in ranching and grazing. These experiences were going on during my last years in high school and my first year in Dartmouth.

I sort of decided when I was in Dartmouth that I wanted to study forestry. But my father was a lawyer; my grandfather had been a lawyer; my uncles were lawyers. The whole family on the men's side were lawyers. My parents naturally wanted me to study law. They didn't press me, and I didn't think I would like law. I was pretty immature at the time. I loved the New Hampshire country during the wintertime. So really there were three outdoor experiences: one in Wyoming and Colorado, one in Minnesota and southern Canada, and one in northern New Hampshire. During that time, it was about 1929 or 1930, the American Forestry Association came out with its issue commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Forest Service. This was a very exhaustive compendium and fascinating to me.*

I think it's a combination of those outdoor experiences, my frustrating exposure at Dartmouth, and that issue of American Forests [American Forests and Forest Life] magazine that sort of motivated me to decide to enter forestry. I went back to Dartmouth in the beginning of my sophomore year, but I was not happy and became impatient about it, so I told my folks that I wanted to switch to Yale to study forestry.

*American Forests and Forest Life Vol. 36 (July 1930).

My dad came down and the two of us went to Yale in October. We were very graciously received by Dean Graves, who at that time had gone back to Yale after being chief of the Forest Service. I remember we sat on the front porch of his home on a hot October day, and he served us ice water, which is all he ever served, and he advised me to go back to Dartmouth, finish my four years, and then, if I still wanted to study forestry, come down to Yale and take the two-year graduate program.

I went back to Dartmouth and thought more about it. Again it was the impatience of youth. If I had taken Dean Graves's advice, I probably never would have studied forestry; I probably would have finished at Hanover [Dartmouth is located at Hanover, New Hampshire] and then gone into law or medicine. But at that time, I didn't want to spend three more years at Dartmouth, so in the middle of the first semester of my sophomore year I transferred to the University of Michigan and entered the preforestry curriculum. They had an undergraduate forestry program as well as a graduate forestry program at Michigan; whereas, at Yale they had only graduate studies, so I got into forestry right away. I finished out my undergraduate work at Michigan and graduated in 1932 in forestry.

SS: In 1931 you worked for the Forest Service?

EC: Yes, that was my first job with the Forest Service. Maybe before we get into that I ought to finish my educational aspects, that is, if you want to know them. Do you?

SS: Yes.

EC: When I graduated in 1932, I still had this law thing kicking around in my mind, and so the following year I gave up forestry completely and entered law school as a freshman in a three-year curriculum. I lived in the law quadrangle and took the standard freshman law courses of contracts, torts, property, pleading, criminal law, and so forth and successfully completed the first year of law. By that time I decided that I wanted to get married. I didn't want to keep on going to school for two more years, so I decided I'd go back into forestry.

I went to work on a regular basis for the Forest Service--I'll go into that when I get into work--and after a lapse of several years I decided to get my master's degree. I arranged with Dean Dana [University of Michigan], who had been my dean during the undergraduate period and still was dean there, to give me a half-year's credit toward my master's in forestry for the full year I had spent in

law school. This was a special arrangement and a very gracious thing for him to do. The law work, incidentally, was much harder than forestry. I only had to spend one more semester, that is, a half year in forestry after the law, to get my master's, which I did during the spring of 1936. I received my master's in June, 1936, and returned, following that, to my Forest Service job.

Then after two more years I decided to study for my Ph.D. and wanted to switch from grazing work, which I'd been involved in up to then, to forest economics. I arranged with the school [University of Michigan] to accept a project, the study of range and grazing insurance against drought, for my doctoral dissertation. Thus, much of my official work could be applied to the dissertation. This was a common thing in those days. But I had to put in one more year of residence at Ann Arbor to get my languages and other course work out of the way, which I did in 1939 and 1940. Then it took me two more years to complete the dissertation because I could only work on it at nights. I finally completed the thesis and got my degree in 1942. That completes the education story. Now where do you want to go?

Forestry Education in the 1930s

SS: When you were at the University of Michigan in the forestry program, could you describe where the heaviest emphasis was placed in the curriculum?

EC: That depended partly on your selection of courses, but they had one professor there who attracted students more than the other professors. I don't know, looking back, that he was necessarily a better teacher, but they liked him. He was a strong personality and very stimulating in class. This was Professor [Donald M.] Matthews, who taught forest management. I think the bulk of the students at the time I was there--largely because of the fact that Matthews was the professor of forest management--thought they wanted to practice forest management. That's what I did. There were a few who specialized in pathology, very few in economics, and a few in entomology and other aspects of forestry. But the bulk of them were forest management majors.

SS: Were there any courses in wildlife, range, and so on?

EC: At that time, I don't believe Michigan offered a course in grazing. They did offer one in wildlife and one in recreation. They were very superficial courses. As a matter of fact the whole forestry curriculum was-- you see, that was forty-five years ago--very different from present studies. In the first place, there weren't too many foresters in the United States to choose from to make up the faculty. I suspect that the caliber of the faculty was possibly not as good as the caliber today. On the other hand, most of the faculty members had had more practical, nonacademic experience than is perhaps the case of many of the faculty people today.

Also, the student body was not the caliber intellectually that the student body is today. Forestry was still suffering from the idea that you had to be a rough, tough, outdoor woodsman to be a forester, and it attracted this type of individual. The entrance requirements were less stringent in forestry than they were in some of the other schools like law or medicine and other long-standing and recognized professions. Forestry was struggling to become a recognized profession. The courses were largely memory courses rather than thinking courses. This was the fundamental difference between the forestry curriculum and law school curriculum. Forestry was largely memorizing what you were told, what you had in your notes, and then repeating it back to the professor or writing it out on examinations. One of the most fruitful experiences in the forestry curriculum was the summer camp, which they held one summer in northern Michigan. You learned a great deal up there.

SS: Would you describe your education in the forestry school as general or technical?

EC: The first two years were general, and the last two years were quite technical.

SS: Do you think it equipped you to make the kind of judgments you have had to make?

EC: No, but I don't think any curriculum would have. I think the further you get away from school and the more responsibility you have thrust on you, the less you use what you were taught in school. This might not be the case in some highly technical physics and chemistry work, but in the field of forestry that is true. When you get into the policy field, which I was in for most of my career, this becomes a matter of judgment, not of what you learned in school. What you learned in school you draw on. It lets you communicate in technical terms with technicians who are subordinates to you and who are still drawing on

their professional work more.

You learn, perhaps, to discipline yourself from your academic experience. Particularly in your doctoral work, the very struggle that you go through to get the degree teaches you self-discipline, application, concentration, and this sort of thing. But the actual things that you learned were not, in my case, used very much in my professional experiences. When I was preparing for my orals, the dean summed it up. I remember asking what to prepare for. He said, "Everything you have ever had in any course in the university; everything you were ever taught before you ever came to the university; and anything else we think you ought to know regardless of whether you were ever taught it or not." I thought this was a pretty comprehensive definition. To answer your question, I didn't use very much of what I learned in school.

SS: Some people have criticized forestry schools for not giving a general enough education, not equipping people to make multiple-use decisions or value decisions.

EC: The problem is, if you are going to have an undergraduate curriculum-- and I'm inclined to think you shouldn't because there is just too much--you can't in four years give a course in liberal arts education and also give students a professional education. There isn't enough time or enough room in that year time span. The difficulty with most foresters by and large has been their own basic intellectual capacity and the fact that few have mastered the English language. They are not able to articulate effectively or precisely by either the spoken word or the written word, and they are not cultured people. That's a pretty sad commentary but it is true. That is a very broad generalization.

Foresters in general have a very limited knowledge of political science and sociology, and they think that what's involved in forestry is trees. The trees are there, but the people who decide what is to happen to these trees are much more important in the whole scheme of things than are the trees themselves. Foresters by and large don't understand this. Most of them don't believe it even if you explain it to them. They will just not accept it, which I think is a great weakness in foresters and the profession. I thoroughly believe that foresters ought to be educated in the political, economic, and social realities of things and then get their technical education. I think the direction in which universities are going at the present time is probably in that direction.

SS: One last question on your education. Was the phrase multiple use

ever mentioned?

EC: Never. The word had not become commonplace. I don't know whether it had even been coined at that time. I do not recall ever having heard the term multiple use when I went to school.

SS: Or various uses or coordinated uses or any phrase that might have been a predecessor to multiple use?

EC: No. The thing that was the predecessor of multiple use was The Use Book for the Forest Service, which was developed very early in the history of the Forest Service.* I would guess around 1910. This advanced the concept of the use of various commodities of the national forests for the benefit of the people. I do not believe the phrase multiple use appeared there. I don't know if the phrase coordinated use or a synonym or semisynonym appeared. I rather think not. But the idea of use of the various resources of the public lands that were within national forests was first put in print in The Use Book. It reflected the very strong philosophy of Gifford Pinchot.

SS: Then when you went to forestry school you believed that logging was the most important use in the forest?

EC: No, I didn't mean to imply that. Do you mean was I under the belief that tree growing and timber harvesting were the most important uses of the forests?

SS: Yes.

EC: We were taught in school--and this goes back to the Weeks Act, which I believe was passed about 1911, before I was in school--that forest management and watershed management were the two most important uses in national forests.** Of course, we did not study forestry only from the standpoint of national forests. We must remember this. We studied forestry in the abstract or in the broader context of the federal public lands, the state and local public lands, and the private lands. But the great emphasis was on the tree aspect. There is no question about that.

* The Use Book, Regulations and Instructions for the Use of the National Forests (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1907).

** Weeks Act of 1 March 1911, ch. 186, 36 Stat. 961, 16 U.S.C. sec. 500 (1964).

Specializing in Grazing Research

SS: When you first went to work for the Forest Service, it was in grazing?

EC: Grazing research. The way that came about was one of those peculiar happenings. [Pause.] I'm trying to reconstruct it in my mind. You know, events that you don't realize at the time sometimes end up by shaping your life. Well, this one did for several years. You see, as I have said, I had worked on a ranch before ever joining the Forest Service. I wanted to work out West, and I thought I wanted to get into grazing work because my interests were stimulated by the ranch work. I was in forestry school and Michigan did not teach range management, but Dean Dana knew of my desires to get into grazing work. He wrote W. R. Chapline, who was chief of the Division of Range Research, and told him that he had this student who was interested in grazing work, was doing reasonably well in school, and was interested in a summer assistant job in the Forest Service in grazing work.

Chapline still lives here in Washington, D.C. He was the great architect of Forest Service grazing research, and I really don't think he's ever had the credit for it. He was aggressive, very dedicated, a tremendously hard worker, and he was very alert in recruiting people. He responded with interest. Once when he was passing through Chicago--this happened to be when I was home, spring vacation or something--he called up and came out to dinner at the house and met my parents and me. We talked. We liked him and I guess he liked me and so on.

There followed another incident. My father, through his job with Armour and Company, occasionally had to come to Washington. Because of my interest in working with the Forest Service, he called on the Forest Service. At that time [Robert Young] Stuart was chief of the service. My father asked to see Stuart and he did. Stuart was an old-time Forest Service man, whom I never met, and he sort of turned my father off. My father was not very well impressed with Stuart. Apparently he was not a very outgoing sort of man; I really don't know. Subsequently Stuart jumped or fell out of the window at the Atlantic Building, which is another story. It has never been settled whether it was accidental or job pressure causing suicide. I was there when that happened. But, because of my interest in grazing, he referred my father to Chapline. My father went down and visited with Chap. Those were the two meetings with Chapline that led up to his offering me a summer job at what was then the Great Basin Forest and Range Experiment Station located high in the mountains

just east from Ephraim on the then Manti National Forest.

This was one of the early sites of grazing research. It started way back in the days when the sheep were tramping out the high mountain country of Utah in the summertime. I went there and spent the summer of 1931 as a flunky, a field assistant, got \$70 a month, lived in a tent, and had a wonderful time. I learned a great deal. I did grazing research, whatever they wanted me to do, mostly examination of various kinds of plots, some foot herding of cattle. I worked from the desert country around Ephraim clear up into the high alpine country. I did some watershed work because they had some control areas of small watersheds, shoveled out the bins after floods, and measured the soil; I took stomach samples of cattle that had been poisoned by larkspur, milked the dairy cows, this type of work. I learned a lot and liked it.

SOUTHWESTERN FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION, U. S. FOREST SERVICE, 1932 to 1939

Grazing Research

SS: And so you returned?

EC: Yes. In 1932 I went back West and worked another summer between the time I got my forestry degree and entering law school. This time they sent me to the Fort Valley Experiment Station in northern Arizona, which was about ten miles out of Flagstaff. This was in ponderosa pine, an entirely different forest and range type from the Great Basin. It was before there was a southwestern forest and range experiment station; Fort Valley was even older than Great Basin, which was started in 1912. Fort Valley was started, I believe, in 1908. The principal project for Fort Valley involved damage to pine reproduction caused by cattle and sheep during the summer grazing period. To put it in a nutshell, it was very dry country, the animals get thirsty, and then they nibble off these succulent new leader tips of young pine trees. The Forest Service was going at this from two directions. It had a forest management study which was blaming a lot of things on cattle and sheep. Then it had the grazing people, who were looking at it from a different set of glasses, who were really trying to prove the livestock weren't creating much damage and were not killing many trees, maybe just slowing up their growth a little bit.

I was assigned to the grazing team. I worked under a man by the name of C. K. Cooperrider, who was a very interesting fellow. He was a grazing expert and a watershed expert, and he had come out from central Ohio to northern New Mexico when he was a young man because he had tuberculosis. A lot of these Forest Service people forty or fifty years ago were men who had originally come to the Southwest because of illness and had subsequently gone to work for the Forest Service because it was outdoor work and healthy work. He was one of that group. I enjoyed this; it was an interesting experience. I worked with two other field assistants, one named Gordon Merrick, who is now dead, and a fellow named Bill Beveridge, who is now retired and who worked on up and became supervisor of the Prescott; Bill spent his career out there.

Also, I was exposed to G. A. [Gus] Pearson, who was the first director of the station and a forest management specialist. I did some thinning work on the Fort Valley experimental forest under Gus Pearson. I had a little interesting experience that I have always remembered. I thinned these plots as I thought they ought to be thinned, and then while I was waiting to get a ride back to the station, Gus came along to look over what I had done because I was brand new and green as grass. He had with him Quincy Randles, who was the chief of forest management in the Albuquerque regional office. Here were the two top timber management men in the region--Pearson the head research man and Quincy Randles the top administrative man--and they disagreed thoroughly between themselves as to whether my thinning was done properly or not.

I thought to myself that if these two experts and veterans--these men were in their sixties at that time, and here was I in my twenties--with all their years of experience and knowledge couldn't agree between themselves how to thin some saplings, why should I worry? That was a very disillusioning experience, and it showed to me how imprecise the practice of forestry was. Forestry really is a judgment matter. Then it was almost a vocation, not a profession, even though foresters were trying their best to get public acceptance of forestry as a profession. Gus and Quincy were poles apart. Nobody could ever reach a final determination whether livestock really did do a major disservice and damage to the trees or not. Depending on your point of view, the range men thought one way and the silviculturists thought another. Here was another example of the impreciseness of the practice of the art of forestry and wild land management. But I liked it nevertheless. Then I went back to law school.

History of Grazing on the National Forests

SS: It was awhile before grazing was accepted as part of the function of the national forests, wasn't it? It would have been before your time, but was it fully accepted that grazing should be carried on in the national forests by the time you joined the service?

EC: I think you're misinformed on that. Let me give you a little of the history. The national forests were created mostly around 1905. Before that they had been uncontrolled public lands, and one of the

reasons they were created was, not to control the timber industry, but really to control the grazing. That time was the heyday of the livestock profession in the West. Livestock were ranging on public lands in excessive numbers, particularly on the summer range, and uncontrolled. When they set the national forests aside, many of the ranges were just dust beds.

The early forest ranger's principal job was custodial, which was patrolling the boundaries for fire and grazing. He had to be able to ride a horse and shoot as well as his stockmen counterparts. And he didn't have to know forestry or tree growing. This all came later. The first job of the Forest Service for the national forests was custodial, protection of the national forests from fire, trespassing, and overgrazing.

The second big job was range management. This was to patrol the resources and also to provide a buffer between the big, powerful rancher and the small homesteader. This was the beginning of the basis for granting grazing permits on the national forests, which holds to this day. They are allocated by the Forest Service. They are not awarded to the highest bidder. If you stop to think about it, timber is sold under one system, which is sale to the highest bidder. Grazing is parceled to individual permittees by selection of the Forest Service, and to this day the method by which the two resources--grass on one hand and trees on the other--are made available to the user, is fundamentally different. This goes back to the fact the Forest Service was trying to help the small rancher and the homesteader, and it allocated grazing privileges by administrative selection. So grazing had its heyday in the Forest Service in the late teens and in the twenties.

Later, timber began to come into the picture. The big push on timber utilization, and where timber in effect passed grazing as the primary function of the national forests, came about the time of World War II. It was in the last thirty years. There was some of it during World War I, such as the Sitka spruce for airplane purposes and this sort of thing. That was very specialized. But the big push on timber was synonymous with World War II.

SS: Was the shooting over by the time you got out there?

EC: They didn't shoot at each other too much. Once in awhile there would be a flare-up. A lot of times men carried guns, but they'd shoot competitively for sport. Sometimes we carried rifles in our pickups, but we didn't carry side arms. There was only one time that I was shot at, and this was by accident. When I came into the picture

in the early thirties, the danger was not with the stockmen at all. I don't mean to leave that impression in any sort of way; that was past. I would say that ended in the late teens.

The danger was from the hunters, and it still is. One time I was working up there at Great Basin, and I was down in the grass measuring a plant. It was during the fall hunting season, and my clothes were tan in color. I didn't have a red hat, which I should have had. The first thing I was aware of was the bullet hitting the fence post right next to me; then I heard the shot and I looked up at a fellow across the canyon getting ready to shoot again. He had seen me move a little and thought I was a deer. I got up and waved and he stopped. But he got off two shots first.

SS: Was there much pressure from the grazing permittees to have the season extended?

EC: Yes, to have the season extended and to have numbers increased. There was then, and there is now.

Wildlife: Competition with Livestock

SS: Was there much conflict or any awareness of a conflict between the needs of wildlife and range livestock?

EC: Wildlife in those days pretty largely took care of itself. There wasn't much active wildlife management. There was a lot of hunting, and there was a lot of wildlife. They were just beginning to get into wildlife management in an affirmative way. Also, despite lip service to the water resources of the national forests, they were just beginning to get into watershed management in an affirmative way. By an affirmative way I mean doing positive things to improve watershed control, to manage the water yield, and to manage wildlife habitat other than just letting them take care of themselves. The thing that they were really zeroing in on was grazing. And they were trying to learn the silvicultural aspects of tree growing.

SS: It was my understanding that during the forties the Forest Service increased the wildlife herds significantly and this caused conflict.

EC: I think that is probably right. By that time--you are jumping from the late twenties and early thirties up to the forties--wildlife habitat management had become an active part of the managing of various resources of the national forests, and wildlife responded by increased numbers. When these animals increase, they are competitive with domestic livestock. So I would say, yes, that there was always competition, even on my first job down on the old Tusayan National Forest, which was not then part of the Kaibab National Forest. There were very large herds of antelope, and they did eat the same stuff as the cattle. There were some elk in there, too. By the forties, wildlife herds really had begun to recover, and in some places there were excesses of wildlife population.

This was true back in the thirties, as on the north side of the Grand Canyon on the old Kaibab forest, which is an uplifted island of summer range where the deer are stuck during the summertime. They can't get off because there is nothing to eat down below. There was an overpopulation of deer, mainly coming out of the Grand Canyon National Park, and in the wintertime they would drop off the high country into the brush country on the side slopes. There wasn't as much winter feed as there was summer feed. The deer would starve to death by the hundreds and thousands because they ran out of winter feed. This was not so much competition with livestock; it was just too many deer for the winter feed supply.

Political Influences in the Grazing Service

SS: To skip back again to 1934 and the Taylor Grazing Act; that act put the unreserved Public Domain, which was important to grazing, into the Interior Department. Do you recall having any reaction or subsequent reactions to that bill?

EC: At the time the bill passed in 1934 I was a junior range examiner. I practically didn't know anything about it. I was not involved in policy or legislation at that time. I heard about it and read about it, but I didn't have any personal exposure. The Taylor Grazing Act didn't affect the Forest Service directly. Our work wasn't affected by this sort of thing. In general we thought the Taylor Grazing Act was a very good step, and I still think it was. But its impact on myself personally or on the Forest Service management was nil.

I do recall shortly after the Taylor Grazing Act passed, and I may have my timing a little wrong here, that C. L. Forsling, who was director of the Great Basin Experiment Station when I first worked there--it subsequently became the Intermountain Experiment Station--had been moved to Washington and promoted to assistant chief of the Forest Service in charge of all research. He left the Forest Service to move over to interior to become head of the Grazing Service. He had me come over there on loan from the Forest Service for a period of several weeks to make an analysis for him based strictly on my own views. He didn't want me to consult with anybody. He wanted to know what I thought of some of the things they were doing and trying to do in the Grazing Service, particularly with respect to grazing fees; their fees were very much lower on the Public Domain than the comparable fees of the Forest Service. So I had that brief exposure. I might just say as an aside that Forsling did try to raise grazing fees, and as a result, he lost his job. Senator [Patrick] McCarran of Nevada forced his resignation.

The Grazing Service, which evolved into the Bureau of Land Management, until this day has had a very rocky road in so far as its chiefs or directors are concerned because, being in the Department of Interior, it has been much more vulnerable to political influence at the top. It was subject to more pressures than the Forest Service was. I know this is getting away from the subject, but I want to put it in. It holds to this day because the next assistant chief of the Forest Service who took a whirl at the BLM was Boyd Rasmussen. This happened only in the last year or two. Boyd was director of the Bureau of Land Management for about five years, and within the last few months he has been forced out by the Nixon administration. I don't know whether it was Secretary [Rogers C. B.] Morton or whether the pressures on this came from the White House, but he has been forced out of his job and given a place to sit as a special assistant to the secretary. In other words, he has been kicked upstairs. This is a shame because it affects the whole image of the Interior Department. It also affects the image and morale of the Bureau of Land Management. Boyd was one of the best directors the Bureau of Land Management ever had.

SS: Wouldn't it have been better if the Grazing Service had been put in agriculture?

EC: [Laughter.] That's a moot question. Way back the national forests were in the Department of Interior under the General Land Office. Then they were transferred to agriculture, and ever since that transfer the question comes up constantly whether it would be better for the

national forests to be moved back to interior and merged in some sort of way with the other Public Domain lands or whether it would be better to move the Public Domain lands over to agriculture for merging with the Forest Service. I could talk for several days on that subject, both ways, and I think it is premature to get into that discussion now.

SS: I'd like to talk about it later. What I am getting at now is whether there was any awareness of this issue at that time that the Taylor Grazing Act was passed?

EC: An awareness, yes, but I think the issue was fairly quiet at that point. It came up again at the time of the first Hoover Commission.

Establishing the Parker Creek Experiment Station

SS: After you left range research you went into water research?

EC: No. When I was down in the Southwest, first I was a junior range examiner, and then they were able to promote me to assistant forest ecologist. I was in a training assignment really. They would give me different jobs. For awhile I worked in grazing under [C. K.] Cooperrider. Cooperrider also had watershed research under him. That was just starting. One of the first moves was to prospect for and find a locality to carry out watershed research. He and I together prospected the national forests of Arizona for that purpose, and he finally decided on an area on Parker Creek on the Tonto National Forest. I remember he and I went there before there was anything there and climbed that creek to see whether--this was very dry country--it would be possible to get enough water out of that creek for people to live there and to develop an experiment station there. One time I was going up over a ledge and practically ran into a rattlesnake, but that's beside the point. So I was in watershed work looking for a site with Cooperrider--I was a flunky--and he decided on Parker Creek, which we called it in those days. We called it the Parker Creek Experiment Station. We first started out with some tents and then built a few houses. It was called Parker Creek for quite a number of years. Then the name was changed to Sierra Ancha, and that is what it is known as today. Most of the people in the Forest Service never heard of the Parker Creek Experiment Station. First it was named for the creek or watershed; now it is named for the

mountains behind it.

Arthur Sampson

SS: Were you acquainted with the work of Arthur Sampson?

EC: Yes. I should have mentioned Sammy when I was talking about the Great Basin. He started the Great Basin around 1912, I believe. That was really his living monument. Many of the plots that we examined and experiments that we carried on were things that were started by him, and I remember one summer that I was there he came to visit. I don't know how old he was at that time, but he was a middle-aged man, very vigorous, and a great believer in physical fitness. He would stand with the young fellows and throw one of these very heavy medicine balls around, which greatly impressed me. He was a very fine gentleman. I have a high regard for him. The same applies to Mr. [G. A.] Pearson. He was one of the pioneers, too, and I don't think either Sammy, Pearson, [C. K.] Cooperrider, or a lot of these pioneer men have had the credit that they should have.

I might say this. I haven't been back to Great Basin, so I don't know the condition it is in, but I have been back to Fort Valley near Flagstaff a number of times; the last time only a month ago. Fort Valley is dilapidated, run down, and unstaffed; they moved the offices into town. The Forest Service is letting these early monuments to research, these early field experiment stations, gradually disappear, which I think is a mistake. I think Great Basin, Fort Valley, and Wagon Wheel Gap in south central Colorado should be kept in a condition sort of as monuments to the way the work first was carried on. I also think it is very good experience for a man to live under those conditions out in the area where the experiments are, rather than come in and live in an apartment in a town of 25,000 people, work in air-conditioned quarters, in university surroundings, and so forth. I think they miss something. It is partly the experience, the conditioning process. But anyway, the Forest Service is doing this, and I want to say I think it is a mistake, and it's too bad.

Forest Service Research: Pure or Applied?

SS: In your years in research who decided what you were going to do research on?

EC: When I was in grazing research, Chapline was the ultimate boss. At the field level it was Cooperrider in the Southwest and Forsling up at Great Basin. Then when I was over in watershed work it was still Cooperrider; I was only in that a very short time. Then I was switched over to forest management work, which also was at Fort Valley, and there my immediate boss was Bert Lexen, who subsequently became assistant chief of forest management research in Washington. He is now retired and living near Ludington, Michigan. Above him was Pearson, who was a forest management man and director of the experiment station. Also, along came Arthur Upson, who succeeded Pearson as director. He is still living and is in Tucson. There were various individuals. When I was in forest products research, which was not until I got to California--partly in California and partly in Washington--the real boss was a fellow named George Trayer, who was chief of the Forest Products Research Division here in Washington.

SS: Was any pure research done where you could follow a lead, or was it administratively directed?

EC: You mean where I just followed the lead?

SS: Yes.

EC: No. It was all administratively directed.

SS: Is it ever anything else in the Forest Service research?

EC: I can't speak for now. In those days, to the best of my knowledge, it was always administratively directed and planned. They always had a research plan or a work plan for the totality of range research in the Southwest. Then they would have more specific project sheets for each individual experiment, and they had to be updated every year with an annual report. You weren't turned loose in a laboratory or out in the woods to just wander around and see what you came up with. It was very tightly controlled. It was, what they might call now, empirical research, applied research is the better term. It was applied research as distinct from what you might call pure research. I think the Forest Service now with better trained technicians, better facilities, and more money has gone into pure research to a considerable

degree.

SS: Do you think the fact that it was applied made it more effective?

EC: I think it was the proper approach at that time. The whole art of land management had a pretty practical and applied tone. We didn't have the money or techniques to enjoy the luxury or sophistication of pure research. It was the proper thing to do in those days in my opinion.

Grazing Surveys in New Mexico and Arizona

SS: Do you recall any awareness of multiple use during the thirties?

EC: I can't remember the words. I can't remember when I first began to hear the words. I think it was around the time of World War II. But certainly we were trying it in the thirties. The Forest Service was engaged in multiple use, meaning the grass, the timber, the water, the wildlife, and so on. It may be the term was used some, but I can't recall specific instances. I think we were moving much more toward the consciousness of multiple use, but the term was not a common one in the thirties.

You asked what I was doing in grazing research. This was certainly applied research or perhaps not even research. Two special assignments that I had when I was in grazing are maybe worth mentioning. This is the way things worked in those days; people were loaned around. You were switched from one job to the other. I was loaned by the Forest Service for three months to the old Agricultural Adjustment Administration. This was during the depression. I was loaned to survey the grazing capacity of ranches in eastern New Mexico. Depending upon the grazing capacity that I would estimate for that ranch, the owner would be qualified to receive a certain payment from the federal government to help tide him over the depression period when he couldn't market his livestock. This was done in De Baca County in eastern New Mexico, along the Pecos River in the short-grass plains.

It was a very fruitful and valuable experience to me, my exposure to the stockmen and to different range types. There was no really real research. It was grazing surveys. The ranchers would

test you; they'd come in and pound on your door. I lived in a little rooming house in the town of Fort Sumner. They'd come around and pound on your door at five o'clock in the morning, get you up, and say they were ready to go to work. In those days it was illegal to shoot antelope. A lot of times I would eat lunch at the ranch house, and the rancher's wife would put on a nice lunch and so on. They were very hospitable people. Her husband would often say, "My, isn't this fine mutton we're eating?" And I'd know perfectly well we were eating antelope. But part of the protocol was that you weren't suppose to admit this. It was fun.

The other special assignment was a range utilization survey of all of the ranger districts in Arizona. They were sending a supposed range expert, which in this case was myself, to each ranger district on every national forest in the state of Arizona to form an opinion as to the condition of the ranges and to try to develop some guidelines or utilization standards for what would be the proper degree of utilization for the particular range conditions that were found. We worked on this utilization standards project and did develop some guidelines, reports, and so on. But the valuable part of that to me was the exposure I had to every ranger district and the knowledge that I gained of the national forests in Arizona. I probably know those forests better than anyplace else in the country, and it goes back to that experience because I was on every district with the ranger for several days. These were training assignments, and they knew it. It was partly to give what I could contribute and partly to make me more valuable in the organization.

DEVELOPMENT OF MULTIPLE USE, 1930s and 1940s

Multiple Use and the New Deal

SS: Did the legislation of the New Deal have much impact?

EC: I have described the impact the AAA legislation had on me. Then there were the three Cs. I was never assigned to a Civilian Conservation Corps camp to live, but I was assigned as a supervising technician to the Civilian Conservation Corps camp located at Mormon Lake on the Coconino National Forest outside of Flagstaff. I lived at Fort Valley, but I went down each day and went out with the crew. These were tree-thinning crews. I also did some fire fighting with the CCC boys out of those camps. Later on, when I was located at Parker Creek, the labor to construct the houses, the lysimeters, and some of the research installations was CCC labor, and I was a technical foreman. I supervised the construction of some of these research installations, which were major installations: concrete jobs, ditches and conversions, equipment installations, and all that sort of thing. There was quite a bit of work with the CCCs and this, of course, was a spin-off of that. Then we surveyed acre-square timber plots at Coulter's ranch on the Coconino National Forest using three Cs money.

SS: So would you say that the New Deal legislation furthered the multiple-use concept?

EC: Yes. There is no question that the New Deal helped put the national forests in shape. This is the greatest thing that ever happened to the national forests. Up to that time, as I say, it had been custodial, protective, and scrimping for people and money. All of a sudden they got all this money and all this labor, and what did they do? They built fences, water holes, stock tanks, salt grounds, trails, roads, recreation improvements, campgrounds, and structures of all sorts. This is where recreation got its first great boost. They could do a better job of fire patrol as well as insect and disease control because they had this tremendous source of unskilled labor available to them. As I say, it was a milestone in making the transition from custodial protection to a management function in the national forests. They put the national forest house in order, and then the service could move

into management. That is what the CCC did, and it jumped national forest management ahead a quarter of a century.

SS: How about TVA?

EC: Do you mean the impact of TVA on the national forests? The Tennessee Valley Authority is localized. It had relatively little impact on the national forests, except in connection with some of the dams that were built or the waters that backed up into the national forests. TVA developed its own forestry organization. It did go into forestry but not closely connected with the Forest Service.

SS: I was thinking of it more as an example of a form of multiple use?

EC: I think you're right. It's a multiple-purpose project. The Corps of Engineers is, too. Reclamation is, too. They don't call it multiple use; they call it multiple purpose, but it's basically the same thing.

Recreation in the 1930s and 1940s

SS: You mentioned recreation being advanced by the New Deal. What was the attitude of most of the men in the Forest Service toward recreation at that time?

EC: They thought it was kind of foolish. That's wrong; I thought you were going to ask something else. Not the rangers; they thought it was great. I thought you were going to ask what was the attitude of the people who lived on the national forests or on inholdings. They thought it was kind of foolish because whenever they had any free time, they wanted to go to town, and they couldn't see why anybody would want to come out on the forest for recreation. As far as the rangers and the men above them and below them were concerned, they recognized the need, and it helped them control people, helped provide better facilities, and helped reduce the fire hazard. They were all for it.

SS: Was there any feeling that recreationists were getting in the way of what the Forest Service's prime purpose was?

EC: I didn't sense this from the Forest Service people. There was this

feeling by the users of other forest resources--by the lumbermen and by the stockmen. They felt the recreationists were getting in their way; they always have and still do. They give lip service now to recreation, and they have adjusted to it by now. It is so tremendously important. But in those days they thought it was kind of silly and sort of odd. This was natural. I don't say this in derogatory terms. They were adjusting to something new.

SS: Do you think the Forest Service was slow or dragged its feet in the development of recreation, especially during the thirties and forties?

EC: No. Not then. The Forest Service was in the van; it was in the front lines. There was a former assistant chief of the Forest Service, Lee [Leon F.] Kneipp. He was in charge of the Division of Lands. He came out of Region 3, which was the Southwest, and he had a vision that nobody in the Forest Service did as to the future of recreation on the national forests. If one wants to, they can go back and get this twenty-fifth anniversary issue of American Forests magazine which came out in 1930. There is an article in it by Lee Kneipp on recreation on the national forests that could have been written today.* The Forest Service at that time led the way in recreation on federal lands. In those days it was way ahead of the Park Service. BLM didn't have any recreation. The Forest Service was developing facilities, developing ways of handling people, was way out on the vanguard.

This was during the CCC days and the early forties, but then when the big push on recreation came, from 1950 on, the Forest Service slipped behind for a variety of reasons. They slipped behind because of the pressure on them for timber and because Congress would give money for other things but not recreation. Those were the two principal reasons. Also, the Forest Service just didn't happen to have people with the foresight on recreation that they should have had who were given responsible policy positions. It was a combination of those three things. They got way behind, and they have been playing catch-up ever since about 1955. They are not caught up yet with their needs, but they certainly are aware of it now and are doing the best they can.

*L. F. Kneipp, "Forest Recreation Comes of Age," American Forests and Forest Life Vol. 36 (July 1930): 415-419.

Relations between the Forest Service and the Park Service

SS: Were you aware of any rivalry between the Forest Service and the Park Service in the thirties and forties?

EC: Not in the thirties, I wasn't knowledgeable then. In the forties, it was beginning to develop even more. There were problems in the thirties. I wasn't exposed to them so I didn't think of them. But, for instance, there was the Olympic National Park controversy; this was at the time when FDR was president. I believe [Earle H.] Clapp was associate chief. I think I have my facts right. This was one of the big fights, the proposal to enlarge the Olympic National Park, and this was one of the prime reasons why Clapp never got to be chief of the Forest Service. He crossed FDR on the Olympic National Park.

Consider the national parks of the West: the Olympic, Rainier, Lassen, Sequoia, Kings Canyon, Yosemite, Grand Canyon. Go right down the list of the big ones that come to your mind. All of them were carved out of the national forests. The Forest Service was the have agency; the National Park Service was the have-not agency. So they were taking land away from the Forest Service and making it into national parks. The Forest Service resented this bitterly and fought it, sometimes in the open, sometimes undercover. Yellowstone was created prior to the creation of the national forests. Except for Yellowstone and possibly a few other exceptions, the national parks were just cut out of the national forests. Most of them in the West today are surrounded by national forests.

Even after the parks were established, there were continuing boundary problems. There was an awful flap about Kings Canyon, which I don't know the details of. There were constant boundary problems, trades back and forth between agencies. The Forest Service felt it was all a one-way street with everything going in the direction of the parks. They feel that way up to this day. I took part in one when I was director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in interior. I helped create the North Cascades National Park. It was carved out of parts of five national forests, but I had recommended a park be created there when I was still in the Forest Service, after I had made an inspection over there. It was not a position change on my part.

The Forest Service should have recognized that there was a place for the national parks in the American scheme of things and not tried to be so possessive. It should have cooperated on a more

statesmanlike plane with interior in the creation of national parks. That's my view. On the other hand, this was difficult to do because the National Park Service was very grabby; you couldn't trust them. We obtained documents we weren't suppose to see from the Park Service showing they had aims on fifty million acres of national forest lands. This was in the 1950s and part of the beginning of Mission 66. So this great distrust between the two agencies existed. This feeling had its ups and downs; sometimes cooperation was fairly good, and at other times it was bitter. It fluctuated with personalities--with secretaries and with heads of the two agencies.

SS: Hasn't there been a division within the National Park Service itself as to the character of relations with the Forest Service? I know in my research I studied John Merriam who worked closely with Newton Drury. They felt somewhat differently than some of the Park Service personnel toward the Forest Service and had a different conception of what the division between the Forest Service and the Park Service should be.

EC: You mean these men did?

SS: Yes.

EC: That undoubtedly is true. There were differences of viewpoint among individuals in the Forest Service and in the Park Service. Newton was head of the Park Service for awhile. The real troubles with the Park Service came in the very early days of the Park Service and then again during the period when Connie Wirth was director. Connie was ruthless and unscrupulous in his efforts to build the National Park Service and the national park system into what he thought it ought to be. And [George] Hartzog, the current director, is following pretty much the same pattern. During the tenure of these two men there has been great suspicion between the two agencies. I think more so than when Drury was director.

SS: How about during the period when Secretary Ickes [Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes] was in?

EC: That was one of the worst times. He was very grabby. He wanted the Forest Service in its entirety. This was one of the big fights, the move by Ickes to try to transfer the Forest Service into interior. I just can't go into the details of all that. I don't know them all as I was not personally involved. I was in the Forest Service at the time. This was one of the things that Clapp, who was then acting chief of the Forest Service, prevented and got caught in the process. This is

the other real reason why he was never made chief of the Forest Service by [Franklin D.] Roosevelt. Although he functioned as chief for four years, they denied him the title. This was the last big push to transfer the Forest Service into interior until right now, with the administration proposal for a department of natural resources including Forest Service functions.

SS: Was the Forest Service's development of the recreation program in any part a reaction to the [interrupted]?

EC: The Forest Service was simply reacting to the needs of the people who came and wanted to camp and picnic primarily in the national forests. You must remember that. Even though certain of the most scenic parts of the national forests were turned into national parks, there were other equally scenic parts of the national forests that have never been converted to national parks. Also, a great many of the local people went to the national forests when they began to turn to outdoor recreation, people from the small towns in the West. Now they come from the large cities as well. Many people are not interested in going into the national parks; they want a different type of recreation. They don't like the crowds of the national parks. They don't like to live in hotels. They don't like the masses of people. They like to get off by themselves into more rustic surroundings.

So the Forest Service really offers a different type of recreation than the national parks offer. The Park Service offers primarily some sort of scenic wonder and then various types of facilities to use while you are enjoying the scenery. A lot of times the Forest Service is not a scenery oriented type of recreation. Of course, it also provides hunting on the national forests, which the national parks never did. The hunters and sportsmen have always relied on the national forests for their recreation and never on the national parks. That is a very fundamental difference.

SS: I have heard that one of the differences between the Forest Service and the Park Service in transfer cases was that the Park Service sometimes won because they afforded congressmen with better accommodations.

EC: I don't know; I can't comment on that. That could be true. Of course, they had better accommodations to provide through the concessionaire setups; but the Park Service didn't always win. During the time that I was assistant chief, as I told you the other day, one of my jobs was to keep track of snakes. This is one of the things we meant by that term. I was to watch for people who had designs on the national

forests, whether they be lumbermen, stockmen, Park Service, or whoever, and if there was something that the Forest Service didn't want, try to see that it didn't happen. I spent a lot of my energies in combating the things that the Park Service was trying to do, and most of the times successfully.*

Forest Service Relations with Various Government Bureaus

SS: Do you think that in any sense the existence or activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Biological Survey, or any of these other groups during the the thirties and forties added impetus to the Forest Service's development of multiple use?

EC: It certainly might have. It certainly helped the Forest Service to get into the wildlife management field and act in a professional way. There was a very close relationship between the Biological Survey--now the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife--and the Forest Service. There was some interchange of lands. The Wichita Wildlife Refuge down in Oklahoma used to be part of the national forests. There were lands that went both ways, and there were good relationships there. The Biological Survey wasn't empire building in the sense that the Park Service was. And, of course, they weren't in conflict either because they were interested in the management of the game, not land acquisition. They had to use the national forests as a home for game.

Did you mention the Reclamation Bureau? Not too much of a relationship here, although a lot of the reclamation sites were within national forest lands. The two agencies got along fairly well. It was a limited type of relationship. There weren't too many problems. The same went for the Corps of Engineers in those days. There were more problems with the corps in later years than there were in those days.

*For further discussion by Dr. Crafts of the history of relations between the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service, see Edward C. Crafts, "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962," tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley.

FOREST ECONOMICS, U. S. FOREST SERVICE, 1939 to 1950

Division of Forest Economics

SS: When you were with the Division of Forest Economics, from 1939 to 1950, what did your duties in this division include?

EC: I wasn't with that division the whole time. For three years I was with the California Experiment Station at Berkeley assigned to economic studies and later to collection of requirements and supplies data in forest products for the War Production Board. In 1944 I was transferred to Washington on the same war projects.

In 1945 or 1946 I was assigned to the Division of Forest Economics as chief of the division. The work included a number of things. The principal job was the nationwide forest survey, which was an inventory of timber supplies of the country, where they were located, forest types, and so on. We carried on a study of forest requirements, which is demand for timber products of various types and sizes. We did some foreign forestry work; the Forest Service was just getting into foreign forestry. We were doing forest taxation studies, forest insurance studies, and special studies of various kinds and descriptions as requested or wanted by the chief or the staff. I would say that the great bulk of the effort was in the forest survey field.

Actually, there wasn't a great deal of economics involved in the traditional sense; it was sort of the economic aspects of forestry, but I wouldn't really call the forest survey economics. It is an economic-related project, but you don't use economic theory very much in the Forest Service. The Forest Service had a very difficult time getting appropriations for economic research in those days, and I think appropriations for this purpose are still rather limited.

Public Regulation of Private Timber Practices

SS: During this period, the late forties or early fifties, you wrote and advocated extension of public control of [interrupted].

EC: What did I write?

SS: You gave several speeches on it.

EC: Are you talking about regulation or ownership, whether they were controversial?

SS: Regulation.

EC: [Laughter.] You're probably talking about forest regulation. I should tell you a little history about it. Let me go back a little. There were four main pushes or program drives of the Forest Service historically. First, was the creation, management, and getting control of the national forests in the West, meaning those created from the Public Domain. Then probably the second big step forward was the Weeks Law and the authorization for national forests in the East through the purchase of private lands. This was still national forest related. Third, there was the whole forest research program that got its big push with the McSweeney-McNary forest research act.* Then the fourth big push--I'm not sure I have these in the right order chronologically--was forest practices, forest protection, and forest fire prevention and control, all on private lands. Earle Clapp had a major role in two of these four major Forest Service thrusts. One was forest research--he is really the father of the forest research branch of the Forest Service--and the other was that he was the great advocate of regulatory practices to apply to private lands.

Forest regulation meant legal requirements to adhere to certain levels of acceptable forest practices in the management and cutting of privately owned forest lands, large or small. This was extremely controversial. This was the forest regulation push during the days of his eminence and both before him and after him. Before him was [F. A.] Silcox, and after him was [Lyle F.] Watts. There were various bills, but none of them got very far. The position of the Forest Service was that there should be state control of forest practices but with a proviso in a federal statute that if the state didn't adopt forest

* Reforestation and Forest Products Act of 22 May 1928, ch. 678, 45 Stat. 699, 16 U.S.C. sec. 581-581i (1964).

practices up to a certain standard, then the federal government could move in. These things never happened, although the fear of federal regulation had a great deal to do with improvement of forestry on private lands and the passage of state regulatory laws. In this respect, the Forest Service's stand and push for regulatory practices on private lands performed a very great national service in my opinion. My role in it was relatively meager.

SS: I gathered you incurred some enemies in the process.

EC: Yes, I had enemies all over the place. But when I became assistant chief of the Forest Service in January, 1950, Lyle Watts was still chief, and [R. E.] Marsh had just retired. I succeeded Marsh. Prior to my moving into that position in policy and program development and following Clapp's leaving the Forest Service, Watts and Marsh together carried the load for Forest Service policy, including its position on regulations. Watts knew he wasn't going to be around very long because he was approaching retirement, and he was looking for some new spokesman for forest regulation to articulate the Forest Service's position. When I succeeded Marsh, I was the natural person to do this because I occupied the program position and helped formulate policy and articulated policy. So Lyle talked to me and asked if I would be willing to take this on. I said, yes. My philosophy was if you weren't willing to do the things that are part of the job, you shouldn't take the job. And so I did.

I put the case for forest regulation in my own words and developed a somewhat new exposition of the subject at that time. There was one particular talk that got very wide publicity.* This was one I gave up in New Haven at Yale University in 1951; it was sort of a panel debate. I was a new person talking in a new way about an old subject, and this resulted in a lot of publicity and a lot of anguish on the part of the timber industry, particularly the large private

*Edward C. Crafts, "The Case for Federal Participation in Forest Regulations," a paper presented before the Yale Forestry Club and the Yale Conservation Club, 5 December 1951. For a copy of this speech, see Appendix A, pp. 122-128. For the Forest Service's reaction to the speech, see Appendix B, p. 129, and for the reaction of the lumber industry, see Appendices C-G, pp. 130-137. These manuscripts were located in Box F3 of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association's papers held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California. For the published version of Craft's speech together with counter-arguments by H.H. Chapman, see "Do We Need Federal Forest Regulations," American Forests 58, no. 5 (May 1952): 26-44.

landowners. As long as I continued with the Forest Service, I occupied this position as assistant chief, which was the policy program position and congressional liaison.

When [Richard E.] McArdle became chief of the Forest Service, two years after I had moved into my spot, he ducked the forest regulation question. McArdle took over in July about six months before Eisenhower was elected and assumed office. Ezra Taft Benson became secretary of agriculture, and it was touch and go whether the administration would retain McArdle or kick him out and put in their own man. One reason McArdle had been picked to be chief was because he had, heretofore in his role in the Forest Service, occupied noncontroversial positions in research and in state and private forestry, handing out money for fire, nurseries, and technical assistance. Everybody likes a person who hands out money. Moreover, he had a likeable personality. So he was picked partly for these reasons. He decided--it was all discussed in staff, there was nothing secretive about the strategy--that the Forest Service would draw in its horns so to speak, back off from some of its fronts, and concentrate on the national forests and research, allowing regulation and acquisition to sort of go by the boards. But there was this continuing suspicion by people in industry that these matters would blow up again, that the Forest Service really believed these things, and I was the focal point of suspicion. I know I still believe in them.

I was never popular with forest industry because of my position on regulation and also because I was an advocate of expanded public ownership. I think those are probably the two reasons, and they are both controversial, particularly expansion of the eastern national forests. Also, I never was popular with the National Park Service because of numerous controversies with the Forest Service over jurisdiction of certain areas. So I was not a popular person, but this didn't bother me particularly because I figured that was part of the price of the position that I was occupying.

In substance, during this period and because relations were so precarious for the first two years of the Eisenhower administration, McArdle avoided the controversial things, and where we had to get into them, he let me do it. This procedure protected the number one man; this is the right way to do it. Many organizations do this. We did it with the full and initial understanding between us of the role that each of us had.

SS: Did any of these regulatory measures that the Forest Service hoped to obtain apply to multiple use on private forests?

EC: No. These were regulatory measures relating only to the growing of timber. Multiple use didn't enter into it.

SS: They had no watershed purposes?

EC: There might have been something. I don't remember the details of the various bills. There may have been something on watersheds, but I think they were 95 percent related to silviculture practices.

SS: How much watershed protection, wildlife protection, and these sorts of things, are actually extended by private owners?

EC: Wildlife is getting to be more and more prominent. It depends on the purpose of the ownership of the land. A lot of private land isn't owned or operated by lumber or pulp companies; on some of that land the wildlife management objective is of a pretty high caliber. Watershed management, I think, is pretty incidental.

SS: Are there any serious complications in some areas as a result of the lack of care in logging on private lands as far as floods and erosion?

EC: Oh, yes. Two good examples come to mind right off--some of the problems of the Douglas-fir region of the Northwest, where there are large, extensive clear cuttings, and some of the problems of the redwood region of California, where there has been extensive clear cutting and tremendous erosion on those clear cuttings. Wherever you practice clear cutting--there has been much in Montana, Wyoming, Alaska, West Virginia, you name it--wherever there are large areas of clear cuts on either private or public lands, you have erosion problems.

SS: You said that you favored, sometime in your career at least, an extension of federal ownership?

EC: I did, and I still do. For example, the Forest Service is still acquiring land. They are acquiring land particularly in the East and to solidify wilderness areas. When the national forests were laid out in the East under the Weeks Law--under the authorizing state enabling acts, which were the requisite counterparts--what usually happened was that the Forest Service and the National Forest Reservation Commission would put a boundary around a proposed purchase unit. There would be very little federal land in there to begin with. Then the Forest Service would start buying bits and pieces within that boundary. They would usually buy along the periphery of that boundary, leaving a lot

of scattered private land toward the middle. The idea was that they would gradually solidify the federal holdings as they moved toward the center.

A lot of this land in the East had been cut over; it was tax delinquent land, and it was in very poor shape. The Forest Service bought this for a small price, but they protected it and began to restore it to productivity. A lot of that land is submarginal for private ownership; it was then and still is. The Forest Service is acquiring small amounts of it still for these original purposes.

But its major acquisitions in recent years have been for recreation purposes, and it has been acquiring land under the Weeks Act authority, but the source of funding has been the Land and Water Conservation Fund. These have been lands that have been acquired for recreation as a primary purpose. Some of these eastern lands are very close to high centers of population. Also, they have continued to acquire lands in the West, trying to solidify the ownership of the wilderness areas. Finally, they have been going for a continuous program of land exchange to consolidate wilderness and other needed areas.

SS: This policy has been [interrupted].

EC: It is still going on; it has been continuous.

SS: Did it begin with the Copeland Report of 1933 or was it simply accelerated by it? I know the report strongly recommended the extension of federal ownership.*

EC: I think it probably was accelerated. I can't give you a definite answer on that. Acquisition was certainly in the Copeland Report. But there were reports preceding the Copeland Report and after it, and they all got into the question of federal ownership and public ownership. The Forest Service's position on this, I think, has been consistent through the years, except for the low profile during the McArdle regime. The acquisition emphasis has changed from time to time, from watershed, to timber, to recreation. Purpose, speed, funding, and method of acquisition, all have fluctuated, but the general thrust has remained the same.

*U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, A National Plan for American Forestry, 1933, S. Doc. 12, 73d Cong., 1st sess. Also known as the "Copeland Report."

SS: In other words, federal regulation had little bearing on multiple use, but the extension of Forest Service lands did?

EC: That's correct.

Forest Taxation and Multiple Use

SS: You mentioned that you had been involved with forest taxation. I was going to ask whether you thought some of the taxation laws warranted for many years against good multiple-use practices on private lands.

EC: I was involved very little in forest taxation. I think they probably did. I'm not really knowledgeable, though, in forest tax law. The big forest taxation inquiry of the Forest Service was nearly over when I came to the Washington office, and I was never involved with that. The forest tax work that we did subsequently was mainly keeping up-to-date with state tax laws, responses to inquiries, and this type of thing. I am sure, though, that some of the tax laws were disadvantageous in that they didn't give certain subsidies or certain tax breaks that the forest industries or forest landowners are now getting to encourage forest practices.

Forest Service Reports

SS: These surveys that you mentioned, did any of them have any relation to the various uses, or were they generally oriented toward the supply and demand of timber?

EC: Mainly toward timber. Although there was one that was the Range Report, * which was the counterpart of the Copeland Report. It was prepared, I think, shortly after the Copeland Report and was oriented

* U.S., Congress, Senate, The Western Range, S. Doc. 199, 74th Cong., 2d sess., 1936.

entirely toward grazing. The two best documents on grazing the Forest Service has ever put out were the Range Report and the 1953 annual Report of the Chief of the Forest Service to the secretary of agriculture, which concentrated entirely on grazing. There were other special studies. There were a couple of recreation studies; there was one or two that [Robert] Marshall and I think Russell Lord were involved in. That makes three. There were one or two on watersheds, but I'm not sure whether they were on a national scope or regional scope, and I can't recall the names. I think there were one or two on wildlife, too, but the main ones were the Capper Report, the Copeland Report, a joint congressional inquiry report, the Timber Reappraisal Report, and the Timber Resource Review. There were about nine or ten of them, and they were all catalogued and listed in the introductory pages of the Timber Resource Review at the time that was put out.* You wouldn't find reference in the T.R.R. to the Range Report or the recreation reports. The ones named in the T.R.R. were mainly timber oriented. The Range Report is the best counterpart. This was done under supervision of Mr. Chapline, whom I mentioned earlier, and Mr. Clapp. Clapp was really the guiding genius on the Copeland Report and the grazing report.

Appropriations, Revenue, and Multiple Use

SS: In a discussion about the 1960 Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, Bernie Orell of Weyerhaeuser pointed out that the only paying aspect of the national forests had been the timber.** What I am wondering is whether, during these earlier periods, the fact that the revenue of the Forest Service came largely from timber affected, in economic terms, where appropriations were made into the service?

EC: First of all, I would point out that what Bernie had reference to when you say the only paying aspect is in terms of dollars. He means that

*For a summary of the Timber Resource Review and the listing of reports, see U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Timber Resources for America's Future, Forest Resource Report No. 14 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 1-109.

**"What the People Said," American Forests 69, no. 12 (December 1963): 36-44.

the income in terms of dollars equaled or exceeded the amount of money appropriated for these purposes. The act in itself says that money shall not be the guideline by which the national forests are to be judged. I feel strongly that money is not the only way in which you judge whether something pays for itself. How do you put a value on human life, for example, or on what you get out of a plan for recreation or on how many floods you've prevented and how many people you might have killed downstream if there were a flood? I think these are paying services of the national forests to which Bernie had no reference at all. So to me that's a specious statement.

But the question you were leading up to was, Did the income from the sale of timber influence the size of appropriations the Forest Service received? The answer unfortunately is, yes. And this was a great mistake that the Forest Service fell into. Maybe it would have been pushed into it even if it had resisted. But the Forest Service found, in the limited thinking that it was encountering from the appropriations committees on the Hill in those days, the late forties and early fifties, that Congress was thinking of whether things were paying for themselves purely in terms of dollars. Therefore, the Forest Service could plead, "Well, if you appropriate this many million dollars to us for the management and planting of trees, we'll return this many million dollars to the treasury." This was a saleable item and one that anybody from eighth grade on could understand. But it wasn't the whole picture. But Congress bought this lock, stock, and barrel, and the Forest Service then found itself locked in because this did become the pattern for justification of its appropriations. Consequently, the Forest Service was continually pushed to cut more and more timber in order to raise more and more revenue in order to get more and more appropriations. This was and is a vicious cycle and as wrong as it can be. Earl Loveridge was the principal architect of this policy, and Watts, McArdle, and Cliff all condoned it. However, Watts, before he retired, told me he thought it was the greatest mistake of his career.

SS: Would you say this warranted against the rapid development of multiple-use practices?

EC: Yes. It still does. The Forest Service has gotten 90 percent or more of the increases it has asked for, for timber purposes in recent years; it has gotten 15 percent, I think, of requested increases for some of the less popular services like watershed, range, and wildlife. The Forest Service is completely out of balance right now. I won't say it is spending too much money on timber. It is spending too much on timber sale preparation and administration and not enough on planting

and rehabilitation of cutover land, which is still in the field of timber management. But it is not spending anywhere enough on grazing, wildlife, watershed, and recreation.

It is just like a teeter-totter that's tipped way heavy on timber. The right way to balance it is not to reduce the amount on timber; it is to shift the timber expenditures to planting and rehabilitation and to increase amounts on the others. This is what the Forest Service tries to do periodically when it develops these long-range forest programs. It presents them to the Congress. It's got one on the Hill right now. They come up with them about every ten years just to help get things in balance, but they never quite do get in balance. It usually helps, but they never quite make it.

The antitimber people must remember--and I don't classify myself as such--when they criticize the Forest Service, that the Forest Service is simply an agent of the executive branch. The Forest Service has its bosses in the executive branch to tell it what to do, and it has the people that control both the policy and the purse strings in the Congress who also tell it what to do. The Forest Service is not a free agent. It doesn't determine the major policies that it necessarily follows; they are determined for it. The Forest Service attempts to influence this policy determination, attempts to guide it; sometimes it's more successful than at other times, but never is it a free agent.

As for the criticism that has been felt by the Forest Service so greatly in recent years, particularly on timber, much of it is merited and much of it isn't merited. The Forest Service has been doing what Congress made it do, in part by way of appropriated appropriations and earmarked money for specific purposes. I think a great deal of the fault rests with the Congress and the higher authorities in the executive branch. This gets right into the heart of multiple use, which is the balance between resources.

SS: I want to ask, since you were in this Division of Forest Economics, whether the fact that local counties get 25 percent of the revenues from the Forest Service's cut puts any added pressure on the Forest Service or whether that pressure is nominal?

EC: You mean to cut timber?

SS: To do that more heavily, yes.

EC: Yes, in some cases it did, not too many though.

Multiple Use During the 1940s

SS: Was there any awareness of the concept of multiple use during the period from 1944 to 1950 when you were chief of the Division of Forest Economics?

EC: I think so. It was beginning to be talked about during World War II, but the term wasn't used too frequently at that time according to my recollection. It was a vague term; it wasn't defined. It was a pretty good catch-all phrase, and people began to use it without a very clear idea of what they were talking about. It was sort of like being for God and motherhood and against sin. It began to come into the jargon of Forest Service officers during those years. I have thought about it, but I cannot tell you where the term originated or who originated it or when it originated. I simply don't know, and I doubt if anybody knows.

SS: Did the war have any impact on the development of multiple use?

EC: Yes, but accidentally. The war, in its demand for forest products, increased greatly the pressures to cut on the national forests. This was coupled with the fact that a great deal of private ownerships with better quality lands had begun to be cutover at about that time. When this happened, it was necessary for the landowner to wait a long time for his trees to grow up. There was a time gap until he had mature timber again. So they began to look to the public lands. That, coupled with the high demand, put the pressure on them to increase the timber cut. Also, there was then, and still is, excess mill capacity in relation to timber supply.

All of this tended to throw the Forest Service more out of balance. While there was an increased war demand for livestock products, the increased pressure for timber far outweighed the pressure for more livestock products. Grazing declined in relative importance. Watershed problems increased in importance as more and more timberland was cutover. Recreation picked up right after the war by leaps and bounds but not so much during the war. Funds were very scarce during the war for everything except timber. These things that were happening began to make the leaders of the Forest Service increasingly concerned about the imbalance in the Forest Service management and handling of the various resources on the national forests.

Also, there was one other thing going on that I haven't mentioned, and that was the creation of primitive areas and wilderness

areas, which started way before World War II, by administrative action of the Forest Service. I think the first one was the Gila Primitive Area in New Mexico. I believe it was established in 1924. During the course of twenty years, the Forest Service built up a system of I don't know how many millions of acres of primitive and wilderness areas. These were essentially the same thing, except wilderness areas had recognition by secretarial regulation, whereas primitive areas only by Forest Service regulation. But this was a form of recreation as well as a form of preservation. The principal users of wilderness areas were recreationists. Of course, grazers used them, and wildlifers used them, but timber people were out. And the timber people weren't very happy at seeing all this timber set aside. They weren't then, and they aren't now.

So this countermovement--if you want to call it that; it wasn't conceived in those terms, but it amounted to a countermovement--to the push for timber was developing through the concept and implementation of a system of primitive and wilderness areas. The Forest Service pioneered wilderness preservation long before any other agency and sought special protection for substantial areas of the national forests for scenic purposes, recreation, and preservation, foreseeing the day when the use pressures would be such that the nature of the land would be completely changed. They are trying to preserve some of these areas so people will always know what they were like originally.

SS: Did you have anything to do with timber contracts or timber sales when you were with the Division of Forest Economics?

EC: Yes, though not a great deal. We weren't the administrative body in economics. When they would draft a timber-sale sample contract and this sort of thing, we often would review them and comment. We worked internally on the details of contracts and this sort of thing. We never dealt with the lumber companies, and we had nothing to do with the handling of timber sales. It was an advisory in-service function.

SS: During this period from 1945 to 1950, were there many stipulations written into the sales contracts?

EC: I don't know whether there were many. There were some. They are always changing the contracts.

SS: What I was thinking is that specifically applied to wildlife or [interrupted]?

EC: I don't recall.

Third World Forestry Conference, 1949

SS: You were a delegate in 1949 to the Third World Forestry Conference in Helsinki. Was multiple use discussed at this conference at all?

EC: My guess is that it wasn't mentioned. Most of that congress was in Helsinki, but we also went to other parts of Finland. After the conference, the U.S. group spent about three weeks touring through the forests of Germany and France. I think we encountered more of it in Germany and France than we did in Finland.

You see, Finland is a very heavily oriented timber country; it is entirely different. You just can't conceive the difference between forestry in Scandinavia and forestry in this country. Forestry is refined to a degree of precision there undreamed of here. It is practiced on small areas. Trees are grown to a small size; they are grown for wood purposes, and other things are of no consequence. Timbering in the comprehensive sense was the primary industry of Finland. Sweden is more diversified, but forestry is still very important. In Finland it was as if forestry occupied the role that you would have in this country if you were to combine the steel industry and the automotive industry. It was that important.

The capitalists of Finland were the heads of the big pulp companies, the rich people of Finland, and the educational elite of Finland were foresters. They were like the doctors, the politicians, the statesmen, and the leaders of this country. They were the national leaders. Forestry has never occupied such a role in this country, and it takes some adjusting in your mind and experience to try to understand it. Of course, they are interested in hunting over there; they go out and hunt and have a good time and eat the meat and so on. But if you have to make a choice between a deer and a tree, you pick the tree. Recreation, no; they'd recreate on the lakes and so on, but at that time there was no developed recreation to amount to anything. As for the multiple-use idea, it just didn't enter their heads.

Now, when you got down into Germany and France, you would get the hunting estates, the big forested estates owned by the counts or other estate owners, often surrounding old castles, where the forest would be criss-crossed with wide trails, and at the point of the cross they would have a big tower. The nobility would sit in the tower, and the workmen would drive the game through the forest until they would have to cross the cleared spaces, cleared just like fire lines, and from the central tower they could see down every lane like

spokes of a wheel. Whenever they would see a deer crossing, why, they'd just shoot him from the tower. If you call that multiple use, it was game management of a sort. It was sporting, and it was recreation. You didn't hear much about watershed, except in the Black Forest. They were practicing it there because it was in the mountains. Along the coast near Bordeaux in France, the maritime pine forests were used for recreation. Also, those forests were planted for dune and wind erosion control. They were reclaimed sand dunes. In France and Germany you would find some forests where they would grow very high quality timber by the Crown. Some oak forests in France would be grown on a rotation of three hundred years.

You found no waste in the forests; there was no slash, no underbrush. Even though the Scotch pine and Norway spruce would be clear cut, the forest would be meticulously cared for, like a park. Everything was picked up or used for firewood, for heating. The intensity of management throughout the Scandinavian and western European countries was much greater than you can find in this country even today. There is just no comparison. Forestry practices in this country are very crude and wasteful compared to European forestry practices. There the key thing--with a few exceptions, such as the big hunting estates--is the growing of wood for the purpose of wood.

ASSISTANT CHIEF, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, 1950 to 1962

Duties as Assistant Chief

SS: In 1950 you became assistant chief of the Forest Service. Could you describe your duties during those twelve years?

EC: They were very broad. I was sort of the roving assistant chief. The formal title of it--I don't remember the precise words--was program development, policy formation, and congressional liaison. McArdle used to say I was in charge of snakes. You can break down the functions. Take the congressional part first. There were two divisions under me, the Program Division and the Legislative Division. The Forest Service functioned at that time under a body of law of about five hundred statutes, applying in one way or another to Forest Service functions. Of course, there was the general counsel's office and the secretary's office. Administrative arrangements changed from year to year. We didn't have a legal office of our own. We used the Office of the General Counsel.

But we did have a Legislative Division, and each session of Congress there were usually about three hundred bills introduced that in one way or another affected the Forest Service. We monitored all of the legislation that was introduced. We handled the preparation of Department of Agriculture position statements on all legislation that the Congress asked us about, or often, when we wanted to, we volunteered positions. We prepared those position statements and testimony for hearings. Questionable matters went to the chief for the final say, insofar as the Forest Service was concerned. Of course, they all had to clear the secretary's office before they would go to the Hill.

This was really a very great responsibility because this was the way policy was made. I always was very careful and did a lot of preparation myself, although I had some excellent staff aides. Reynolds Florance was the chief of the division most of the time, and he was a marvelous lawyer, a splendid person, and performed a great service to the Forest Service. The other aide I think about was a woman, Mrs. Martha Combe', who was my personal staff assistant. She and Reynolds and I did most of the legislative work. We would try to get reports and testimony drafted in the subject matter divisions

initially--timber in the timber division, grazing in the grazing division, and so on. Usually they wouldn't do a very good job; we'd have to do it over. Most of these bills related to national forests. We had relatively few bills bearing on research or on state and private functions once we had dropped the regulatory aspects. We had some acquisition bills.

In addition to these position statements on legislation, the division was responsible for the preparation of congressional testimony for Forest Service representatives. And I, personally, was frequently responsible for giving the testimony and subjecting myself to interrogation. We dealt mainly with the Interior Affairs Committee, the agriculture committees, and the public works committees. Appropriation aspects, which were extremely important, I did not handle. This was handled under another branch of the Forest Service. I was in on the chief's discussion of appropriation matters, but the annual appropriation acts were not my responsibility. Well, that was one big function we had and probably the most important.

In addition, we were given special program assignments. For instance, we spent six years working on the Timber Resource Review, which was a servicewide, major undertaking on the timber situation in the country. It was very controversial, and we encountered a great deal of opposition, but we finally got it out. It's a tome a couple of inches thick, probably the last major survey of this type the service has made. It should be making another one. We also developed the ten-year Forest Service development program at that time; this was our responsibility. I prepared a great many of the chief's annual reports, which always consisted, not only of the routine or what we did from year to year, but in different years we focused on different subjects. One year on acquisition; another year on recreation; another year on grazing; and that sort of thing. I handled a great many of the interagency and interdepartmental policy sessions. I had many dealings with the Park Service, BLM, Interior Department, Bureau of the Budget, and this sort of thing.

It was my job twice a year to serve as acting chief, a job which we rotated among the six assistant chiefs. This involved handling all the routine chief's signatures, knowing nothing was brought up to the chief unless it first went through the acting chief. The acting chief's job was to have the judgment to know what to bring up to the chief and what to handle himself. So it was a very sensitive assignment. This was a very fine system, I thought. It was a good experience because it kept all the assistant chiefs involved in the total functioning of the Forest Service. Another one of my duties was

to function as advisor to the chief during all the staff sessions which we had, usually several a week. Many of them were on personnel.

There were countless special problems that would come up, and most of them would be dumped onto me. I didn't have the routine functions of running the national forests or running research. My functions cut across all of the other branches and all of the other functions of the Forest Service. My functions were servicewide, just as the chief's functions were servicewide. It was comparable in many respects to the job that has since been divided between one assistant chief and the associate chief. There was no associate chief at that time. At times the Forest Service has had an associate chief, and at times it has not. During those years, there was no associate chief. And to a considerable extent, I think it is fair to say that I performed the functions of associate chief, although my colleagues of the time might not agree with me. Now they have an associate chief. They also have an assistant chief in charge of legislative work. But during my time those functions were combined into one. That's the best way I can describe it.

Stockmen's Grazing Bill

SS: Do you recall any pieces of legislation that were particularly important with development of the different multiple uses?

EC: You are talking about ones dealing particularly with one function. Let me give you sort of a general answer to that question. I may be leaving out some things that should be mentioned. In the legislative and congressional field the things you keep from passing or getting enacted are just as important as the things that do get enacted, and often they are just as big a battle.

One of the first things I got involved in was one of these negative-type battles, which was the Stockmen's Grazing Bill of the early 1950s, which would have given stockmen a property right on the national forests, allowed them to buy and sell grazing permits, and to incorporate the value of the public range in the value of the ranch when it was offered for sale.* This was a long, controversial battle. It was ultimately defeated. Some heads rolled over that; Congressman [Wesley] D'Ewart [Montana] was defeated for reelection, and Congressman

*Stockmen's Grazing Bill, S.B. 2548, 83d Cong. 2d sess., 1954.

[Lee] Metcalf [Montana], now Senator Metcalf, came into Congress on the strength of this controversy. Senator [Frank A.] Barrett [Wyoming] lost his position in the Senate during this period partly as a result of his role. The advocates of the stockmen lost over a period of several sessions of Congress. The Forest Service experienced some very difficult times. But we survived, and the bill was defeated.

The battle gave birth to a citizens' committee that has ultimately evolved into the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources. That was the origin of this conservation lobbying organization. You see, the grazing bill battle had an effect on multiple use in retrospect because it broke the stockmen's hold on the national forests. And it assured that the Forest Service would really have control of grazing on the national forests rather than the stockmen. This was a very important step forward toward the ability to implement and to manipulate the management of the various resources on the national forests.*

Oregon and California Railroad Lands

We had another affair in Oregon that was regional in nature. This was one that was accomplished with the help of Oregon's Senator [Guy] Cordon. It may sound small in retrospect, but it wasn't at the time. We settled the squabble between the Interior Department and the Agriculture Department over jurisdiction of the controverted O & C [Oregon and California] lands in southwestern Oregon. These were lands owned by the Forest Service and intermingled on an alternate section-by-section basis with railroad grant lands that have reverted to the government and to the Interior Department and were administered by the Bureau of Land Management. It took an act of Congress to straighten this overlapping jurisdiction out. There was great controversy there. The counties were greatly concerned because they got 75 percent of the O & C reverted land receipts and only 25 percent of the Forest Service receipts. We finally worked out an exchange. The

*For another discussion by Dr. Crafts of the Stockmen's Grazing Bill, see Edward C. Crafts, "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962," tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley.

Forest Service drew its boundaries back, and O & C also drew its back. As a result, there was a clear boundary and mutual solidification. It sounds simple, but it wasn't. It took about two or three years to achieve. This was a major accomplishment, and it settled a festering sore spot between the two departments.

There was another major matter in Oregon--the termination of the Klamath Indian Reservation and the turning over of a portion of that reservation to the Forest Service for the Klamath National Forest. I think they have changed the name of it now to the Winema National Forest. This again was about a two- or three-year struggle that I telescope here into a few seconds.

I just can't recollect others at the moment; there were so many, many minor ones. On the average we passed fifty or sixty statutes a year affecting the Forest Service. Most of those were ones that we wanted, very few that we didn't want. We would usually prevent about an equal number each year from getting through. It is much easier to block a bill than to get one passed. But you see, I have been out of the Forest Service for ten years, and some of these things slip away. We are talking back over a twenty-year span.

Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955*

SS: Was there a bill called the Multiple Surface Uses Incumbant Act?

EC: Oh, yes. I should have mentioned that. It was a major accomplishment. You don't have the name quite right. It was called the Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955. There was a very great problem with mining claims on the national forests. On the public domain western national forests, miners were stealing timber on the basis of their mining claims because at that time they had rights to the surface resources of the claims and we couldn't sell the timber. It was just a mixed-up mess stemming out of those 1872 mining laws. It is interesting history.

*Multiple Surface Use Act of 23 July 1955, ch. 375, 69 Stat. 367, 30 U.S.C. sec. 601, 611-615 (1964).

This was a very major accomplishment, which started with the American Forestry Association. Most people don't know this. The man who was executive director at the time, Lowell Besley, and myself got together and decided we ought to try to do something about this. Besley generated enough interest on the Hill to get the mining people to sit down and talk. I remember very well that Wesley D'Ewart--whom I liked and got along with fine, but who had been our enemy in the grazing fight--at that time was occupying the position of assistant secretary of agriculture. He and Forest Service representatives had a one- or two-day session in the American Forestry Association offices with some designated leaders of the legislative committee of the American Mining Congress to try to work out something. The mining representatives had become convinced that there were some bad things going on and something should be done.

And so we ultimately were able to work out a draft of legislation which set up what they called an in-rem procedure whereby there was a certain time allowed for the claimant to prove up on his claim. If he didn't do this, the claim would be voided. This tended to clear the book of all those thousands or millions of old, ancient claims that nobody knew whether they existed or not, nor where. Also, the surface rights were given to the secretary of agriculture to regulate, except as much of the surface as the miner needed to operate his claim. The patenting requirements, as I recall, were changed somewhat.

As a result, this act was passed through the joint efforts of the Mining Congress and the Forest Service working together with the help of the American Forestry Association. So we didn't go to Congress fighting each other. Otherwise nothing would ever have happened. This act was about a two-year job. It greatly helped to clear up the mining problems on the western national forests. There were other acts passed. There were about thirty-five acts passed in the recreation field.

SS: Why did the Mining Congress support the act?

EC: They were afraid that if they didn't go this far, they'd get something worse. They weren't really being deprived of their rights to the minerals. This act did not hurt the legitimate miners. It did hurt the man who was trying to get free timber under the guise of the miner.

In connection with this, there was the famous Al Sarena case, which involved some mining claims in Oregon. No legislation was at stake here; this was an investigation. The Senate Interior

Committee, as I recall, set up a special subcommittee chaired by Senator Dick Neuberger, who was a great friend of the Forest Service. This was a classic case of misuse of mining claims for the purpose of getting out timber. It was located on the Umpqua National Forest. The problem of the validity of the claim came up, and at times the hearings on these packed the Senate caucus room. Probably the highlight of the hearings was when one of the mineral examiners for the Bureau of Mines testified that he'd thrown the ore samples he'd taken from the claims into the Rogue River to get rid of them. Interior and agriculture were in opposite positions on the Al Sarena case. What it did was to focus attention on the problem, but I can't remember whether this came before or after this 1955 multiple use act. I don't remember the sequence, but regardless, it was a great deterrent for others to misuse mining claims.*

SS: Is it call a multiple use act because it is a question of [interrupted]?

EC: It is called the Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955. I don't remember how it got its name, but the purpose of it was to permit the use of national forest subsurface resources and impair or impede in a minimal way the use of the surface resources. Multiple use in connection with this act is used in a different way than multiple use as defined in the 1960 Multiple Use Act. Multiple use in the Multiple Use Act of 1960 and as the Forest Service normally uses it, relates only to surface resources and not to subsurface resources. But in this particular act it related to both subsurface and surface resources.

Dealing with Congress

SS: What other thoughts do you have about your work as assistant chief?

*For another discussion by Dr. Crafts of the Al Sarena case, see Edward C. Crafts, "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962," tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley.

EC: We averaged during the time I was in this job, fifty to sixty acts a year, many of them very small and minor, directly oriented to the Forest Service. There was one, and that is the Forest Service Omnibus Act of June 20, 1958, which included a number of unrelated provisions.* It was sort of a housekeeping act, but it was one that the Forest Service had tried to get for a number of years and hadn't been successful. Another was finally gotten through in 1962.** These should be mentioned as having some particular merit.

I'd also like to say in connection with this legislative work that one of the jobs, in addition to the substantive aspects that I have been discussing, was contact work with members of Congress--the getting to know them, traveling with them on field and inspection trips--which I did a considerable amount of. I answered their requests and inquiries concerning their district or their state. You went up to see them when they wanted you to, in their offices, or got them off the hook with their constituents whenever you could.

I enjoyed this. At first I was uneasy at it, but I got to enjoy it, and it seemed to me that you could always get along with these men--most of them I had a high regard for--if you were completely honest with them. The trouble with most Forest Service people--and I don't know about other government agencies--is that Forest Service people tended to hold back when they were dealing with members of Congress and weren't completely frank and candid. I always thought that was a mistake. But I do want to say that the interior and agriculture committees that I worked with during that twelve-year period were composed of good men, and they did well by the Forest Service.

I also want to mention one other individual, George Burks, who was chief of my programming division. I have mentioned Reynolds Florance as chief of the legislative division, Mrs. Combe', who was my staff aide, and now George Burks. It was under him that the T.R.R. [Timber Resource Review] was prepared, that national forest programs were developed, and that many of the special studies were prepared. He had a very responsible job, and he was a very fine worker. He is now retired. All of these people are gone.

*Forest Service Omnibus Act of 20 June 1958, 72 Stat. 216, 217, 16 U.S.C. sec. 556b (1964).

**Forest Service Omnibus Act of 23 October 1962, 76 Stat. 1157, 16 U.S.C. sec. 551 (1964).

SS: Did the Omnibus Act contain anything that had relevance to multiple use?

EC: I don't think so. I don't remember the detailed provisions of it, but I don't think so.

THE MULTIPLE USE-SUSTAINED YIELD ACT OF 1960*

Evolution of the Act

SS: I think we might as well go on to the 1960 Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act. Now, reading your article, "Saga of a Law," I gather that the Forest Service was the prime mover in generating the idea of a multiple use act.**

EC: **That** is correct. Maybe it would help to put in here--for those who are interested in this--a reference to that article. I can't supply it, but I think it ought to be referred to because it does give a good bit of the history of the genesis and the day-by-day efforts that went into its enactment, as well as the interpretation of both the act and some of the things that were not in the act. I couldn't possibly repeat the details of that history here because I wouldn't remember them in the first place, and, secondly, there is no need to. The article is available to those who want to take the time to look it up.

SS: I think all of these questions will be premised on that article. My questions will largely be things that I want to ask you to explore more fully than you did in the article. So I'll just use a standard footnote and keep track of the pages that stimulated my questions. Were there previous multiple use acts pushed by any other groups?

EC: Not to my knowledge, except this Multiple Use Mining Act of 1955, which was a different thing entirely.

SS: I've found this, and I can't trace it to any bill. It is part of a letter. The date is on the top of it; it is 1955, and the names are on it, who the letter is to and who signed it. There is a reference in there to a bill that was pushed by wildlife conservationists. I was wondering if

*Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 12 June 1960, 74 Stat. 215, 16 U.S.C. sec. 528-531 (1964). See Appendix H, p. 138.

**Edward C. Crafts, "Saga of a Law," American Forests, Part I, 76, no. 6 (June 1970): 13-54; Part II, 76, no. 7 (July 1970): 22-96.

you could identify it? I found it in the AFA [American Forestry Association] papers.*

EC: I have a vague recollection of this, but it is so vague that I can't elaborate on it. All I can say is, whatever it was, it didn't amount to anything; it got a little attention and went nowhere. I cannot recall the specifics of this at all.

SS: I gather from your article that the Timber Resource Review was one of the primary means that lead ultimately to the formulation of the Multiple Use Act.

EC: That is right. Of course, this is all in the article, so I'll be repeating, in a way, what is in the article. The Timber Resource Review was different from earlier program studies in that it confined itself to an appraisal of the timber situation and was devoid of recommendations for a program. Always before the program had been the concluding section of these overall evaluations. This was done because of the suspicion that the industry had of regulation and because we were in the throes of the Eisenhower administration. The Forest Service decided tactically that this was the best way to do it. So the recommendations part that was eliminated from the Timber Resource Review really manifested itself in two ways: one was the long-range Forest Service development program, a ten-year program, and the other was the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act.

Really, I think I am putting more emphasis on a connection between the Timber Resource Review and the Multiple Use Act than other Forest Service people in comparable spots or than [Richard] McArdle would do if you were talking to him. But I know what I'm saying is a reflection of the way my own thinking evolved, and I was deeply involved in all three of these things--the T.R.R., the long-range program, and the Multiple Use Act--more than anybody else in the service. The Timber Resource Review showed in a nutshell that there was then and would be in the future a shortage of high-quality softwood saw timber. From that you deduce that because there is a shortage to meet the national needs, there will be pressures on the national forests to cut more and more high-quality saw timber. The national forests were the biggest single source of high-quality softwood saw timber that was left. Therefore, the truth of the deduction was

*Nelson to Bodine, 21 February 1955. Held by the archives of the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California. For a copy of the relevant portion of this letter, see Appendix I, p. 139.

inevitable unless we were completely wrong in our predictions of supply and demand, and we didn't think we were.

In retrospect, through the passage of time, there are those of us who were involved that take some satisfaction that time has proved us right. Because all you've got to do is think of the pressures that the Forest Service has been under to up, up, up the log cut in recent years. This is just what we thought was going to happen. We were afraid then that the Forest Service was out of balance one way or the other. It was out of balance then, and it was getting more so. We feared that the pressures for timber would be so much that they would override the proper or balanced use of the other surface resources on the national forests. We were trying to look ahead, ten, fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years. As I say, I am repeating what is in the AFA article.

We felt that we needed a congressional mandate that we could fall back on that would prevent us from overcutting, overgrazing, or overusing any of the surface resources of the national forests. We didn't feel that if the pressures got strong enough or if the president, whoever he might be, got so inclined, we in the Forest Service were strong enough to say no and make our views stick. So we wanted a congressional directive, not just an authorization, to require us to manage these various resources in balance.

SS: So then, it would be correct to say that the Timber Resource Review was one of the standard surveys that the Forest Service made every so many years and that the results of this stimulated the service to think in terms of what pressures it would be under.

EC: Oh, yes. I think there is no question about that.

SS: It wasn't a reaction to pressures of the time?

EC: It was more an anticipation of what was going to come. And it did come.

SS: Would any particularly strong credit be due Ezra Taft Benson?

EC: Benson didn't know anything about it, nothing whatsoever. I might say in that regard that credit is due one assistant secretary of agriculture. There were a number of them who supervised the Forest Service during Benson's tenure as secretary of agriculture. One of the two that I remember the best was Earl Coke, who was from California, I think, from the university extension service. When he left the

government, he went to the Bank of America as vice president for agricultural affairs. He was a very good administrator, but he wasn't around very long, and he didn't get to know the Forest Service too well. I had a high regard for him. Others in the service did not.

Then succeeding him was Irvin Peterson, who had formerly been, I believe, state secretary of agriculture in Oregon. He was a good Republican. He--Pete as we called him--had been raised as a boy in Coos Bay, and he knew the national forests from the time he was a little boy. Also, he had very close contact with them in his work in the state. He was very knowledgeable about the western national forests. Pete is the one who helped us at the secretarial level. He became firmly convinced of the need for a Forest Service program and helped us get it cleared. He became firmly convinced of the need for the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, and he helped us get that cleared through the Budget Bureau. He authorized us to send some parts up even without checking with the Bureau of the Budget; it's all in that article.

I say Benson didn't know anything about it; I think that is a pretty accurate statement. Benson could have stopped things at any time, and certainly Pete must have informed him to a small degree, but Benson, like most secretaries of agriculture, did not have the time to concentrate on one act or one agency. So it was really Peterson who paved the way for us within the administration.

SS: You mentioned that some of the people in the service opposed the act because they didn't wish to take a chance of losing. Now did anybody in the service oppose the act because they opposed the idea of not having timber as a primary use?

EC: All of the policy people who were involved in our internal discussions before we finally decided to go ahead, subscribed to the concept, I think, with varying degrees of enthusiasm. They couldn't very well afford not to subscribe to the concept and still stay in the Forest Service or still occupy their positions in the Forest Service because it was so basic to what the Forest Service had been trying to do and should continue to try to do. So they all subscribed to the concept.

There were those, as you have mentioned and as I mentioned in the article, who recommended against going ahead fearing that we would be unsuccessful in the second session of the Congress and fearing that, if unsuccessful, the adverse legislative history would work against us. The individual who opposed going ahead with most vigor was the man who succeeded McArdle as chief, Ed Cliff. He fully

- subscribed in concept, but tactically, in his judgment, he didn't think it possible to get it done.
- SS: What was the impact of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission on the Forest Service's multiple-use program?
- EC: That came later. Am I wrong in my dates? The act passed in 1960, and the Outdoor Recreation Report was finished in 1962.
- SS: I thought it was started right when the Timber Resource Review [interrupted].
- EC: I think it was started, but there had been no findings. On the contrary, the Multiple Use Act helped originate the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Initially one of the opponents of the Multiple Use Act was Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, who was one of the private conservation leaders at this time. He is in very poor health at the moment. Joe was fearful that we were trying to downgrade recreation, and it would end up by the Multiple Use Act giving the Forest Service the latitude to upgrade timber and grazing and some of the other things. Of course, depending on how you interpret it, it does give administrators great flexibility. This has been one of the weaknesses of the act and one of the errors of the Forest Service in its administration under the act.

But Joe finally got convinced that the Multiple Use Act was a good thing, and he helped us toward the end a great deal; he helped us get the definitions in the act. Then one day, he came over to the office, and he said, "Ed, we need a study of recreation comparable to the Timber Resource Review. Because out of this Timber Resource Review we have an assessment of the timber situation in this country, and we're trying to get this Multiple Use Act. But we don't have an assessment of the recreation resources of the country, and we never have had." He said, "I'm interested in recreation, and you fellows are, and you ought to be. Recreation is going to get balanced treatment along with timber on public lands. We need to know as much about recreation and its supply and demand for the future as you fellows have reported on timber." So we talked this over and I agreed with him. I thought he was correct, and then we talked over how to do it.

It was obvious that the Forest Service was not the agency to do it as we could in timber. We were sort of recognized as the leaders in timber; we didn't have any real competition. But in recreation there was the National Park Service. The Park Service would not accept having the Forest Service do it. The Forest Service wouldn't

accept having the Park Service do it. Okay, what's the answer? Well, you can have a joint congressional committee--that's what they have done in times past for other studies--or you could set up a commission made up of a mixture of citizens and members of Congress. Joe and I sat down--I'm not sure we did this all in one day, but we didn't spend too much time--and roughed out the wording of the act that created the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. He then became sponsor of that cause on the Hill. He had good rapport with many people on the Hill, particularly Congressman [Wayne] Aspinall.

We backed him up all the way down the line. They never would have gotten the act if the Forest Service had bucked because we had enough weight in either committee, I think, probably to have kept it from passing. And I think he never would have gotten the act through if the Park Service had bucked it. But both agencies were interested in recreation, wanted the study made, and neither wanted the other to make it. This was the best compromise, so both supported it. I say the connection between the recreation report and the Multiple Use Act is that it was the concept that Joe had, with the Forest Service's concurrence and help, of trying to put recreation on an equal plane with timber and to have a report on recreation that was the counterpart of the Timber Resource Review. Most people don't know that history.

Wilderness and Multiple Use

SS: There was one thing that I didn't notice that you discussed too much in your article--maybe there is nothing to discuss--was the connection between the first wilderness bill and the Multiple Use Act.

EC: I have to think back. The Forest Service was one of the prime sponsors of that wilderness bill. There had been earlier drafts of the wilderness bill for several years over about a ten-year period, and the Wilderness Society had asked for too much and hadn't gotten anywhere. Did the Wilderness Act* pass before the Multiple Use Act was passed?

*Wilderness Act of 3 September 1964, 78 Stat. 890, 16 U.S.C. sec. 1131-1136 (1966).

SS: After.

EC: I think you are right. Then the word wilderness was mentioned in the Multiple Use Act.

SS: I don't think so.

EC: Well, let's take a look.

SS: In the first part of "Saga of a Law" you talk about [interrupted].

EC: Yes, here it is; I thought so. "The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this act." That was the first mention of wilderness in a statute. It preceded the Wilderness Act, and we worked this out with the wilderness people. Otherwise they would have opposed the Multiple Use Act because we mentioned other resources. They wanted wilderness mentioned. So we worked this out with them and got their support for the act. That really is the relationship between them. This was the way we both helped each other. They got their first mention of wilderness in the statute, and we got their support for the act.

The fact of the matter is that wilderness is a specialized use of the national forests. When an area is designated wilderness by a statute, it tends to contravene the multiple-use concept. You can rationalize it because wilderness areas have recreation use, life use, and watershed use. Wilderness areas set up by act of Congress, in a sense, are at variance with the Multiple Use Act. They are special situations, and, of course, this has been a weakness, but the Forest Service supports the Wilderness Act and the wilderness concept and also supports the Multiple Use Act. So wilderness areas open the door to a legitimate question. Why shouldn't there be areas designated for timber, and why shouldn't there be areas designated for various other things? It leads you into the dominant-use theory in opposition to the multiple-use theory. Wilderness does have a form of recreation use; there is also grazing use; and it has wildlife and hunting; and it has watershed. It has four of the multiple uses. It does not have timber, and it has a limited type of recreation.

We have, up until the time I left the service, always said in connection with multiple use that for an area to qualify as a multiple-use area, you needed to have three of the five uses, more than two. Otherwise it is single or dual use. This is not in the statute, and it's not in the legislative history. But as I said in that article, it is in a policy talk McArdle gave at the Fifth World Forestry Congress at

Seattle shortly after this act passed.* It is unfortunate the Forest Service has paid as little attention to that talk as it has because that talk was designed specifically by McArdle to fill the gaps in the statute and in the legislative history. If it had been used as such by the Forest Service and had become Forest Service policy and understanding, as it had been intended to be, it would simplify matters.

But to come back to wilderness, I would like to say we helped a great deal to develop the Wilderness Act. I testified on various phases of the Wilderness Act three times. McArdle did several times. Initially the Park Service was against it. And the first time any administration ever supported a wilderness act was along in the fifties. That determination was made at about a 6:00 P.M. conference the night before the testimony McArdle was going to give at a session over in the Bureau of the Budget involving the Budget Bureau, Park Service, and Forest Service. The Park Service--namely, Conrad Wirth--was opposed to the Wilderness Act at the time. The Forest Service was advocating it and we won. I think the Park Service was afraid that most of the parks would be converted to wilderness, and that is just what the wilderness people are trying to do.

SS: About what year was this?

EC: I don't remember, along about 1958 or 1960. The historians can trace it because it is the first time there is any administration record of support--official executive branch support--for a wilderness act. It is sad the way wilderness advocates now, in recent years, have tended to berate the Forest Service for fearing it hasn't gone far enough; these advocates want more and want de facto wilderness and all this. Memories are very, very short. They forget that the Forest Service pioneered the primitive and wilderness area administrative system. They forget that the Forest Service got the first statutory mention of wilderness ever in the Multiple Use Act. They forget, or they never knew, the Forest Service was responsible for getting the first administrative support of wilderness legislation; and they forget that without Forest Service foresight and pioneering, there might well be no Wilderness Act or wilderness system today.

SS: Wilderness isn't a multiple-use area?

*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 (Seattle: University of Washington, 1962), pp. 143-145.

EC: No. I'd say it is as I have explained above.

SS: It is?

EC: I'd say it is. I think it is because it's got recreation, grazing, wildlife, and watershed resources. I think it qualifies.

SS: That is not always the Forest Service's reaction to wilderness areas. I gather, for example, that the AFA--Kenneth Pomeroy and some of these people--has maintained that a park, which would be similar to a wilderness area, is not a multiple-use area.*

EC: The AFA does not speak for the Forest Service. A park does not have grazing, and it does not have hunting. So it's not similar to a wilderness area.

SS: But it has wildlife, recreation, and watershed.

EC: It doesn't have utilization of wildlife. It only has the growing of wildlife. It has recreation of a particular type. Wilderness has its own recreation of a different type. Wilderness has the grazing and the livestock; the Park Service does not. Wilderness had hunting and the utilization of wildlife, and the parks do not.

SS: Fishing?

EC: Fishing the parks have, that's right. They are the same on fishing. Parks have two uses really--recreation and fishing. They don't manipulate the water, and they don't much in wilderness areas either. You see, the water runs off and is used. But the Park Service doesn't do things to improve the watershed unless, as in Jackson Lake, there are special situations where they've raised some of the lakes with reclamation dams. But there is a difference that a lot of people, I think, don't understand between the resources just being preserved in the wild and not have anything being done about them and multiple use. Simple preservation isn't multiple use.

Multiple use requires taking some affirmative action with respect to enhancing, developing, or managing a resource. It is a management function. The Park Service has wildlife, but they don't utilize it, and they don't do much in the way of management, really. That is why they get overstocking and have to have these special kills. They don't

*"Wilderness Bill Probed," American Forests 62, no. 8 (August 1956): 8-56.

manage the waters; water runs off the parks. They don't manage the watershed, and, therefore, I don't think parks qualify for multiple use.

But there are very few people, including Forest Service people, who today understand multiple use as it was explained and understood at the time this act passed. This is a most unfortunate thing. The Forest Service has become very glib in its use of the term and so have the conservationists, and everybody uses multiple use to mean whatever they want it to mean. Now, it wasn't meant to be that way. It had very specific limitations in meaning, and these are some of the things that McArdle explained in that speech. This is what people ought to get hold of. I forget now, but I think there are four or five criteria you have to meet in multiple use. You have to have, I think, three uses. There has to be affirmative action. It has to be over an area of substantial size, usually about as large as a ranger district. You don't expect to have the three uses and affirmative action on every acre, but you have to consider a very substantial acreage. There are some other guidelines that I have forgotten.

SS: To get back to this wilderness act. I understand that one wilderness bill preceding the Multiple Use Act had a multiple-use clause in it. When the act was not passed, the Forest Service then pushed a multiple use act by itself.

EC: I don't recall that. It may be true, but I don't recall it. Certainly that has nothing to do with our decision to go ahead with the Multiple Use Act. We didn't lift anything out of the Wilderness Act. The Multiple Use Bill was drafted by the Forest Service initially and then changed and rewritten and drafted by a man named Fenton Shepherd of the Bureau of the Budget.

SS: And there was no previous wilderness bill that the Forest Service came out in opposition to?

EC: In opposition to? The Forest Service has never opposed a wilderness act to my recollection. They might have opposed certain drafts before they got introduced, and I think we did. I know we had problems with [Howard] Zahniser, thinking he wanted to go too far and wanted too much. I don't remember the specifics or what the problems were. Zahniser was a wonderful guy. He was one of these dreamers and very persistent if he had something he wanted. We finally sat down, got him to sit down, and worked out the bill. As I say, the administration supported it. I don't remember official opposition by the Forest Service to any of these early drafts. I think it was probably unofficial while

we were trying to negotiate out an acceptable draft.

SS: I remember reading that one of the earlier drafts provided that a council would be created that would pass on the areas to be designated as wilderness.

EC: I don't remember. It might have well been.

Pressure Groups and the Multiple Use Act

SS: How much of a role in getting the Multiple Use Act through Congress did some of the wildlife groups play, for example, the National Rifle Association, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wildlife Federation, or the Sport Fishing Institute?

EC: You mean in getting it through? Well, my memory is a little dim on that. I'd have to go to that article. But the Wildlife Management Institute played a very great role in helping, so did the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and the American Forestry Association. I don't think the Wildlife Federation did very much. The Sport Fishing Institute, nothing.

SS: The National Rifle Association?

EC: I don't think they were involved very much.

SS: How about the Boone and Crockett Club?

EC: No.

SS: How about any irrigation groups or water supply companies?

EC: They stayed out of it.

SS: How about any labor unions?

EC: They were involved and for it.

SS: Both the CIO and the AFL?

EC: Yes.

SS: What was their reason?

EC: Public interest, I think, as much as anything else. Generally they take public-interest stands on conservation issues. This wasn't hurting anything that they were for. They didn't want any particular group to get too strong. As I understood it, this was their reason. You see, there is one additional thing. The grazing people were for it; you haven't got to them yet. The grazing people were for it because they were playing second fiddle to the timber people, and they thought it would help them. Wildlife people were for it--same reason. Recreationists were for it--same reason. Timber people were for it because they were afraid recreation was going to get too big for its britches and hurt timber--reverse reason. But all these commodity users had their particular axe to grind; none of them wanted the others to get too strong. So this sort of equalized it.

SS: Would the labor unions have supported it if the lumber interests had not finally come around and supported it?

EC: Yes. They were not subject to the employers' positions or to the lumber trade associations at all. In fact, it was rather unusual to find the two of them on the same side. The labor unions were traditionally liberal, conservation minded, public-interest minded. Trade associations that represent what you mean by lumber interests usually represent the employer, the entrepreneur, the businessman, as distinct from the working man.

SS: This may be a bad question, but would it be conceivable that the labor unions would ever use such a natural resource bill, not necessarily this one, as a tool against the lumber industry?

EC: Tool? How?

SS: Support it as a leverage to gain other advantages.

EC: No, I don't think so. I don't believe this was consequential enough. I don't think their efforts were quite like that.

SS: Does that sort of thing ever happen with natural resource legislation?

EC: Once in awhile there is some of this. Usually on land exchanges between agencies. You support this bill, and I'll help you with this one. But I don't recall this trading-off business taking place very

much or at all, really, between the industrial interests and the commodity users on one side and the conservation interests on the other. They usually go their independent ways for their own reasons. All these groups have their own interests and believe they are right. I just don't believe that sort of horse trading happens in conservation legislation, at least it was not in my experience.

- SS: I just have a tendency to think--from dealing with the redwoods, where when the lumber industry opposed the Redwood National Park, the unions went along with the companies' stand--that if it was in the company's benefit, it would also be to the workers' benefit.
- EC: There was a little of that in the redwood park. But that was a special situation--a small area, a highly dependent working force, and a one-industry economy. I don't remember that situation being duplicated elsewhere. I don't remember it being duplicated where the national forests were involved. You see, the national forests were involved with the redwood park only in a minor way.
- SS: How much of a role did the AFA [American Forestry Association] and the SAF [Society of American Foresters] have in the passage of the Multiple Use Act?
- EC: Well, let me say again with reference to that article that I may say some things here this morning, talking off the top of my head, that are at variance or not entirely consistent with what is in that article. Should that occur, what is said in the article should be interpreted as controlling because that was done deliberately with adequate time and adequate thinking and so on.

To come back to your question on AFA and SAF. The Society of American Foresters took practically no role, no effective role. I don't remember whether the council passed a resolution endorsing the act while it was pending or not. My recollection is that it did not. The society at that time didn't and still doesn't exercise a very aggressive role in legislative matters. Of course, there was difference of opinion over the desirability of the act among professional foresters, and most of them were members of the society. So to some extent it would be difficult for the society to arrive at a concensus within its membership. So for these various reasons my impression is, in retrospect, that the society exercised no consequential role whatsoever.

As far as the American Forestry Association, my recollection is that it was for the act. I think representatives of the association testified on behalf of the act. I suspect the record would show that. I

would also suspect the testimony was rather brief as is characteristic of the association. It is a tax-exempt organization, and, except in rare cases like the Multiple Use Mining Act, it normally doesn't get involved too deeply in the legislative process. So the American Forestry Association, I would say, exercised a helpful, beneficial, cooperative role; it really wasn't one of the key parties to the legislation either on behalf of it or against it.

SS: You mentioned a difference of opinion among the professional foresters. This was related to the desirability of the bill or the idea of multiple use?

EC: They are pretty much one and the same thing. There were a great many foresters who were timber oriented and wanted timber. They are what we call sawlog foresters, still are. They didn't like the idea of these other resources being equated by Congress with timber as the management purpose of the national forests. There were a great many forest-industry companies who individually were not really in favor of the bill for the same reason, basically. Those foresters who worked for companies of that type, I think, would have been pretty careful before giving vigorous support for something that their employer was opposed to.

Then there was that group of foresters who simply were conservative, didn't think ahead, didn't have the foresight, more in the traditional pattern. This was quite a departure from normal in the thinking of a great many foresters, for various reasons. I suspect that half or more of the society membership would have either been indifferent, neutral, or opposed.

Relations between the Forest Service and the Park Service

SS: You mentioned last week in our discussion that the Forest Service slipped behind in recreational development from 1940 on. Could you talk about this?

EC: The Forest Service was on the recreation ball during the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps when they had this great push for the construction and development of recreation improvements. They pretty well got caught up and were leaders. Then during World War II, in

the early forties, there was a great pressure for timber products from the national forests and attention to recreation dropped off. It was hardly receiving top-priority Forest Service attention and funds were very short. The eminence of timber really had its big acceleration during World War II, continued after World War II, and has continued pretty well up to the present. One of the reasons for the genesis of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was to put things back in balance again.

As I think I described the other day, following the Timber Resource Review and the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, there were those outside the Forest Service who felt that recreation was getting left at the post to some extent. And that was really the idea behind Mr. [Joe] Penfold's thinking on behalf of a commission to study recreation. And, of course, out of that came the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the national recreation areas and seashores, the wild rivers and national trails system. Also, certain national parks were created, some of them out of the national forests.

There was a great impact of recreational use on the national forests when the war was over and people came back, the work shortened, pay became better, and people had more leisure time. So there was a recreation impact on the national forests, which the Forest Service really was not prepared for. They hadn't anticipated it. Even if they had, the agency wouldn't have been financed for it. They weren't geared up for it. This is what I meant when I said they got left at the post. They used to be ahead, then timber caught up and ran ahead. The Forest Service sort of followed that pattern.

Then when the boom came along on recreation, the Forest Service didn't take the lead. The Park Service, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, and the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty took the lead. Outgrowths were the Land Water Conservation Fund and the numerous special-area acts, of which the Forest Service was a peripheral beneficiary, but of which it wasn't the central focal point that it had been with timber. The service is getting caught up now. It is getting back in balance, although it is having a hard time, but not within the service; the service has made its shift in thinking. It's having a hard time getting Congress to support recreation with money. But that's about the sequence of events that happened.

SS: During the period of 1958 to 1960, was there a particularly strong tension between the Park Service and the Forest Service?

EC: I think those were the years that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was doing its work and making its report. There was competition, of course, between the Forest Service and the Park Service. They shared suspicion, curiosity, and concern over what the commission was going to recommend. They both cooperated to the best of their ability with the commission, and, I guess, thinking back, there was a period there for a few years when the Park Service was coming up with its Mission 66 when relations were tense. There was Operation Outdoors of the Forest Service and Mission 66 of the Park Service. Mission 66 came first and was a very ambitious plan. It was comparable in the Park Service to the Long-Range Program of the Forest Service. It was the proper thing for the Park Service to do. But it did propose transferring to the jurisdiction of the Park Service substantial areas that were in the national forests.

So the competition wasn't so much whether both agencies should provide recreation facilities; it wasn't so much in particular types of recreation facilities the two agencies provided; it wasn't in the wilderness field. It was in the land jurisdiction field. The Forest Service's philosophy was--these were lands entrusted to its care. It's been administering them for years. It has recreation competence. There is no reason, no necessity, for transferring these lands to the Park Service to get the recreation job done. All we needed was money. The Park Service's view was that the national parks and monuments are something different from the national forests, that recreation and preservation are the primary purposes of units of the national park system under its 1916 organic act, which gives recreation a priority that it doesn't enjoy on the national forests.* And many of these areas are of sufficient scenic uniqueness, wonder, and grandeur that justify national park status.

Now on the score of who was going to administer certain areas, there was very strong competition. It started out during that period from 1958 to 1962 about. For awhile the top staffs of the two agencies here in Washington used to meet once a month for dinner, just a social dinner to get to know each other, to become more friendly, and so on. It worked all right for awhile. Then the problems got too difficult, and those monthly meetings were gradually stopped, which I always thought was too bad. But they were just discontinued.

SS: Do you remember what year?

* National Park Service Act of 25 August 1916, ch. 408, 39 Stat. 535, 16 U.S.C. sec. 1-18f (1964).

- EC: Well, I said sometime in the period from 1958 to 1962. They didn't continue after 1962, I'm sure.
- SS: Did this rivalry between the Park Service and the Forest Service have anything to do with generating the passage of the Multiple Use Act?*
- EC: No. It was unrelated. The Forest Service wanted that act to protect itself, not against the Park Service, but to protect itself against congressional pressures and pressures from other groups, industrial and otherwise, to enhance their particular commodity or noncommodity interests in the national forests. It wasn't a Park Service-oriented bill at all.
- SS: You mentioned certain transfer cases. Are there any that you recall being involved with that caused any particular [interrupted]?
- EC: Oh, sure. After I left the Forest Service, the North Cascades National Park was a classic case. There is a long story about that. I don't know whether you want to go into that. It is a little out of order, chronologically. The Forest Service, of course, was very much opposed to that. I had felt when I was still in the Forest Service, that that area ought to be in the National Park Service as a national park. The Forest Service people knew this. This was an area that the Park Service had long overlooked, although there had been earlier proposals. The history of the North Cascades National Park, the genesis of that, is all written up in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's report on the North Cascades, so there isn't much point in reviewing that now.** But this was a classic case of jurisdictional controversy. It was a very good illustration.

The redwoods is another one in which the Forest Service was involved, not in controversy with the National Park Service, but was simply trying to retain jurisdiction of lands of the Northern Redwoods Purchase Unit. The Park Service was not the prime mover on that because the administration--both interior and agriculture, as well as the Forest Service and the Park Service as agencies of those two

*For a discussion of this rivalry and the Multiple Use Act, see "Multiple Use as a Concept of National Forest Management," American Forests 66, no. 2 (February 1960): 10.

**U.S., Department of Agriculture, U.S., Department of Interior, North Cascades Study Report, by Edward C. Crafts, Arthur W. Greeley, George B. Hartzog, George B. Hartzog, Jr., George A. Selke, and Owen S. Stratton (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

departments--was opposed to the transfer of the Northern Redwoods Purchase Unit, recommended it not be included in the national park to be used for transfer to private owners as part compensation. But that was another problem that was an offshoot of a creation of a national park. If the Forest Service had elected to administer the purchase unit as a natural area instead of clear cutting for timber sales, it would not have lost the area.

SS: How about the Ice Age National Park?

EC: No great problem there for the Forest Service.

SS: And the Great Basin national park?

EC: There is no Great Basin national park.

SS: No. The proposal [interrupted].

EC: That was the Wheeler Peak proposal in Nevada. The Park Service lost. There was controversy there. That is out of Ely, Nevada. It proposed to include Wheeler Peak in a national park. It would have been the only national park in the state of Nevada. You see, Nevada and Idaho are the only two western states without national parks. And they would like to have them for the tourism aspect. Wheeler Peak, in my opinion--I was with the Forest Service at that time--didn't justify national park status.

It was just another western mountain. The only thing unique about it at all was that it happened to be the highest peak in Nevada, and it was alleged to have a mountain glacier on it. You can get a lot of difference of opinion on that. I've been up to that snowfield. It looked to me more like a little permanent snowfield than it did a glacier. But I'm not a glacier expert. If it had been a glacier, it would have been the southernmost glacier in the United States. Those were really about the two things that justify it. But, anyway, it has been dropped. It was promoted largely by local chamber of commerce interests in the town of Ely.

SS: The Oregon Dunes National Seashore?

EC: Yes, that was on the Siuslaw National Forest on the Oregon coast. I was involved in that one when I was in the Forest Service. There was a lot of controversy and competition between the Forest Service and the Park Service on that one. The [Maurine Brown and Richard Lewis] Neuberger were deeply involved in that. That is one that the Forest

Service recognized as borderline. It was doing a pretty good job on the dunes. They are really not forested land at all. They are very spectacular sand dunes following a stretch along the Oregon coast. The Forest Service, while its position was opposed to the transfer, knew internally that transfer made sense, and it was not prepared to oppose that too strongly, and it never did. The thing just floundered. I think it is about to be recognized as a national recreation area under the Forest Service. It deserves such status and probably should be under the Park Service.

SS: One question about the North Cascades. I have heard that if the Forest Service had proposed a larger wilderness area in 1959, rather than a multiple-use program for so much of the North Cascades, that it would not have solidified the opposition causing them to fight for a national park, that many of the preservationists would have preferred to see the North Cascades remain with the Forest Service.

EC: I can't speak for what you refer to as the preservationists. I suppose you mean The Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, and the North Cascades Conservation Council, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, and the Mazamas, right? The wilderness people want the most wilderness they can get, period. They are just as selfish as the stockmen or the lumbermen or any other single-interest user of the national forests. They are insatiable in their appetite. They would like to convert the entire national park system and the entire national forest system into wilderness, or so it seems.

Your question referred to the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area, which is south of the North Cascades National Park. If they had made this three or four, five or six times larger and included the area north to the Canadian boundary in a great big wilderness area, I'm sure this is what the wilderness groups would have preferred over a national park. A national park is not the same as a wilderness area. A lot of people get confused and talk very loosely and erroneously and equate wilderness areas and national parks. National parks are to, first, preserve the area and, secondly, to maintain it for the enjoyment of the people. National parks have roads in them; they have trails. They have hundreds and hundreds and thousands of visitors who use them. They have overnight accommodations. They are oriented, not only for wilderness purposes, but also for mass recreation use. And the wilderness people don't like that. The wilderness people are trying to get as much of the national parks converted into wilderness areas as they possibly can. If they could just shortcut the national park system entirely and get it all in wilderness under the Forest Service, that would suit them fine. That is probably why you heard that argument.

I don't know whether it is true or not. I don't think these groups would ever be satisfied with what the Forest Service did or with the Park Service either, for that matter. It is a specious argument in my opinion. And the North Cascades area should not be locked up so that the only people that can get to it are people who have the time, the money, the health, and the youth to go in there on horseback or on foot, thus precluding everybody else from ever seeing the beauty of those mountains. And that is what would have happened if it had been wilderness. So I think the Forest Service's plans for it or the Park Service's plans for it are far superior to having the whole area made wilderness. It finally ended up in national parks, two recreation areas, and two wilderness areas.

The great bulk of the people don't utilize wilderness areas. Many people who are for wilderness never go in one. A lot of people who live in New York City and have money support the wilderness philosophy. It's good to have wilderness. As I say, we--I'm speaking of when I was with the Forest Service--were the ones that first got any administration to support wilderness legislation, but you can go too far. You can make it so special and so private that only this very privileged group are allowed to enjoy the wilderness. This, I think, is a violation of both the national forest and the national park concept.

SS: Do you feel that the Park Service, in its drive for territorial expansion, has violated the original terms of its creation?

EC: It hasn't violated the basic act; maybe it has bent it a little bit. You see, it gets to a matter of judgment. The Park Service has this basic operating act of 1916, but this is not the act under which areas are made into national parks or recreation areas or monuments or historical areas or rivers or trails or various other units that are in the national park system. The Park Service has a great many different kinds of units in it. The Park Service is different than the Forest Service in this respect. It takes an act of Congress to establish most of these areas. They are established by individual acts of Congress; whereas the national forests are not. The national forests were done administratively under general legislation. This is a fundamental distinction. Therefore, when you speak about, say, the Current River in the Ozarks in Missouri, it does not violate the national park concept. It does not because it was an act that established that area as a suitable national scenic river, by determination of the Congress. Look at the Lake Mead Recreation Area. It was established by an act of Congress. It was the first national recreation area to have been established. The Park Service attempts to administer those areas in

accord with the individual acts creating them.

The thing is, in the opinion of some people, the Park Service has tended to lower its standards of what should be in its system. It has sort of run out of the fantastically unique and scenic wonders. It is putting in areas now that are more plebian. It is responding to the need for areas closer to eastern centers of population. Take the Appalachian Trail, for example, which Congress just created as a national scenic trail. It is very popular in the East, very heavily used, and now it has national protection. You put that same trail with the same scenery and those same mountains in the West, and it wouldn't get any attention at all. It is oriented to what the country offers; it is where the people are. Take the Lincoln Homesite in Indiana. There is nothing very spectacular about that, but is a valuable historical thing. I tend to think sometimes that the Park Service has lowered its standards a little too much. But Congress makes that decision in every single case.

SS: You mentioned in "Saga of a Law," page 18, that it would have helped the Forest Service to have included a statement in the Multiple Use Bill to the effect that the national forests are of national significance?*

EC: I don't remember whether I said it there. This would have helped us in some of our problems with the Park Service at the time. Congress pays a great deal of attention to the term "national significance," and it has never been defined. The national parks are recognized as being of national significance. This is one of the arguments for a redwood national park as distinct from just continuation of the state redwood parks, the national trails, the national scenic rivers, and the national monuments.

Of course, the national forests carry the name national, but most use of the national forests, except one that is on the border of a state, usually is from within the state. It is mostly nonnational in character. If the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act had, by act of Congress, established the national character of the national forests, it would have helped the Forest Service in offsetting one of the arguments that the Department of the Interior used when it was trying to transfer jurisdiction of a portion of the national forests, claiming that within the Park Service it would be of national significance and have national protection. That is about the only reason.

*Crafts, "Saga of a Law," Part I, p. 18.

SS: And why wasn't such a phrase included?

EC: I think that we were not aware of the importance of doing it at the time. I am sure that is the answer. We didn't think of it. We could have done it, but we became aware of the importance in having it done after the fact. It was just too late.

SS: Why did Conrad Wirth oppose the Multiple Use Act?

EC: Why did he oppose it? You would have to ask him that, to be sure you're getting the right answer. But my belief is the Park Service was fearful that at the last minute some language would be put in the act, maybe in conference, to preclude any more transfers of land between agencies. They may have been worried, also, that if general legislation of this nature passed, one of the things it would do would be to build up recreation as a Forest Service function and thus make it more difficult for the Park Service to work out transfers of lands between agencies. This fear was something that the Park Service anticipated might happen. Actually, the Forest Service, as I have said, did not pursue the Multiple Use Act for reasons of protection against the Park Service at all. But the Park Service, looking at it from its own eyes, was fearful that the act might have an adverse effect on its interests or that some very specific prohibitory language might be put in. Those are the only two reasons that I know.

SS: Did the Rockefeller interests take any stand on the Multiple Use Act?

EC: No, the Rockefeller people really hadn't gotten involved in Forest Service activities at that time. They didn't become involved until the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission study was nearing completion. Prior to then the Forest Service had no contact with the Rockefellers, didn't know them. The reverse was true, also.

SS: So then, groups like the Conservation Foundation and the National [interrupted].

EC: The Conservation Foundation didn't exist at that time.

SS: Okay. How about the National Parks and Recreation Association?

EC: That didn't exist either.

SS: Have the pressures to take over Forest Service land by the Park Service decreased since the passage of the 1960 act?

EC: The Multiple Use Act had no effect one way or the other on that subject. In fact, there have been a number of transfers since then.

Relations between the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers

SS: Did rivalry between the Forest Service and the army Corps of Engineers give any added impetus to the Forest Service's development of multiple use?

EC: No. I think that was not a factor at all. As a matter of fact, at the time there wasn't too much rivalry between the Forest Service and the corps. The two agencies got along pretty well. The corps administers about one hundred and sixty reservoirs in connection with its civil works program. Its total land ownership around these reservoirs is only about four million acres. That's about the size of maybe two national forests. So it's very minor. And only a few of these are inside national forests. There are some that are entirely inside national forests. There are others that are partly inside national forests. Specific boundary problems sometimes arose where corps inholdings occurred--some in Texas, some in Oregon, and others around the country. But the two agencies, in general, were able to work these things out. They agreed in some cases to have the Forest Service administer recreation at corps projects and in others for the corps to administer recreation on intermingled Forest Service land. In some cases, they worked it out so that the corps would administer one side of the lake and the Forest Service the other side.

Both of these agencies were professional agencies in the truest sense of the word. The corps was not acquisitive for land. It was pushed into recreation by the very fact that the water was there and the people came. And I speak with some knowledge because since I retired I did a four-month job for the corps on its recreation policies and management and have a fair familiarity with the corps's functions. I had many dealings with the corps when I was in the Forest Service, and rivalry is too strong a term. There was, sometimes, conflict of interest. Moreover, there was a mutuality of respect. There were a few occasional sore spots, but at the responsible policy level in the two agencies things were generally worked out. Sometimes the Forest Service thought the corps did a poor job and vice versa. Sometimes the Forest Service didn't do too well; sometimes the corps

didn't. But it was not at all comparable to the situation between the Park Service and the Forest Service.

SS: When a reservoir is built on national forest land, who builds it?

EC: The corps may build it; the Bureau of Reclamation may build it. They may be built, sometimes, by local government.

SS: How is it decided who will build it?

EC: An act of Congress is what sets it up for reclamation or corps reservoirs. Sometimes they are built under the Small Watershed Act, which is administered by the Soil Conservation Service. Mostly, these things are determined by the Congress, either by substantive legislation or by appropriations.

SS: And this causes no rivalry?

EC: There is great rivalry between the Bureau of Reclamation and the corps. Both of them are in the dam-building business in the seventeen western states. But there is no great rivalry between the dam-building agencies and the Forest Service. The Forest Service recognizes the need for water for flood control, irrigation, domestic or industrial use, and recreation--multiple-purpose projects. The impact on surface management from flooding land is negligible insofar as the total national forest system is concerned. Probably the use of these areas for artificial lakes is about as valuable a use as can be developed.

Relations between the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management

SS: Were there any conflicts between the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service that might have contributed to multiple-use development, for example, the problem of the national grazing lands?

EC: I think you mean the national grasslands.

SS: Yes, I'm sorry.

EC: The national grasslands, of course, were in the Department of Agriculture long before they were assigned to the Forest Service for

administration. They are the old Bankhead Jones farm-tenant lands that were acquired during the depression as submarginal, tax-reverted lands. The government picked them up. They were administered for a long time within the Department of Agriculture, and then they were converted to land-utilization districts. The question finally came up during the Eisenhower administration, "How long should the government hold onto these lands?" Some of them, under procedures that I now forget, were returned to private ownership. They were resold, but it was decided, after surveys, to retain some of them in federal ownership because it was felt they were submarginal for private use. These were scattered all up and down the Plains States, clear from Canada to the gulf.

Up to then the Forest Service hadn't been in the picture, but then the question arose, "Who is going to administer these lands that are scheduled for permanent retention?" They were in the Department of Agriculture, and the Forest Service not only was the principal land administering agency in the Department of Agriculture, but also it was in the grazing business. These were mostly grazing and watershed lands. The Forest Service was the natural repository.

These lands were not, however, typical national forest-type lands. They weren't mountainous lands; they were plains lands. They had minimal timber on them. Not too many of them had valuable recreation use. So the Forest Service was trying to figure out what in the world to call them. We had a staff meeting one day and came up with the idea of national grasslands. That is how the name got established. It was just an administrative choice, a decision of the chief's staff, but it caught on. I am proud to say "national grasslands" was my suggestion, as was "Boundary Waters Canoe Area" when we renamed that area at another time. Then for a long time the Forest Service administered those national grasslands under different laws than applied to the national forests. Eventually some legislation was passed making them subject to the same laws and regulations as the national forests.

During the time when the question of jurisdiction and permanent administration of national grasslands was under review, consideration was given to whether they should be transferred to the Department of Interior and merged with the public domain lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. I know the BLM people were very unhappy that they hadn't thought about the name national grasslands and called their whole empire national grasslands. But the Forest Service got there first and thought about the name first and latched on to it.

Some people in the Interior Department regretted that it didn't receive the national grasslands for administration. It would have made a lot of sense, really. But, here again, it was a question of jurisdictional responsibility, and the Forest Service could do the job just as well. We had two agencies, both qualified to administer these western grazing lands. But at that time, the Forest Service was more professional and less subject to political influence than the Bureau of Land Management. It had been in business longer. It had somewhat higher standards. Its grazing lands were in better condition than the BLM lands. Its grazing fees were higher. There were a lot of reasons.

But there wasn't any real connection between the national grasslands and the Multiple Use Act. These were two independent moves of the Forest Service at that time. You can claim--and I think it is correct--that the national grasslands, in the broad sense, are multiple-use lands in that they have grazing, wildlife, watershed, and recreation. But very few have timber.

SS: They are covered by the Multiple Use Act?

EC: Now they are, yes.

Need for the Act

SS: I wanted to discuss the need for the 1960 act. Has timber historically been the dominant use in terms of the legislation governing the Forest Service?

EC: The 1897 act and perhaps the act of 1891--I think more the 1897 act--provided, among other things, that the principal purposes of national forest establishment and administration were for timber and water.* They didn't give one purpose priority, but it named just those two. Later the Weeks Law came into the picture in 1911 for the eastern national forests with essentially the same objectives. So those were the purposes of establishment up until the Multiple Use Act.

* Forest Reserve Act of 4 June 1897, ch. 2, 30 Stat. 34-36, 43, 44, 16 U.S.C. secs. 424, 473-482, 483, 551 (1964). Also known as the Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill of 4 June 1897.

But the functions of administration, as I said the other day, were custodial in the very early days--protection against trespass, fire, insects, disease, and overgrazing. In the early days, grazing was the principal use. There was the protective function and the grazing function. The timber was just sitting there. The watershed function up until about World War II was principally a protective function. It was there; the streams originated in the high mountains that were nearly all national forests. That was where the snow fell and where the snowbanks were. But the Forest Service didn't do much affirmative watershed management until the 1930s, until the CCCs came, and then they built many check dams, erosion control structures, and stream diversions.

I guess the 1930s would really be the dividing point between custodial and management functions. It was during the depression and the time of the CCCs that the Forest Service made the big transition away from a mainly custodial function. Grazing was very important in the thirties. Timber was just beginning to be important. Recreation was important. The service was beginning to take affirmative action for the control and manipulation of the watershed, using both revegetation and structures.

Later, during World War II, timber boomed. Timber has been the preeminent resource function ever since World War II, up to and including right now. Recreation was slowly beginning to accelerate, and it has accelerated very rapidly in recent years, particularly since 1960. Recreation, I think, is now the number two function, although that is the wrong wording to use. Number two in terms of appropriated money. You asked about wildlife. Wildlife, of course, is very important. The wildlife were there; there were protected. But again the affirmative action for wildlife habitat management started about in the thirties.

A lot of people don't understand the Multiple Use Act. It doesn't mean you have got to have all five resource uses on every acre. It doesn't even mean that you've got to have these five uses on every district. There are a number of things that it does mean. This is what people don't understand. It means that on an area of substantial size--generally defined as about the size of a ranger district--you will not only find these uses, but you also will find affirmative management of the resources on which they depend. The latter means affirmative action by the Forest Service to enhance these resources, to protect them, to manage them, and to manipulate them. And you must have on a designated multiple-use area, such as a ranger district, three out of the five to qualify as multiple use. So you have to have

three out of the five on an area about the size of a ranger district, and the Forest Service has to take affirmative action to enhance those three.

The equal aspect of the Multiple Use Act only means that when the Forest Service is developing its plan for administration and management of a multiple-use area, such as a ranger district, in its consideration of how to manipulate, how to plan, how to manage, it will give equal attention to all three. It doesn't mean that it will come out in the plan that all three will be given equal dollar expenditures, equal manpower expenditures, or equal effort. On some multiple-use areas grazing will obviously be much more important than timber and vice versa. But when you start off at the beginning to make a multiple-use development plan, then they start out equal. You didn't ask that, but I wanted to get it in.

Impact of the Act

SS: I was going to ask all of those questions that you answered, so that is fine. What I had originally been trying to get at was just how much of a departure the 1960 act represented in terms of the actual administration of the national forests.

EC: Do you mean if the act had been administered the way it was conceived? Or do you mean the way it has been administered?

SS: Whether or not the passage of the act really made a difference in the administration of the national forests. The Forest Service has said that the act wasn't a departure, but yet they said it was a very significant piece of legislation.

EC: It is a piece of defensive legislation, as I think I have explained, to prevent any particular use from assuming the driver's seat. It was a protective and defensive action. The act should have resulted in major changes in administration. It should have resulted in a stop, look, and listen reassessment of what the Forest Service was doing in terms of the act and its legislative history.

The act passed in 1960, and I left the Forest Service in 1962. During that two years the Forest Service was stopping, looking, and

listening. It was reassessing the balance between the different uses and developing what purportedly were multiple-use plans.

From 1962 on, I looked at progress under the Multiple Use Act from outside the service. I think what actually happened was the Forest Service found it very difficult to get hold of the concept in precise terms. The service forgot the requirements of size of area, three of five resources, and affirmative management actions. It had difficulty translating generalities of the language, definitions, and history into specific working mechanics.

Also, there was a big change in Forest Service leadership. People who were running the Forest Service and who understood the act and its subtleties left about that time. [Richard E.] McArdle left; I left; [Verne L.] Harper left; [Earl] Loveridge had left before. There was a big transition in the top management of the Forest Service. The new staff who took over to run the Forest Service shortly after the Multiple Use Act passed were men who had not participated in the conception nor enactment of the statute and who didn't really know the legislative history and intent. The one exception was Ed Cliff, who had nothing to do with enactment of the act. Reynolds Florance, whom I mentioned, the lawyer, remained, and he knew it better than anybody else. Unfortunately, he was in an advisory position only. He was not in a decision-making role.

Therefore, the Forest Service put a very superficial and sometimes erroneous interpretation on the act. The service tended more and more to use it as a propaganda cloak. Everything fell under multiple use, and who can argue against multiple use because it is all things to all people. They used it as a justification for whatever they wanted to do, instead of applying some of these rather specific interpretations and guidelines that I have tried to describe. Many of the multiple-use plans that resulted were so general that they were meaningless. So the service lapsed back into the pattern of a general multiple-use plan that was so general it didn't mean much and depended on administrative guidelines for specific functional plans--one for timber, one for recreation, one for grazing, and so on. These functional plans were competitive with each other.

Such handling finally caught up with the Forest Service, so the service has been accused, and with some justification, of using the Multiple Use Act to mean all things and as a propaganda weapon. But the act was not intended to be a propaganda weapon at all. This was not one of the purposes of it. The directives in the act have not been used effectively or successfully to stand up to the timber people. The

service has tried in some cases, but there are people in the Forest Service, the functional specialists, who were similar to the commodity users outside. There are timber management people who are out to enhance the timber management function of the Forest Service. There are grazing people who wish to enhance the grazing function. These men didn't, in their actions, subscribe to the basic philosophy or concept of the act which they were supposed to administer.

This happens frequently with government officials, particularly in regulatory agencies. The Forest Service, in this sense, was a regulatory agency in that it was regulating the use of these various resources on the lands entrusted to its care. Frequently regulatory agencies--like the people who are supposed to regulate the electric utility industry, for example--become the spokesmen or advocates for the industry they are entrusted to regulate. This seems to be a disease they catch. And the Forest Service has been subject to some of this. Really, it is very easy for me to sit here now, being removed from responsibility, and criticize. The Forest Service has had enough irresponsible criticism directed against it.

I really think the Forest Service has not done as well as I know we hoped it would do, and possibly as it could have done, in translating generalities of the act into specific application; in achieving a proper balance between uses; and in using the act effectively to overcome the pressures from the timber people or the other users for excessive use of the commodities in which they trade. So I have been disappointed in the implementation of the Multiple Use Act, not only by the Forest Service, but also by the secretary of agriculture and by the Congress. Most people, the federal executive and legislative branches, don't fully understand what the act was supposed to do and still don't. The Forest Service has done a poor job of getting the concept of the act understood, even among its own personnel.

Defining Multiple Use in the Act

SS: I reread last night McArdle's speech at the Fifth World Forestry Congress in 1960, and I get a much clearer view of what multiple use means

than I do from reading the definition within the act itself.*

EC: McArdle's speech is more specific. We didn't want things too specific in the act. Hindsight is always pretty good. It would have been far better if a number of the guidelines that were in McArdle's talk had been included in the House and Senate committee reports and thus made part of the legislative history. We should have done that, but we didn't. It was a real mistake that we made, looking back, because most people don't even know that talk existed. Most people in the Forest Service today will draw a complete blank if you ask them about it. Even if they have heard of it, they haven't bothered to read it.

At first we tried policy directives, orders, and everything else to make that talk as much of the act as any piece of legislative history, but I am sure we were not successful within the Forest Service in doing that. Possibly it wouldn't have been well to have those three guidelines in the act itself. But they should have been in the committee reports, and then some of the problems that the Forest Service has since faced would not have developed, at least not to the degree they have.

SS: Why wouldn't it have been well to have it in the act, for example, that multiple use means more than two uses?

EC: Someday we might want to change that and might want to make it mean four. I don't know. Probably now if you were passing the act, it would be in the act. The trend in Congress is to pass less and less general legislation and become more and more specific in the natural resource field. Forest Service statutes like the 1891 act, the 1897 act, the Weeks Law, and even the Multiple Use Act are general statutes giving wide administrative discretion to the executive branch. The executive branch likes this because it is given more flexibility to meet unforeseen situations, and it lets them adjust and adapt to times, and so on.

Congress, particularly the interior committees under the influence of the recent chairmen of those committees, is getting way away from general legislation into specific legislation. This is why the Land and Water Conservation Fund is specific; this is why the Park Service

*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 (Seattle: University of Washington, 1962), pp. 143-145.

legislation is also specific. The Congress spells out minute details right in the statutes. The agriculture committees, which were the ones that handled the Multiple Use Act, tend to favor the more general type of legislation. But still the trend of the times in Congress is to be less general and to give less latitude to the executive branch. The Multiple Use Act was about the last piece of general legislation the Forest Service ever got through.

Discretionary Powers of the Forest Service

SS: Do you think this tendency toward more specific legislation is [interrupted]?

EC: Good or bad? Is that what you're driving at? I have mixed feelings on that. I worked with the Hill for thirty years. [Pause.] I think probably the trend to have more specific legislation is a good thing because it is a reflection of change in the country. It is a reflection of intensified management; greater value of resources in the lands involved; greater use; and greater population pressures and pressures on these lands. Congress is supposed to be the policy arm, and if you leave the statutes too general, the executive branch becomes the policy guide. I think probably in some cases specificity has gone too far. But, in general, I think that the trend toward more specific legislation is probably a good thing. It tends to make Congress more of a partner and share responsibility.

SS: Some of the wilderness preservationists have accused the Forest Service of having too wide a discretionary power, administrative power. Even Samuel Dana, in Forest and Range Policy, mentioned that the Forest Service had a great deal of, not only independence with the department, but a great deal of freedom.*

EC: The Forest Service did have that to a considerable degree, and still

*Samuel T. Dana, Forest and Range Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956). For a preservationist discussion of the Forest Service's discretionary powers, see Ian Burton and Robert W. Kates, Readings in Resource Management and Conservation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 189-201; and "The Wilderness Bill: Nobody Wants It But the People," Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 3 (March 1960): 2.

has it to some extent. He was talking about the subject long before the Nixon administration took over. His book was written long before then. The Forest Service doesn't have much discretionary freedom now. They are really tied down by the secretary's office. The secretary's office has been cutting into Forest Service discretion during the last several administration.

I remember when Clinton Anderson was secretary of agriculture, he commented once, "God help the secretary of agriculture who crosses the Forest Service." You should remember that the Forest Service had its men scattered in eight hundred to a thousand ranger districts; it had its roots in towns all over the country. It could develop tremendous pressures if it wanted to. It had a very fine subterranean lobbying system, and it took risks, gambled, and men were willing to do it. The Forest Service formerly had great latitude, but it has lost a great deal of that latitude.

People criticize that latitude when the Forest Service does not do what they want it to do. But they feel the latitude is fine when the Forest Service is using the latitude to agree with them. It cuts both ways. For example, I don't imagine the preservationists, as you call them, would have criticized the Forest Service for creating primitive areas in the national forests. Yet that was purely an administrative action with no endorsement from the Congress whatsoever. So as I say, it all depends on who's ox is being gored.

SS: Do you think this trend away from such discretionary power is good?

EC: No, I don't think so because it means that the politicians in the executive branch are running the Forest Service more and more. Traditionally that has not been the case. This has been one of the great strengths of the Forest Service; it has been professional. It can be overprofessional and lose touch with the people. There may have been some of that in recent years, but it has been remarkably free of political pressure, political domination, and political guidance. This has been one of its great strengths. As it becomes controlled more by the secretaries of agriculture, Office of Management and Budget, and the White House, this introduces politics into the picture.

SS: In other words, this discretionary power that the Forest Service has had, has meant less political and public involvement?

EC: Not public. Less political involvement because they could ignore the politicians. In the past they could not make the service do what they wanted it to do. It did what it thought was best. Unless the

Forest Service had men who were crooked in positions of responsibility and would be tools of some particular interest, this freedom was a good thing. The Forest Service was attempting to read the public interest. And these were dedicated men. Most of them were men of rocklike integrity.

There has never been a scandal in the Forest Service of this nature. There has never been a financial scandal in the Forest Service. There has never been a public interest scandal in the Forest Service. People can criticize the Forest Service and berate and damn them up one side and down the other, but they have never questioned the honesty or the integrity of the service. As long as they can retain integrity and make their voice felt at top levels, it is better for the service to have independence. Service employees are not running for office; they are not trying to get reelected; they are not trying to curry favor in Oregon or Washington so they can get reelected as senator or congressman from a particular state. You see, they have that independence.

But when you get an administration such as the Nixon administration, there can be trouble. For example, the timber industry has close liaison with people in positions of power in the White House. The orders come down from the top--do this or do that. That is bad. It is real bad. This has been one of the great contrasts between the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service, on the one hand, and the various resource agencies of the Department of Interior over the years. The latter have been politically dominated.

SS: Which gives the public a greater control over resource allocation?

EC: I think the one that I favor does because all the people can speak through their elected representatives and through their appropriations committees, and legislation can be passed. But when you represent this lumberman or that preservationist who knows John Doe, who happens to be secretary of agriculture or staff assistant to the president, you're not getting a cross section of public opinion. You're getting a very particular special interest zeroing right in at the top. Five years from now it may be John Smith down in Arizona, who happens to be a big stockman, who knows the secretary of agriculture.

One time Secretary [Ezra Taft] Benson became secretary of agriculture, and he was a Mormon. All the Mormons who had ever had grazing complaints against the Forest Service flooded in on Benson. I will say this about Benson. He was very much embarrassed by this, and he didn't respond to it. But this is the way people try to take

advantage. Complaints that had been settled for ten or fifteen years all came to light again as soon as Benson became secretary of agriculture because they would all write him as Brother Benson. As long as he took no active role in settlement of the complaints, it was all right. But if he had said to the service, "I want you to do this," or, "I want you to do that," then the chief would have to do it or quit. But Benson stood his ground. He was a strong secretary. So as long as the Forest Service is counselled and advised, but not ordered very often, I think it is better.

The whole trend in the executive branch is centralization of power in the Office of Management and Budget and the White House, with less and less power in the cabinet departments, cabinet officers, or subcabinet officers, and even less in the bureau chiefs. Things have changed very rapidly, you understand. This has nothing to do with multiple use. This is a centralization trend that has happened during the last several presidencies, but particularly in the last two years. Nixon has pulled power away from his cabinet officers and centered it in the White House staff and the Office of Management and Budget. These are anonymous people. Many of those people who make the real decisions that control what the Forest Service or other agencies do are staff members who occupy relatively minor positions in the Office of Management and Budget. The public never even hears about them. This isn't good.

SS: If the Forest Service is largely operated on the basis of wide discretionary powers on the part of what are essentially full career professional technicians, or whatever you want to call the foresters, how does the public control the resource allocation questions in multiple-use situations?

EC: I gave you one example. The public controls through Congress. It controls through the biennial and annual elections and by picking a president. You made one erroneous assumption in your question by stating that the Forest Service is run largely by foresters. There are about forty professional disciplines in the Forest Service, and I would say the foresters represent less than half the professionals in the service. There is a very wide cosmopolitan group of various kinds of disciplines that are in the Forest Service, not just foresters.

Also, the service has its own internal administrative devices to sense public opinion. If you are sympathetic to the Forest Service, you think such devices are good; if you don't like the Forest Service, you don't think they are good. I refer to such mechanisms as multiple-use advisory councils on the national forest level and on a regional

level. They did have one on the national level, but Secretary [Clifford M.] Hardin did not reappoint it so it has been allowed to lapse. The service has appeal processes--both informal and formal appeal processes--for people to go through. And a citizen can reach the secretary of agriculture through the appeal devices. Also, they have the usual avenue of appeal to representatives in Congress.

SS: So the pressure through the legislature is largely on appropriations or actual pieces of legislation?

EC: It is both appropriations and legislation. But a lot of it is just day-to-day relationships. Congressman Doaks calls up and says, "I have a problem in my district; let's get together and talk about it." So he and the service representative sit down and talk about it. And a lot of times they work it out. This is just the daily liaison, which was one of my jobs when I was in the Forest Service.

Most of the dozen or so top responsible people in the Forest Service used to have wide acquaintances on the Hill. They have lost some of that relationship in recent years. Congressmen and senators are calling the Forest Service constantly. The Forest Service may get a hundred letters a day from members of Congress about questions on behalf of their constituents. This is constantly going back and forth all the time. This is not unique just to the Forest Service. It is true with any real estate agency of the federal government which is administering land and which is involved with people to the extent the Forest Service is involved.

SS: I'd like to get back in awhile to some of the things you were talking about--the multiple-use councils, for example--but one further question on this problem of discretionary powers. In talking to one avid wilderness enthusiast about multiple use, his feeling was that the discretionary power that the Forest Service had held, has caused the service to be more politically oriented and to be more concerned about its public image and to become a very powerful lobby. You yourself admitted the Forest Service has become such.

EC: No, you're wrong. Admitting carries the wrong connotation. On the contrary, I helped to build up Forest Service congressional relations. I am proud of it. I think it was the thing to do. The term admission carries a connotation that it was wrong, and I disagree with that thoroughly. The Forest Service was and is sensitive politically, and it should be. There's nothing bad about politics. The politicians represent the people in the states or the districts that they come from. They have to stand for reelection. If there's anyway to get a reading

of public opinion, they ought to have a feel for that opinion. Why shouldn't the Forest Service be sensitive to their views and have good contacts with members of Congress and be able to work things out and talk to them?

Any agency that administers land or real estate--and the Forest Service has about 12 percent of the United States entrusted to its control--has thousands and thousands of users who do so for different reasons. Frequently the objectives of different user groups are in conflict. Therefore, somebody has to make the decision, and this is the job of the Forest Service after due consideration of differing views.

Recently a new trend has developed in the country. Those who happen to be displeased with a decision are less and less willing to accept it and thus abide by the system of government that we have. So they berate the establishment, the Congress, and the executive branch, which are exercising the functions given to them by the Constitution. This is one reason why discontented users have turned to the judicial branch in recent years. Involvement of the judiciary may or may not be a good thing. It's too early to tell. In some respects it's probably good, but it can go to extremes, and it's also time-consuming and costly. I think the Forest Service was wise in being sensitive politically and was and is wise to let people know about issues as they occur, to have these advisory councils and appeal procedures.

I might say that nearly all the quotations you've given me in the last couple of days are from people who are mainly wilderness advocates or preservationists. This must be your focal point of contact, which I think is too bad if that's true because to carry on an interview of this sort you should have balanced contacts with all the user groups of the national forests and not just the wilderness preservation groups.

SS: But when I ask these questions I'm taking another viewpoint;

they're questions to stimulate a response rather than [interrupted].

EC: I understand that.

SS: advocate a particular philosophy of my own.

EC: I understand.

SS: I will say this much, that the best discussions of multiple use that at least gave me ideas of questions or tackled the problem really came from, for example, the Sierra Club Bulletin as opposed to the papers of the NLMA [National Lumber Manufacturers Association].

EC: Have you ever talked to any of the leaders in the lumber industry?

SS: Yes I have.

EC: Have you ever talked to Bernie Orell, for example?

SS: No, I've never met him. But the only wilderness man that I have talked to was Grant McConnell. I've never talked to any of the others at all, but [interrupted].

EC: He's pretty reasonable.

SS: But I read all of American Forests, and I really got very little help on what multiple use actually means, so perhaps some of my questions tend to come more out of [interrupted].

EC: All right. Let's get to the question.

SS: But in any case it's not a question of personal advocacy but [interrupted].

EC: I understand that, but you would get different questions to ask if you talked to other people is what I'm trying to say.

Definition of Multiple Use

SS: I'm sure. It was too bad that I didn't talk to other people, but

Grant McConnell is in Santa Cruz, so I talked to him. But in any case this question of discretionary powers I thought was worth discussing.

Now, I want to get back to the actual passage of the act itself. We were talking before about the definition of multiple use. Did any of the groups involved in the act want multiple use more closely defined than it was in the bill?

EC: No, as I recall there wasn't any real issue or question which arose on that point. The basic question was whether it should be defined at all, and Penfold was the principal advocate of having a definition in the act. The definition was drafted really by the Forest Service and Penfold working together. Reynolds Florance was the chief architect. As it finally passed, there were some changes in punctuation, but that's all. Unless you really get into this, it's difficult to conceive of how carefully the phraseology was chosen. I mean every word was weighed. The Forest Service hesitated in having it defined because we feared it might get changed in some disadvantageous way en route through Congress. It turned out all right. There may have been one or two minor moves, but I don't remember anything major in the definition where changes were attempted. It seemed to be generally acceptable.

SS: You mentioned that Clem Miller had advanced a definition that was unacceptable to the Forest Service. You mentioned this in "Saga of a Law."* Do you recall what that definition was?

EC: I don't recall what it was. I think he was stimulated in that by a man named Bill [William] Duddleson, who at that time was working for Clem and who is now with the Conservation Foundation. Bill's a good friend of mine. He might be able to give you a little insight into that, but I do not remember the details of what Clem wanted that we didn't.

SS: Was the Multiple Use Bill in any sense a partisan measure?

EC: Oh, no. Absolutely not. It was introduced by fifty or sixty members of the House and a number of senators on both sides of the aisle. It was not partisan at all, in any way, shape, or form.

* Crafts, "Saga of a Law," Part II, p. 32.

The Regional Forester's Role in Legislation

SS: How much of a role did the regional foresters play in the legislative process, particularly in the Multiple Use Act?

EC: Now which are you asking--the legislative process in general or the Multiple Use Act in particular?

SS: I guess both.

EC: Well, the regional foresters exercised a role in policy formation within the Forest Service through the constant interchange between the Washington office and the regional office by personal contact, phone, and wire. The regional foresters are in Washington frequently; the Washington people are in the regions frequently. Then there were the annual regional foresters' meetings when we all got together for several days. So they had substantial inputs into the policy positions that the Forest Service took on almost any question, including legislation.

They were consulted when we were deciding whether to go ahead with the Multiple Use Act. I don't remember how they felt about it. My belief is probably most of them thought we should take the gamble. None of them raised any question about the concept. Internally they exercised a policy-advisory role, which was a very important role. They were sort of the pulse that we had on feelings around the country. Everything from the lower echelons came up through them to us and vice versa.

When it came to legislation before the Congress, regional foresters occasionally would come in and testify. If it was a piece of legislation of local impact, like the O & C controverted land legislation that affected just the state of Oregon, the regional forester would be in on drafting the bill or in our review of it if it had originated in Congress. We would send him drafts of policy positions and testimony to comment on. Sometimes we'd ask him to initiate their preparation. When it came to more general types of legislation, such as the Multiple Use Act, that affected all regions or several regions, then their role was usually less specific, but nevertheless it followed the same pattern of counsel and advice.

The regional foresters would respond to questions about the bill from people in the regions which they represented, or they would supply information about the legislation and the Forest Service's position.

Sometimes people would want to express themselves for or against a piece of legislation. About all the Forest Service could do in these situations would be to tell people whom to write to or the mechanics of how to get themselves scheduled as witnesses and so forth. It was very rare that the Forest Service would request somebody to testify or attempt to influence legislation because, you see, this could get into questions of legality. The Forest Service was very careful to stay legal on this sort of thing. But serving as a channel both ways to and from the people really was what the regional foresters did, plus their own internal policy inputs.

They exercised another role, often a very important one, when congressional committees would travel. They would handle the logistics for the committee in their region. If a committee was coming out to visit certain national forests or look at particular situations, the regional foresters would work all this out. Usually there would be one or two people from the Washington office along, frequently myself, but when we were in a particular region the responsibility and burden shifted to the regional forester. There's an awful lot of preparation for this type of thing, both in the simple things--like hotels, transportation, appointments, food, communications, press coverage--plus the more technical aspects of arranging for the rangers to be on hand, working out the schedule, and showing congressmen the things they want to see. So these were the ways in which the regions and the regional foresters individually participated in relationships with the legislative branch.

If the regional foresters were assigned to one region for any length of time, they got to know the congressional representation from the states in their region. When the regional foresters visited Washington, they would call on these people. Also, there would be frequent telephone conversations back and forth directly from congressional members to the regional foresters, and this was encouraged.

Really about the only control we exercised on regional foresters was, they were not free to write a member of Congress and state a policy position without that letter clearing through the Washington office. They could write it and sign it, but it had to pass through our office for approval before transmittal because sometimes the regional foresters would state a position that might not be fully in accord with the position of the agency. Then we'd intercept it and work it out with them. Other types of correspondence they carried on directly.

SS: Did most of the regional foresters favor the Multiple Use Act?

EC: They all did.

SS: They all did?

EC: Yes.

SS: I read somewhere that J. Herbert Stone favored the use of a phrase coordinative use.*

EC: If he did, I don't remember. He favored the bill even if he may have preferred a different phrase.

SS: Would coordinative use mean something different than multiple use?

EC: Not to me it wouldn't.

SS: I was wondering if it was a [interrupted].

EC: No, I don't get the significance of the difference.

Attitude of Lumber Interests

SS: In the 1950s the NLMA opposed the idea of multiple use. Then they came around, and they eventually favored the passage of the act. At least I get this idea from reading the organization's papers. Now what caused this change?

EC: I think basically you're right, although I think their favoring it at the end was a very lukewarm feeling. There was very strong division of opinion within the National. The principal architect of support from the lumber industry was Bernie Orell, who was a fairly new vice-president of Weyerhaeuser. He formerly had been state forester of Oregon or Washington.** The key meeting on this with the National was in San Francisco when [Richard E.] McArdle went out and talked

*"Wilderness Needs a Multiple Use Hearing," Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 5 (June 1960): 2.

**For discussion of Bernie Orell's role in the Multiple Use Act, see Crafts, "Saga of a Law," Part II, p. 35.

to them. Orell, of course, was vitally involved in that meeting. At that meeting the two of them persuaded the policy makers on the governing board of the National to go along with it. So they did.

I don't believe they were ardent in their support because they felt they might be losing the preeminent role of timber. Bernie recognized this, but he also recognized that times were changing, and that if they didn't support the bill, it was probably going to pass anyway. If they opposed it and it passed, they would not be in a very good position. Also, he felt the time might come when recreation would get so strong that the timber people would be glad to have the equality with recreation that the Multiple Use Bill gave them.

SS: Is that a possibility?

EC: Yes, of course it's a possibility. In fact, I think it's quite a likelihood. I think timber will get progressively less important, and the nonconsumer uses of the national forests will get progressively more important. I don't think there's any question about that.

SS: So would you say that without Bernie Orell the situation would have been very [interrupted].

EC: Without him, I think, the lumber people would have opposed it.

SS: And without their support could the legislation have passed?

EC: It is very hard to make that type of conjecture. It would have been more difficult, much more difficult. It was a lot easier to be able to go before Congress with support and no major focal points of opposition. I think the bill probably would have passed anyway. I think it might well have taken longer than it did, but it probably would have passed.

SS: So when the bill did pass it had at least the lukewarm support of the lumbermen as well as [interrupted].

EC: Support of the designated spokesman for the lumber industry, as well as the stockmen, the recreationists, wildlifers, the water people--the whole ball of wax.

SS: That was quite a feat.

Bureau of the Budget

SS: I'd like to spend a few minutes talking about the questions I have on the actual passage of the act. You mentioned that the bill was log-jammed in the Bureau of the Budget for two years.* Now why did it just sit there?

EC: Lots of bills sit there that long or longer. Many bills are buried permanently there. The Bureau of the Budget wasn't very enthusiastic about it. It had other things to do. Also, they had some question as to its desirability. Possibly somebody had spoken to them against the bill, somebody within the executive branch, and that helped to hold it.

I think that probably, though, it was more apathy, disinterest, and lack of understanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget as to why it was really needed, lack of persuasion. And it was a bill that came up from an agency to them, rather than from the White House down. The Bureau of the Budget is always overloaded, and they have to give priority to things. Matters that don't originate from on high get less attention than those that do. It was probably all those reasons.

SS: You mentioned in "Saga of a Law" that the Multiple Use Bill, as first introduced into the legislature, was a product of the Bureau of the Budget's draft, not of the Forest Service's draft.** How did they differ?

EC: I don't have the two drafts to compare. A man named Fenton Shepherd called up when they finally decided to move it, and he was the man in their Civil Works and Natural Resources Division who was assigned the responsibility to work on it with the Forest Service. I knew Fenton so he called me. They had a number of questions about it, minor questions, as I recall, not major ones. There are a lot of people in government who feel they have to express things in their own way. It gives them something to do, or they're just of that nature; they want to rewrite everything. The Bureau of the Budget tended to do that a little bit in those days, and Fenton as an individual tended to be that type of individual. So we agreed on the consequential, substantive things. He said he'd like to try his hand at shaping it up, so I said go ahead.

*Crafts, "Saga of a Law," Part I, p. 16

**Ibid., p. 18.

So they sent back a revised draft. Then we negotiated out some things between us. The final bill wasn't precisely as he had redrafted it, but it was basically his redraft with compromises on some things we wanted changed. Why did they do a rewrite job? I don't know. I think the impact of the bill would have been just the same with either draft.

Mining: A Multiple Use?

I do not recall that the BOB made any major, substantive change except they wanted to get mining included, and we didn't want mining as one of the multiple uses. Budget insisted because they called it a legitimate use of the national forests. Naturally it was, but it wasn't a renewable use of the national forests, and we didn't want mining or minerals included because to do so would introduce the secretary of the interior into the policy decisions. We wanted these multiple-use decisions to be made exclusively in one department, not a divided responsibility between two departments. So we just left that part out and sent it up to the Hill. We violated instructions to do it, but we did. We just left minerals out of the act, and they never challenged us on it so we got away with it.

SS: Why wasn't wildlife excluded from the bill on the same basis that mining was?

EC: It's a renewable resource.

SS: Yes, but on the basis of divided administration.

EC: No, the Interior Department didn't have anything to do with it. The hunting or harvesting of wildlife was administered by the states. The management of wildlife habitat is administered by the Forest Service.

SS: Mining is destructive to the landscape. Wouldn't it have been better if it had been included in a sense of making it a more complete multiple-use program?

EC: It is a debatable question. This was the way the Bureau of the Budget felt. But, of course, some timbering is destructive of the landscape, too, and so is overgrazing, so is uncontrolled erosion. All of these

things if mismanaged are destructive of the landscape. But the mining came under a different set of laws, and basically it would have been divided responsibility. This was what we were trying to avoid. But you can develop a very good argument for minerals to have been included and the mining laws to have been changed. Ours was a pragmatic solution, is what it was, rather than a theoretical solution.

SS: Did the American Mining Congress care one way or the other?

EC: I don't know because mining was never included, but they apparently didn't mind being left out.

SS: They didn't?

EC: No, no because they were operating under their own body of law. This didn't override anything, didn't affect their law, didn't change it one iota. Whether they would have objected to having been included or not, I don't know. They might very well have.

SS: Would you think it would be better for multiple use in the national forests if mining were transferred from the interior to agriculture?

EC: Yes. I think this is one of the big problems. Maybe not so much transferred. That isn't phrased right. The minerals in the national forests should be disposed of under a leasing provision under the control of the secretary administering other resources of the national forests rather than by the mining-patent procedure where the individual gains fee title to twenty acres inside a public domain land. He also secures title to the resources on those twenty acres. It would be better to lease minerals as is done for grazing. That's the way it should be, and that's been the policy of the Forest Service all along. That's the way they are disposed of on the eastern national forests under the Weeks Law. The 1872 mining laws apply only to the public domain national forests. This is bad, and it has never been corrected.

Industrial Use: A Multiple Use?

SS: Was there any consideration given to including industrial uses as one of the multiple uses?

EC: Timber is an industrial use. I don't understand you.

SS: I was thinking like power lines. I've seen some Forest Service posters lately that have included as one of the multiple uses industrial uses, meaning power lines and that sort of thing.

EC: I don't think this should have been mentioned. Power lines are not a resource. It's a special-use permit. The Forest Service has many special uses as summer homes, roads, pipelines, and others. No, this bill covered management of the basic renewable resources produced from the land. Transmission lines across the national forests are a different type of use.

SS: I was just wondering if it had been considered.

EC: Yes, the answer is yes. It was considered, but we chose not to include that type of use. We didn't think it fit the concept. We didn't just overlook it. We did not forget about it.

Sustained Yield in the Act

SS: Which part of the act, multiple use or sustained yield, was the most important part when the bill was first conceived or first introduced?

EC: Neither. I would say they were of equal importance then and now. Multiple use gets the most attention, but the directive in the act applies to both sustained yield and multiple use. The definition of sustained yield is very, very important. So I would say they were of equal importance at the time and still are or still should be.

SS: The thing that prompted me to ask the question is a historian by the name of Smith in The Politics of Conservation [interrupted].*

EC: He was a former congressman.

SS: He said that the bill had first stressed sustained yield, but that the

*Frank E. Smith, The Politics of Conservation (New York: Pantheon Books, 1966), p. 289.

Democratic conservationists had reversed it, feeling that it would cause a fight, and emphasized multiple use.

EC: That's absolutely untrue. I don't know where he got that idea. Maybe in Congress at the time. Smith had nothing to do with getting the act passed. He didn't serve on any of the committees that handled the act. I don't know where he got that idea.

SS: That was page 289 from The Politics of Conservation.

Administrative Clearance

The Forest Service chose to push the bill through both houses in one session. You mentioned in "Saga of a Law" that you were afraid that you might lose administrative support.*

EC: We weren't successful in getting it cleared through the Bureau of the Budget during the first session of whatever Congress it was. So we didn't get the go-ahead sign within the administration until the beginning of the second session of Congress. And the way these things work, when an administration takes a position on a bill, that position holds during the remainder of the Congress that was in session when the position was taken. Then if the bill doesn't pass and the same bill comes up again in the next Congress, the administration's position is reconsidered regardless of whether it's the same administration continuing or a new administration. At the beginning of every Congress nothing carries over. Everything starts over again. Positions on legislative proposals are reevaluated.

We had so much delay and so many problems in getting clearance from the administration that we did not want to risk going through the clearance process again. We knew we would be faced with a completely fresh start within the administration, and we might be faced with a completely new administration. It was just too uncertain to take that gamble. At least, that's the way we judged. So we decided to go for broke and try and get it through in one session. We would much rather have had two sessions, but that wasn't the way it worked out.

* Crafts, "Saga of a Law," Part I, p. 17.

Reaction of Department of Interior

SS: At this stage did interior attempt to block the bill?

EC: Oh, they were throwing little blocks in it. No major objection, and I don't think there was any official objection, but they were making problems for us.

SS: Was there any competition between the House Committee on Agriculture and the House Committee on Interior?

EC: No, the interior committee didn't get into it at all until the bill got out of the House Committee on Agriculture, and then Interior Department people stirred up members of the interior committee a little bit and got them wondering just what was going on. I think as it went through the floor, Congressman [Wayne] Aspinall and John Saylor raised some questions about it and made some legislative history about it. I know we talked to them about it before it came up on the floor and pretty well allayed their fears. So there was no committee competition at all until almost time for floor action. Then there was a little interior committee concern and interest in the bill, but that was pretty well taken care of. The same thing did not happen on the Senate side at all. The interior committee on the Senate side didn't show any interest in the bill.

SS: Was there any feeling within the Forest Service that the passage of the Multiple Use Act would mean greater ease in getting appropriations, especially for uses other than [interrupted].

EC: We hoped it would. I don't know as we thought that it would. I guess you could say we thought that it might help us get a better balance in appropriations. We hoped it would mean more money for under-funded things rather than less money for the adequately funded things, but we didn't go at the bill for purposes of the money.

Equal Priority for the Multiple Uses?

SS: The phrase "equal priority" didn't appear in the Multiple Use Act.

EC: That's right.

SS: And I gather that some Forest Service men did not wish to have that phrase in there.

EC: I think [Edward P.] Cliff objected to it. He struck it out whenever he found it in the letters or in the legislative history. I guess he felt it was too confining and too restrictive. But we put it back in. McArdle and I put it back in, not in every place he struck it out, but in a number of places. So you will find it in the legislative history. But he was the only one who raised a question about it.

SS: And he was an assistant chief at the time?

EC: Yes.

Richard E. McArdle

SS: I gather that McArdle was generally the type of man who avoided controversy whenever possible. I could be erroneous in that impression. Did supporting the Multiple Use Act represent a departure in this attitude?

EC: I think your impression of McArdle is probably a little wrong. He didn't go out to seek controversy, but he didn't avoid it at all costs. He was a high-principled man. He would take a position on what he believed in, and if controversy came, why, let it come. But he had a pleasing personality. He was an extrovert. People liked him, and he liked people. He had a way of expressing things in a noncontroversial way. He didn't balk on the Multiple Use Mining Act. He didn't balk on any pieces of controversial legislation we handled when he was chief that I can remember. He handled the Multiple Use Act with the timber people. That was his doing, and that was certainly highly controversial.

He did play down or change the Forest Service's posture and role on regulation of private cutting practices. I think he did that for two reasons. Partly, I guess, it was his belief that maybe about as much good has been accomplished out of regulation through the fear of it. The other was a very pragmatic and political view that under the administration he was confronted with, of President Eisenhower, Sherman Adams,

and Ezra Taft Benson, he had about as much chance of getting regulation as a snowball in hell. So, if he wanted to stay on as chief and do the best he could for the Forest Service on other matters, he'd better quit fussing about regulation.

SS: So McArdle and Bernie Orell worked closely together?

EC: Yes, on some things they did.

SS: I'm sorry, with specific reference to the Multiple Use Act.

EC: Yes, on the Multiple Use Act they did.

SS: So it was McArdle's personal [interrupted].

EC: Excuse me. I worked very closely with Bernie, and Bernie worked with Mac and me, but the key meeting that I referred to out in San Francisco with the directors of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association was handled by McArdle, and that was the most significant.

SS: Do you remember the year of that meeting?

EC: The act passed in June of 1960, so it must have been in the spring of 1960.

SS: Was this a public meeting?

EC: No, no! This was a private meeting with the board of directors of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Wilderness Clause in the Act

SS: There was some question as to whether the act should contain a clause on wilderness, which it finally did, and whether wilderness should be entered as one of the multiple uses. Was there any fear that the lumbermen wouldn't support it if such were included?

EC: It wasn't so much a fear of the lumbermen. The Forest Service didn't want wilderness designated as one of the multiple uses, and I talked about this in my AFA article. The amendment on wilderness came up

suddenly, and it's the one thing that we didn't know in advance was going to arise. The wilderness people pulled a fast one on us. They were the only group that did, all through the passage of this act. We worked completely on the up-and-up with all the other interest groups, and vice versa, including the lumbermen and stockmen. The wilderness people were the only ones who surprised us, and I think it was rather unethical. Anyway, at the last minute when the bill was being worked up by the Senate committee, they proposed an amendment to make wilderness one of the multiple uses. This was argued back and forth by the senators. Senator [Hubert] Humphrey straighten it out really and sort of put [William] Proxmire and a couple of those others in their places. They really didn't know what they were arguing about. The Forest Service did not object to wilderness being named. As the language finally came out, it was acceptable to us, but we would very strongly have objected to having it named as one of the separable multiple uses because this would have equated wilderness as a distinct use from recreation and equal in priority to timber, water, and the rest. Wilderness is not. Wilderness represents a very small part of the national forest system, and it basically is a form of recreation use.

SS: Yes. I understood that from the article. I was just wondering [interrupted].

EC: But it was not the fear of the lumbermen on our part. That was a straight philosophical confrontation between the Forest Service on the one side and the wilderness people on the other.

SS: You mean the wilderness people introduced [interrupted].

EC: They sprang it on us in the executive session of the Senate Agriculture Committee at the mark-up time, when the bill was being marked up and reported out. Three senators introduced the amendment in the form of a telegram they'd received from Howard Zahniser. McArdle and I were there at the invitation of the committee. It was a closed session; these mark-up sessions always are. We were there to advise the committee, and three senators produced these identical telegrams--I think they were signed by Zahniser and Charlie Callison. This is what I mean by springing it on us; they had not told us they were going to do this. We didn't have any forewarning from them, although we had worked with them right along. Mac and I just had to whisper to each other and decide right then and there what we were going to do without consulting anybody.

"Greatest Unit Output" and "Greatest Dollar Return"

SS: There was some question as to whether the phrases "greatest unit output" or "greatest dollar return" should have been put in. Were these purely monetary phrases? What did they mean?

EC: They're both in there. They were mentioned adversely. It meant we wouldn't use either one of these measures--such as board feet per acre or income per acre--as necessarily the combination of uses that would be controlling. This was to get away from the cost-benefit ratio being applied to the national forests. This ratio is commonly applied in flood-control projects both for reclamation and corps projects and is very commonly used in water projects all over the country. With the cost-benefit ratio you try to evaluate the costs on one side and the benefits on the other in dollar terms; with this ratio they try to convert all the intangibles into terms of dollars.

The Forest Service just plain never subscribed to the cost-benefit ratio theory because we felt that many of the uses of the national forests were intangible and that intangible uses cannot be converted into dollars in any sort of nonarguable way. Depending on a person's philosophy and point of view, they can calculate a lot of dollars or a few dollars. Who can put dollar value on the worth of a sunset or a value of a night's camping out? It may or may not have anything to do with how much it cost the man to camp. When you refer to wilderness areas--it is nearly all intangible--there are certain costs, like people who get lost in the wilderness or people who lose their lives in the wilderness. When you get into a cost-benefit ratio on wilderness, all that would have to be considered. I remember many years ago we spent \$60,000 a year just hunting for lost people in wilderness areas in one region. Do you wish to consider that cost in deciding whether to make an area a wilderness area? This was the type of thing we tried to get away from, and we did get away from it.

SS: Did this represent a departure then in Forest Service [interrupted]?

EC: No, it didn't represent a departure. It represented reaffirmation by statute of what the Forest Service had been doing. But the service had been under considerable pressure to start applying the cost-benefit ratio approach, and we didn't want to do it.

SS: Did some of the Forest Service men oppose putting those phrases in there?

EC: I guess only the watershed people. They were pretty well indoctrinated with the cost-benefit ratio approach, but the others were very glad to get out from under it. Incidentally, this is the only statute that I know of that has included a disclaimer of the cost-benefit ratio. It is a very unique phraseology.

MULTIPLE USE IN ACTION ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Dominant Use versus Multiple Use

SS: I understand that multiple use means that, first, all uses be given equal consideration and then at least three uses will be actively managed on any one area of land.

EC: Also, the area has to be of consequential size. Now, the statute doesn't say this.

SS: But even if there are three uses, wouldn't one generally be dominant?

EC: It very likely might be. Probably would be. In the actual administration and management in some cases one use and some cases another use. Sometimes it might change. An area might be predominantly valuable for timber for awhile, and then later recreation might come along and be the dominant use; or it might switch from timber to grass or vice versa. But in respect to your question you should get into an interpretation of what constitutes dominance, whether by dominance one were talking about the most money coming into the treasury, the most Forest Service people assigned to the job, the most people being supported by that use, or some other yardstick. What does one mean by dominance? You see, it's a very difficult question.

Your question is very difficult to answer because to answer it you and I have to have the same definition in our minds of what constitutes being dominant, and that's never been defined. So the dominant-use theory is much more vague than multiple use because multiple use is defined by statute with legislative history and interpretation to refine it. "Dominant" never has been, and it can be construed in as many different ways as there are people who choose to use the word.

SS: Is the Public Land Law Review Commission much of a threat to the Multiple Use Act or the administration of multiple use by the National Forest Service?

EC: You mean the commission's report? The report itself isn't. If it is converted into legislative language and enacted, it could be. It all depends on what Congress passes.

SS: I assume you don't think that dominant use would be better than multiple use.

EC: You're asking such general questions I can't adequately respond. I would have to see what is proposed for enactment or what was enacted and how matters are defined to say whether, in my judgment, they would be better or not. But I'm inclined to think not. We didn't select dominant use at the time. We thought about this for several years very carefully with some of the most experienced minds in the service, and I think the choice of multiple use and sustained yield was not a mistake. In some ways, dominant use and multiple use are almost the same thing. Take a working circle or ranger district and you decide in this segment the principal or dominant use is going to be timber, and on this other segment the principal use is going to be recreation.

I suppose that's what we do when we designate a wilderness area. This is an application of dominant use within the framework of multiple use. It's also what Congress does when it designates by statute a national recreation area. The dominant or paramount use in those cases is a form of recreation. So these are departures from multiple use, if of sufficient size, because timber or recreation is given first priority by statute. But I think it would be unwise to compartmentalize the entire national forest system by saying these acres are for timber, these are for grazing, and these other acres are primarily for something else. This really would destroy the degree of flexibility that administrators need.

Technology of Multiple Use

SS: Do you think that multiple use has been advanced by technological advances? It seems to me that good multiple use hinges upon technology, the knowledge of how to make these uses compatible. For example, I read where they're learning to log so that watershed can actually be improved. I just wonder if they have the technology yet to practice multiple use successfully.

EC: I think I touched on that before when I said one of the difficulties in

its application has been that the Forest Service has not been very successful in translating the generalities of the statute into the mechanics of application. I think gradually the technology is being improved in all fields. I don't think it's as much a technological problem as it is a management problem. By that I mean applying the various technologies that are available, although I haven't kept up on this closely in recent years.

Multiple-Use Decisions and Reviews

SS: Who actually makes the multiple-use decisions? Is it the regional forester?

EC: That's a good question. I believe the way it is now, the multiple-use plan either has to be approved by the regional forester or his designee or by the chief. When I was in the service, it used to be the chief or acting chief. Then the individual functional plans within the framework of the multiple-use plan also had to be approved by the chief. I think they've since been delegated to the regional forester.

But, you see, they not only have the general multiple-use plan and the subsidiary functional plans, like the timber management plan, they also have detailed operational plans, which are usually approved and implemented by the actual officer on the ground, which is usually the district ranger. Lots of times they aren't even approved by the forest supervisor. This is one area where the things fall between the chairs. The things that happen on the ground are frequently approved at the lowest level even though the principles in philosophy and theory are approved at the higher levels. Sometimes there's a great gap in application between what is intended policywise and what actually happens operationalwise.

SS: Would the same apply to the decision as to whether a hearing should be held on a multiple-use plan or a decision to convert an area to wilderness?

EC: If you're talking about a hearing by the national forest multiple-use council, that decision would be made by the forest supervisor. If you're talking about the regional council, it would be made by the regional forester. It would vary depending upon which group you're

talking about.

SS: And the Forest Service just makes that decision on the basis of each situation?

EC: That's right. I think they have some guidelines in the manual to guide forest officers: under certain conditions you will do this, other conditions don't qualify, and this sort of thing. But I'm not familiar with the details of how these matters work.

SS: After the passage of the Multiple Use Act, they set up advisory councils. Have these functioned successfully?

EC: That depends on who you talk to. The Forest Service thinks that in general they have. They take a great deal of time, effort, preparation, and cost the government a lot of money. People who are pleased with decisions think they function successfully. People who are displeased think they have not.

SS: What type of review procedure do they have after a multiple-use decision is made?

EC: There's available always an appeal procedure. A person who has a contractual relationship with the Forest Service can always appeal through a very long, technical, quasi-judicial procedure, which costs a lot of money and of which the government pays most of the cost, particularly if the appellant wins. First, the hearing goes through all the various steps of the Forest Service; then it goes before the secretary of agriculture and through the hearing examiners of the department. It is very much quasi-judicial. Everything is on the record; there is cross-examination by lawyers, and so on. This avenue is open and sometimes followed by lumbermen, by stockmen, and others who may have a good bit at stake. Then there's the informal review procedure which is much cheaper, less formal, and stops at the chief's level. One can follow either avenue he wishes.

SS: Are you familiar with court cases where the Multiple Use Act was [interrupted]?

EC: None of those came up, up to the time I left the Forest Service. That has all happened since I left the Forest Service.

Forest Service and Public Opinion

SS: Do you think that the role of the Forest Service is to act more as a leader in public opinion, to help educate the public--I know they develop a lot of educational programs to explain multiple use to the public--or more to follow what the public wishes to have done with its resources?

EC: You mean which is the role of the Forest Service or which should be the role?

SS: Which should be, and which is.

EC: Actually, neither with respect to the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act. The idea was to get this act to help in the administration of the national forests in their day-to-day operations. This is really what should be the principal purpose of the act and the principal function of the Forest Service. The idea of propagandizing or educating, which is the same thing depending upon your point of view, is something the Forest Service has taken unto itself. I think the principal objectives of the act were to help protect the national forests against single-interest groups and to give the administrators latitude to administer in what they thought was the public interest.

POST 1960 DEVELOPMENTS RELATIVE TO MULTIPLE USE

Multiple-Use Advisory Committee

SS: You made brief mention earlier in our interview of the multiple-use advisory committee to the chief. This was established after 1960?

EC: Whether they had one before 1960 or later, I'm not sure. I think not. They started after 1960 and during McArdle's regime.

SS: How do they function, and is it still [interrupted]?

EC: I mentioned this earlier. Actually, it is the secretary's multiple-use board; it isn't the chief's. Appointments have to be made by the secretary, and Secretary Clifford Hardin did not reappoint the board, so it lapsed under the present administration. But they did function quite successfully from the time they first were created until the present administration came into power a couple of years ago. They met usually twice a year. Members were outstanding citizens--men and women of national reputation and nationally known--of diverse interests, diverse backgrounds. They would meet sometimes in Washington, sometimes in the field.

They would raise issues, and the Forest Service would raise issues and seek advice and policy guidance. It was very helpful. It was helpful for the Forest Service to get the reaction and the judgment of these people who think somewhat differently and were not close to the everyday problems. And it was helpful to these people to receive an interpretation, translation, and understanding of what the Forest Service was trying to do. Usually these people would be headquartered pretty well around the country. In picking them you would try to avoid a concentration of one discipline or one locality.

Outdoor Recreation Resources Review

SS: I'd like to ask about the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review. Was multiple use considered in that report?

EC: I had nothing to do with the preparation of that report except in an advisory capacity to the secretary of agriculture, but I got to know the report pretty well later on when I was director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. My recollection is that multiple use did not enter into consideration of the commission in any consequential way. I'm sure it was talked about, but I believe it was not entered into in any major way. I'm just trying to think over in my mind the fifty or fifty-five major recommendations of the commission. I don't believe multiple use was involved. I could be wrong, but I think not. You see this recreation report was not a multiple-use oriented approach. This was a single-purpose approach. The recreation commission was for the purpose of studying recreation, not for a balance, and it put the emphasis on providing adequate recreation on the land and facilities for the recreation needs of the people. It as single-interest, single-purpose, oriented just like the Timber Resource Review was oriented toward timber. So multiple use was not the function.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

SS: How about the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation?

EC: Same thing. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was a single-purpose bureau.* I was its director, and, of course, I'd been exposed to multiple use in all my recent years in the Forest Service, so I thought that I understood it well. I would say that while the bureau's purpose was the advancement of recreation of various kinds and sorts, some of the things it did enhanced the Forest Service's implementation of multiple use.

For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund supplied moneys to the Forest Service to acquire primary recreation lands in the eastern United States. This tended to enhance the recreational value of the eastern national forest and helped build up one of the uses that

*For discussion by Crafts of the educational-recruitment needs of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, see Department of the Interior, News Release, 13 March 1963. For a copy, see Appendix J, pp. 140-147.

needed to be built up. The bureau pioneered the first successful legislation on national recreation areas, creating a new type of recreation-conservation system. And several of the national recreation areas, under the laws creating them, were assigned to the Forest Service for administration. Within limits this could be construed as a type of multiple use. Certainly over a big enough area it was. The national trails system and the national scenic rivers system came out of the legislation which the bureau originated. Both wild rivers and national trails helped enhance recreation on the national forests and therefore were conducive to promoting multiple use through getting a balance between uses.

High-Timber Yield Bill

SS: In 1969 you testified for the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources before the subcommittee on forests of the House Committee on Agriculture on the bill to establish a high-yield timber fund.* What would the impact of this bill have been on multiple use in the national forests?

EC: You could go back and read the testimony, which pretty well covers that question. But as I remember the bill, it would have established timber as the number-one priority use in the national forests, and as such it would be the antithesis of what we were trying to do under the Multiple Use Bill. So it would have destroyed the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Bill and the equal consideration being given to the various resources. It was a reversal of position by the timber people and an effort to again become number one.

SS: Now was it in any sense a reaction to the Multiple Use Act?

EC: That's a good question. I wasn't close enough to the genesis of that high-timber yield bill to be sure that I can give you the right answer. I think in part it probably was because I think the lumber people were getting kind of tired of the Multiple Use Act being thrown in their

*U.S., Congress, Senate, hearings before Senate and House banking committees, on S. Doc. 1832, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 1969.

faces as the reason why the Forest Service wouldn't do this or that about timber.

I think it also was a reflection of the facts of life, particularly in the West, that private timberland owners were very short of timber and wanted more and more national forest timber put on the market and also wanted the allowable cut upped more and more to increase their supplies. The more timber that's thrown on the market the more there is to bid for, the less the competition, so the more chance you have to get some, and the more chance you have to get it at a lower price. Many companies didn't have their own timber to rely on. They just plain needed timber. I think it was probably a combination of those two factors, probably the second being the most important.

National Environmental Policy Act, 1969

SS: What was the impact of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 on Forest Service multiple-use practices, if any?*

EC: I wouldn't know because I wasn't in the Forest Service at that time, and I have not been involved. You should really ask someone who is active in the Forest Service at the present time. I do know that the requirement of that act--I think it's Section 102--to file these environmental statements with the Council on Economic Quality has put a great burden on the Forest Service as well as on many, many government agencies. There's a tremendous extra workload imposed on the executive agencies by that act. The consequence has been, as so often happens when you get into something like that, that the agencies develop a format for a routine, standardized analysis and approach, and they just sort of crank them out. The environmental statements sort of lose their significance because they are so massive in number.

*National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, ch. 55, 83 Stat. 852.

Bitterroot National Forest Controversy

SS: Have you been involved at all in or know anything about the Bitterroot multiple-use controversy?*

EC: I'm indirectly involved. I know a little about it, mostly what I've read and what I've learned from talking to people.

SS: Do you agree, in general, with the conclusions of the study made by the Montana School of Forestry condemning the Forest Service practices to a certain degree?

EC: I haven't seen the Bitterroot myself since all this fuss has arisen, and therefore I'm very reluctant to express an opinion. I can only express what I suspect rather than know. If I were to see it, I might change my mind, probably would in one way or another.

First of all, the Forest Service made its own study of the Bitterroot when the controversy began to heat up, and it is a very careful, very exhaustive study. And while it's an in-house study and therefore immediately subject to suspicion because the agency is inspecting itself, it's done primarily by the research branch of the Forest Service, which is an independent branch and which functions independently. Whether the people believe it or not, I know it does. That report was very critical of the Forest Service's own operations and made numerous recommendations. I would be inclined to suspect that the Forest Service report was a pretty solid and fair analysis. Most people involved in the Bitterroot tend to overlook the Forest Service report or play it down, or they even just plain don't know about it, although it's published in attractive form with a colored cover and put up very nicely.

The one by the professors--and I know Arnold W. Bolle--was, I think, quite questionable in some of its conclusions. Let me say this, to put it in a nutshell. The fact is pretty well overlooked, that of the whole Bitterroot National Forest, this controversy centers on one and a half percent of it, a very small portion of the Bitterroot. However, the board does not point that out, and nobody who's criticizing the Forest Service points that out.

Secondly, I suspect that on that one and a half percent the Forest Service has probably cut too much, that the cutover areas have

*"Critics Wonder If Smokey's Still Guarding the Forests," San Francisco Chronicle, 9 May 1971.

been too large, that the terracing hasn't been satisfactory, that there's been accelerated erosion and all the bad things that are associated with poor clear cutting, even though it's in the type of timber that silviculturally may need even-age management. So I suspect a lot of what they're saying is true. As a matter of fact, the Forest Service's own report recognizes that matters got out of hand. But by the same token, it's been blown up out of all proportion when you consider how little it constitutes of the Bitterroot and how little the Bitterroot in turn constitutes of the region and how much the region constitutes of the entire national forest system. Such proportions are very conveniently forgotten by critics of the Forest Service.

Also, there's a personality factor involved here. The former supervisor of the Bitterroot, Mr. [Guy M.] Brandborg, whom I don't know, is the father of Stewart Brandborg, who is the executive director of The Wilderness Society. The father left the Forest Service a number of years ago under conditions with which I'm not familiar, but I'm told the relationship was not too happy. And at the time when he was supervisor, the Bitterroot was an inactive forest, in that the resources were not being utilized. Times had not yet caught up with the Bitterroot. I do know that since his retirement, Mr. Brandborg, Sr., has been critical of the Forest Service in this area, and he was involved in stirring up Senator [Lee] Metcalf, who in turn stirred up the University of Montana to have this study undertaken.

So to some extent this was a loaded study with the results sort of predetermined. The professors that made the study would claim my assertion is derogatory to their reputation and so on. And if I'm correct, of course, it is. I can't vouch for the verity of what I'm saying, but I think there's probably some degree of truth in it. This, I think, is not known by the general public. It certainly is known by the Forest Service, but it's not known by the general public, or those that do know about it don't talk about it.

Consolidation of the Federal Natural Resources Bureaus

SS: Do you think that a very broad multiple-use program would be facilitated by the creation of some type of bureau of conservation? There's been movements over the years to consolidate, to have the BLM [Bureau of Land Management] and the National Park Service and the U.S. Forest Service and several other agencies brought together.

EC: This is a very big question. It's been argued over, and fought over, and thought over by better men than I am--by the first Hoover commission, the second Hoover commission, the Ashe commission;^{*} argued by secretaries of agriculture and presidents and so on down the line. And it's impossible in this discussion that we're having here to get into this subject in any depth.

But I will express my own feelings regarding the present proposals to abolish the Department of Agriculture and distribute its agencies among four new departments, one of which would be a department of natural resources, which would be the present Department of the Interior renamed and reconstituted. As long as there's a Department of Agriculture, I think, the Forest Service should stay there. However, I cannot conceive that the Department of Agriculture will actually be abolished. There are too strong agricultural interests around the country and in the Congress to permit this to happen. But if it ever should happen, and the Forest Service must go someplace, then a department of natural resources is probably its natural home. But even if that were to happen, I would not be in favor of combining the Forest Service with the Park Service. I'm sure the Park Service wouldn't want to be combined with the Forest Service, nor would the Bureau of Land Management.

Most people, when they're talking about this subject, tend to forget that the Forest Service is made up of three coequal component parts. When discussing reorganization, people have in mind the national forests. They think it makes sense to fit them with the national parks and/or the Taylor grazing lands. They overlook completely the state and private forestry responsibilities of the Forest Service and the research responsibilities of the Forest Service. The Forest Service

*The Ashe Commission was set up early in the Nixon administration to study possible need for change in the bureaucratic structure of federal government. For discussion of the commission, see R. L. Ashe, "How the White House Got Its New Management Tools," Nation's Business Vol. 58 (August 1970): 44-46.

has one of the largest agricultural research organizations in the country and has an integral tie with the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture. It has a completely separate network of regional directors in experiment stations wholly independent of the national forests and the regional foresters. The only place these two branches come together is in the chief himself.

You cannot consider the national forests as synonymous with the Forest Service. Most of the Johnny-come-latelies in the conservation field tend to focus their attention on the national forests because they have become controversial. If special interests want more wilderness or more timber or more something else, they think about the national forests, and they forget about other coequal branches of the service.

I think that if the Forest Service were to be transferred to a department of natural resources, it should go as an entity and be retained as the Forest Service as a three-pronged bureau with three coequal branches. That organizational approach has been a basic strength of the Forest Service and has resulted in a great deal of the progress that has been made by the Forest Service and forestry in the United States. The Forest Service's responsibility has been much broader than just federal land and should never be forgotten when considering reorganization.

This is another reason why I object so strongly to the present proposal of the Nixon administration to set up the Forest Service in a department of natural resources. If you read the language in the recommended bill, it would transfer the functions of the Forest Service. The bill doesn't say it will transfer the Forest Service. Transferring functions are one thing; transferring an agency is something else. What probably would happen under the language of the bill, as the administration has proposed it, is that the functions of the Forest Service and of the Soil Conservation Service, for that matter, would be transferred. Then new agencies would be created. There would be reshuffling and regrouping of functions as the secretary, whoever he might be, might want to have.

Therefore, the U.S. Forest Service and probably the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management and the Soil Conservation Service could all disappear as organizational units. Those organizations that the nation has known and lived with over the years and that, in my opinion, have accomplished a great deal of good, could disappear, and a completely new and reconstituted, reshuffled group of agencies would emerge. I think this would be very disruptive, and a great deal of value would be lost. That is why I'm opposed to it.

Another reason I don't want the Forest Service to move from agriculture is because of the professionalism and the protection the Forest Service has been given historically over the years. Chiefs of the natural resource agencies in the Department of the Interior come and go as the political winds blow. I'm one example. Boyd Rasmussen, another assistant chief of the Forest Service, who was probably the best director the Bureau of Land Management has ever had, is another example. He's recently been kicked out of that job and moved to a staff job in interior. C. L. Forsling, who back in the forties was an assistant chief of the Forest Service, was the first head of the Grazing Service. He was kicked out. John Gottschalk, recently head of the Bureau of Sports, Fisheries, and Wildlife was moved.

There is no stability of tenure in the career jobs in the Interior Department historically. They are political jobs, and this affects the morale, affects the professionalism, affects the independence of judgment, and affects adversely the performance of the agency.

There has never been a chief of the Forest Service that has been fired for political reasons. There has never been a chief of the Forest Service who came in wholly from the outside and who was wholly inexperienced with the Forest Service. This is a very, very unique record. It dates back to 1905. It could happen someday, but I hope it doesn't.

Still another reason is that growing trees for timber, the manipulation of plant cover for water purposes, the manipulation of plant cover for wildlife and game management, and the manipulation of plant cover for grazing are all plant sciences. They are agricultural sciences basically involving soil, water, and vegetation. The expertise for such activity rests in the Department of Agriculture. It certainly doesn't rest in the Department of Interior.

SS: Is there any historical reason why interior has been so subject to political pressures?

EC: Most of the lands interior administers lie in the West. Most of the secretaries of interior have come from the West. Most of the members of the Senate and House interior affairs committees are from the West. There's your answer. The national forests mostly are in the West. The secretaries of agriculture are mostly from the Midwest--the Plains States or farm belt. The membership of the agricultural committees for the House and Senate are mostly from the Midwest or the Deep South. So this western location of interior functions and the western origins of the secretaries of interior and concerned congressmen make the agencies

more vulnerable to pressure. The membership of the agricultural committees of the Congress and the backgrounds of the secretaries of agriculture have made them much more independent of western pressures. Very good and very practical reasons.

Future of the Forest Service

SS: Do you think that the Multiple Use Act has and will continue to make the Forest Service able to withstand the pressures that it's going to have placed upon it for its resources?

EC: Who can tell? I couldn't predict that. The Forest Service is in trouble right now, deep trouble. It's in trouble partly because of itself, partly because of the administration that's in power, and partly because of the conservationists. A very large factor is attributed to the vocal conservationists who have traditionally been friends of the Forest Service and have now become the enemies. And I think the Forest Service is pretty close to being shot down by whatever you want to call them--the wilderness, wildlife, preservation, environmentalist groups--who are really going to kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

Whether the Forest Service can survive as an agency is questionable right now. It certainly won't survive as an agency if this reorganization bill goes through. Mostly conservation groups want it to go through as a means of getting rid of the Forest Service. There are a great many of these people who want to destroy the Forest Service. I don't know where they think they'll get something better. But, anyway, that's what they want to do. I think the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act was probably a relatively minor factor in the whole scheme of things.

The Forest Service is in very precarious times. It's been slow to be responsive; it's been stubborn; it's been obtuse; it has lacked perception; it has lacked foresightedness; and it has many faults. But it has a history of accomplishment that is unmatched by any other agency in conservation. It has a history of performance and very broad responsibility. It's a large agency if that's any merit. It may not be of merit; it may be of demerit. The Forest Service is old, big, and rich and has resisted change. It's the largest agency in the entire

Department of Agriculture in terms of manpower and money. It has tremendous responsibility. It has high standards. As I said, it has never had a scandal. I think Congress will look pretty hard before it destroys the Forest Service.

But there are many, many, many vocal activists in conservation who want it destroyed. It's partly they want to bring the big dog down. Since the Forest Service is Mr. Big, they're after Mr. Big. And it's a stimulating thing. If they can stir up a controversy with the Forest Service--if they're hired employees working for some organization, and they yap and yip at the heels of the Forest Service--maybe they'll ingratiate themselves with their bosses or think they will. This has been typical of trade association employees over the years, but now has extended to include employees of conservation groups as well.

I'm worried about the Forest Service. There are going to be some major changes very shortly. There have been major departures of key people just within the last few months. Cliff isn't going to continue as chief very much longer. Who will succeed him is very crucial, and whether the Forest Service continues in the Department of Agriculture is crucial. Those two things are probably the most crucial questions facing the Forest Service right now.

I wouldn't be a bit surprised to see the Forest Service transferred, even though the Department of Agriculture continues. I think that would be a tragedy. I wouldn't be at all surprised to see these things happen, and the Forest Service shot down. I think that's about it.

SS: I thank you for your patience.

EC: Well, you're very welcome.

C
O
P
Y

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN FOREST REGULATION ^{1/}

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you here this evening, and to participate on behalf of the Forest Service in this panel discussion of forest regulations. I shall try to explain to you the position of the Forest Service in this matter.

In the brief time available, I want to touch on four items:

- (1) The philosophical barrier to forest regulation;
- (2) Why some form of regulation of forest practices on private lands is needed;
- (3) What does the Forest Service mean when it advocates forest regulation; and
- (4) Why is Federal participation in Forest regulation necessary?

Some of the views I shall espouse probably will be in the minority. However, I believe they are soundly conceived, are in the interest of the Nation at large, and in the long run, time will prove them correct.

Over the years forest regulation has been a controversial issue. During the past decade, however, the area of disagreement has narrowed. The issue today largely centers around whether and to what extent the Federal Government should participate in public regulatory measures in forestry rather than the former issue of whether any public regulation of forestry on private lands is desirable.

The Philosophical Barrier to Forest Regulation

One of the greatest barriers to forest regulation, both in the past and today, is that much opposition is based on philosophical, psychological, and emotional grounds rather than on objective reasoning. I think proponents of regulation have rested their case largely on the forest situation in this country, and have given insufficient attention to philosophical barriers.

However it may be sugar-coated, regulation is an impairment of individual freedom. Our Nation was conceived in revolution against restrictions on individual liberties, and no one—Americans least of all—like to be told what to do. That is simply human nature.

There was a great deal of individual liberty in the United States as our young Nation progressed through its initial period of settlement and development. Like all nations, however, as population pressures grow, as technological developments bring people in closer proximity to each other, and as the Nation's commerce impinges on its natural resources, there must be more and more restrictions on individual actions in the interest of society at large.

^{1/} Paper presented by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief, Forest Service, USDA, at panel discussion on forest regulation, before the Yale Forestry Club and the Yale Conservation Club, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., Dec. 5, 1951.

Anarchy offers the maximum of individual freedom. Acceptance of government, - any form of government, - as a necessary institution of mankind is acceptance of the need for regulation of the individual for the benefit of society. Thereafter, matters of regulation relate only to degree. For example, the phrase "Free enterprise" actually represents a considerable degree of regulation, although it is often cited as epitomizing just the opposite.

When facts are against them or logic fails, opponents of forest regulation often resort to ridicule, or inaccurate and derogatory use of unpopular terms such as "totalitarian," "socialistic," and "anti-democratic" in an effort to discredit the proposal. This is a customary maneuver in debate, and is evidence of emotional resistance.

When used correctly, such terms are not descriptive of the proposals for forest regulation. "Totalitarian" applies to a highly centralized government controlled by one political party with no representation of other parties permitted. Forest regulation does not affect in any way our democratic government and two-party system in which the people retain supreme power through periodically renewed representation and delegated authority.

"Socialism" signifies government ownership and management of essential means for production and distribution of goods. Forest land and timber qualify as essential; but regulation of private forestry aims to keep private timber land sufficiently productive so government ownership is not necessary. Thus, forest regulation does not promote the socialization of private timberland but encourages the capitalistic system in which ownership of land and natural wealth is entrusted to individuals.

In 1944 Fortune Magazine, which is a spokesman not for government, not for labor, but for business management -- the group that traditionally oppose government controls most vigorously -- stated:

"Enterprise must make up its mind that it must conform to a planned program which takes into account the proper use of our resources.
 ---In principle Americans have a neat choice here between the spiritual values of fewer regulations and the material values of more potatoes.
 ---Above a certain level the national output we can have is a tight function of the control we are willing to take.---The purpose of government regulation is to keep the behavior of one individual from damaging too severely the welfare of other individuals.---The notion that there is a complete and universal coordination of individual and social aims ---is more often asserted than seriously argued. The fact is that the individual, left to his own devices, will in some circumstances do damage to his fellow citizens. The government must intervene on behalf of the community as a whole.---"

I give you this rather long quotation because it testifies to the change in progressive thinking within the last decade among one of the most conservative groups in our country.

On the legal side the constitutionality of forest regulation has been established by the Washington Supreme Court in a decision upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. According to the New York Times, the principle established was that "private owners of the Nation's renewable natural resources do not have the unqualified liberty to use and destroy them as they see fit." Said the Washington

Court, the "great unwritten compact --- between the dead, the living, and the unborn --- requires that we leave to the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources. Surely, where natural resources can be utilized and at the same time perpetuated for future generations what has been called 'constitutional morality' requires that we do so."

The specific and widespread endorsement of forest regulation by many organizations and groups is further evidence that --- at least for the record --- the philosophical barrier to forest regulation per se has been largely overcome. The Society of American Foresters, American Forestry Association, the C.I.O., the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Lawyers' Guild, the Isaak Walton League, and numerous other groups at one time or another have endorsed the principle of public regulation. Even the West Coast Lumbermen's Association and the Western Pine Association supported the Washington law when it was before the Supreme Court of that State.

The National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, one of the prime opponents of forest regulation in the past, no longer opposes it outright, but has issued a fence-straddling policy statement.

The Forest Industries Council, representing the American Pulp and Paper, American Pulpwood, and National Lumber Manufacturers' Associations, has advocated State forest regulation when deemed necessary or desirable by people of the State. The Council of State Governments has urged each State to consider forest regulation, and the Association of State Foresters recognizes the necessity in some States. The latter group could hardly do otherwise when one recalls that a third of the States already have regulatory laws of various sorts on their statute books.

Thus, I feel that a great step forward has been made in the last decade. Thinking Americans now pretty largely recognize the public interest stake in the individual forest enterprise. They recognize that a proper function of government is regulation to see to it that an individual does not destroy or leave in unproductive condition renewable natural resources on lands which he may own in fee simple.

However, a formidable psychological barrier still exists when one proceeds from the question of public forest regulation in general to Federal participation in such regulation.

Why Forest Regulation Is Needed

Despite the general acceptance that forest regulation is desirable in principle, let us examine briefly why it is needed. The need for forest regulation hinges on three points:

- (1) The Nation needs forest resources and forest products;
- (2) The condition of the Nation's private forest land to supply its share of those resources and products is unsatisfactory; and
- (3) Measures other than regulation will not by themselves assure the level of productivity on private forest lands required to meet the Nation's need for forest resources and products.

In the time available, I must dispense with No. 1. I think you all recognize it and accept it. The indispensability -- and I use that word advisedly -- of forest resources and products to the Nation's well-being and security is manifest to all of us.

As to the second point, the condition of the Nation's private forest land, here are only a few of the most basic facts. Three-fourths of our forest land is in private ownership. Therefore, if forest resources and products are essential to the national welfare, the healthy condition of private forest lands is likewise essential to the Nation. The latest surveys show -- and practically all authorities agree on the basic figures -- that the drain of sawtimber trees substantially exceeds growth. This is partially explained by the large areas of old-growth in the West, where there is little appreciable net growth. But these areas alone are not sufficient when they come into productivity to bring growth and drain into balance. Also, our present levels of drain are at a substantially lower level than the Nation may need in the future. Thus, we have a situation in which we are gradually using up our capital growing stock of the larger and better trees.

Do not let the near balance between growth and drain of all trees, small as well as large, deceive you. The smaller trees included in such a calculation are suitable for firewood and pulpwood but not for manufacture into lumber. And even here the total figures conceal a deficit of desirable softwoods which is largely offset by a surplus of less desirable hardwoods.

On private forest land two-thirds of the cutting is poor or worse; and 62 million acres -- or 18 percent of our private commercial forest area -- is poorly stocked or nonproductive.

Those who argue that all is well because the gap between growth and drain appears to be closing are practicing self-deception. The "closing of the gap" theory is based on trends derived from comparing past and recent growth-drain estimates. Such comparisons have little meaning for several reasons. The earlier estimates were little more than guesses; over-all comparisons conceal questions of quality and kind of timber; growth is bound to step up as mature old-growth is cut and replaced by young growth; and the level at which a balance may be achieved is ignored. Growth and drain would be in balance even if they were both zero.

The significant facts are that (1) the most recent estimates show a deficit of growth in relation to drain and, (2) the best forecasts of the future likewise show a significant deficit. Looking 20 to 25 years ahead and making generous allowance for present trends and improved practices, sawtimber growth may still need to be stepped up 70 percent above prospective levels at that time or twice 1945 levels. Likewise, if growth and drain of all trees -- small as well as large -- are to be in balance, growth will need to increase 10 percent above estimated future levels.

As to the third point, regulation is needed to restore lands to productivity because other forestry measures alone will not do the job. This country has an extensive system of public forests -- national and State. We are also embarked on an extensive system of public cooperative aids and services to private owners -- inducements, if you please, to get private owners to practice forestry. These cooperative aids and services include among other measures fire, insect and disease control, large-scale public forest research, individual technical advice and service, public education and demonstration, and planting aids.

Substantial progress has been made in recent years, particularly by the larger forest owners and operators, but relatively the progress has been much less among the million of farmers and small forest property holders. That is where the basic problems lie.

Industry can't do the job itself. It controls only about one-fourth of the private forest land and includes less than one percent of the owners. The 4 or 5 million small non-industrial owners, farmers, small town businessmen, absentee city folk, summer recreationists, and others, are not going to submit to direction by the small fraction of industrial owners, whose guiding motive is profit for themselves.

Those who say let public forests, cooperative aids and services, and private initiative do the whole job are being unrealistic. Public forests occupy largely the poorer lands. They will never be sufficiently large nor productive to meet the Nation's needs by themselves; and they should not be expanded to the point where they can. After a half century of public forests and after 25 years of the Clarke-McNary law, which is the basic authority for public cooperative aids and services, we still have an unsatisfactory forest situation. The outlook for two decades hence is continued unbalance of growth and drain despite progressive trends.

Public forests and cooperative aids and services have not done the job by themselves in the past and I believe they cannot do so in the future. The many groups, organizations, and States that are on record favoring public regulation hold this same view. (Otherwise, why should they favor it?) This viewpoint is the consensus of informed judgment in the United States today.

In some instances pleas for delay in regulation in order to give other methods more time may be based not on a sincere belief that other measures will do the job, but on a desire to procrastinate and evade the issue.

There is still another factor. The public is spending millions of dollars a year in cooperative aids and services. I understand it is not possible by contract or otherwise to establish a covenant running with the land for such services. You who are paying the bill should be protected in some way so that the private individual cannot take full advantage of public inducements and subsidies and yet turn right around and destroy his timber resource and the productivity of his land. You, the taxpayer, have a stake in that.

What Does the Forest Service Mean When It Advocates Forest Regulation?

The Forest Service believes public forest regulation, as needed in this country, is only one of a series of forestry measures necessary to keep our forest land in productive condition and to result in forest growth equal to our national needs. Forest regulation is not a panacea. It is not a substitute for other forestry measures. It is a complementary measure of coordinate importance with public ownership and public cooperative aids and services to private owners.

The forest regulation contemplated by the Forest Service does not involve volume or area regulation or sustained yield. In other words, the control exercised would not tell a man where, when, or how much he could cut.

The Forest Service believes that there should be State forest regulation, administered by the State. But it also believes, and this is where the issue lies -- that these State laws should be within the framework of certain over-all standards prescribed by Federal statute. It believes that State regulatory activities meeting

the Federal standards should be matched with Federal funds made available to the State. It believes the Federal Government should have authority to step in and administer regulation meeting the standards if the States fail to do so within a reasonable time. Should this happen, and the States subsequently enact State statutes meeting the standards, the Federal Government would in due course step out.

The Forest Service is sometimes represented as favoring straight Federal regulation without State action. This is not true.

The Forest Service believes the over-all basic framework as expressed in the Federal statute should be in general terms to provide where applicable for adequate re-stocking, to prohibit premature or wasteful cutting in young stands, to reserve for growth and subsequent cutting sufficient growing stock of thrifty trees to keep the land as productive as practicable, to prevent undesirable logging methods that will cause avoidable damage to young growth, to regulate grazing and prevent unreasonable damage to tree growth, to prevent clear cutting except where silvi-culturally desirable, and to provide for methods of protecting lands against fire, insects, and disease. It believes that the State statute, in addition to meeting these standards of forest practice, should also provide for administration by a single State agency, employment of competent technical personnel, and for advice and technical assistance of forest operations. It believes that different rules of forest practices should be established for different areas of the country; that there should be authority to except certain areas, that area advisory boards should be established to help formulate desirable rules of practice; and that working plans for individual forest properties may be approved in lieu of the standard rules of forest practice. This is the regulation that the Forest Service advocates.

It has been alleged that the Forest Service would favor a provision in the Federal statute that would permit the Federal Government to withhold any cooperative forestry assistance being rendered by it to a State unless the State enacts regulatory legislation meeting Federal standards. This is not the position of the Forest Service, and it would not favor such action.

Now I want to ask you to do something. At your leisure and when you are alone, take the trouble sometime to examine - critically but objectively - these regulatory proposals that the Forest Service stands for. You owe it to yourself and the forestry profession which you are about to enter to do so. Do not brush them aside because you may personally be philosophically opposed to regulation. Think them through one by one and try as you do so to offer constructive alternatives which in the aggregate will accomplish with surety the over-all objective of bringing our forest land to reasonably productive condition and preventing deterioration. If you do this, I think you will find there is little in these proposals that the professional forester or expert in public administration can constructively criticize.

Why Is Federal Participation Necessary

May I say first that Federal participation in forest-regulation is the official position of the Department of Agriculture, has been supported by the four most recent secretaries of Agriculture, by five Chiefs of the Forest Service, including two of your most eminent alumni - Gifford Pinchot and Henry Solon Graves, by the present Secretary of the Interior, and by the late President Roosevelt.

There are two reasons for Federal participation: (1) National interests; are involved, and (2) the States themselves will not do the job.

As to the first point, I think we all recognize that forest resources are a basic National resource. Fire, insects, and disease do not respect State lines. Neither do rivers, whose headwaters arise on forest lands. Forest products enter into interstate commerce. The amount, kind, and price to the eastern consumer. National security is not a State responsibility; yet adequate forest resources and products are essential to National security. And, again, the Federal Government is investing so much in cooperative aids and inducement programs that each citizen has a stake in what happens to all forest resources. The Government would be derelict in its position of public trust if it did not seek to protect that public investment.

Some 16 States now have laws aimed at the control of destructive forest practices. I do not wish to belittle the progress that has been made, but the standards of none of these acts measure up to the standards visualized by the Federal Government. Only about half of these involve any compulsion at all. Enforcement where compulsion is involved or application where the law is voluntary has not been notable. A Federal statute would strengthen resistance of State officials to local pressures.

Most of the State laws have been enacted since 1940, and some State officials will agree that one reason for this recent activity has been the desire to avoid a Federal law. I think it not improbable that some of the organizations and groups which have embraced public regulation publicly in the last decade and then have plumped for State regulation have done so in the belief that such action would be an avenue of escape and a means of forestalling Federal participation.

If those who profess to support the principle of public regulation do so wholeheartedly, I have difficulty understanding why they object to Federal participation of the type I have just outlined. The standards proposed for the Basic Federal statute are not severe; the Federal Government would participate in the costs; the States would have full administrative responsibility under those standards; and the Federal Government would step in only where some difficulty arose in a State. If public regulation is really needed and the States are competent to do the job, what is the logical or factual objection to such a proposal?

My conclusion is that the position of those who profess adherence to public regulation and mean State regulation without Federal participation is explained by one or more of the following: (1) They give lip service only and seek State regulation as an avenue of escape. (2) They are confronted with philosophical and psychological barriers in thinking of Federal regulation which prevents their recognition of the National responsibility involved. (3) They are revealing their own lack of confidence in competence of the States to do the job; because in a competent State the only Federal participation after approval of the State statute would be financial; or (4) They lack faith in our own democratic system of representative government wherein the legislative arm expresses the will of the people and serves as a check to prevent excessively restrictive administration of regulatory or other laws by the executive branch.

C
O
P
YUNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service

Washington 25, D. C.

C
SUPERVISION
Programs

January 10, 1952

Regional Foresters
and Directors

Dear Sir:

Last December the Forest Service was asked by Yale University to participate in a panel discussion of forest regulation. I asked Crafts to represent us on this panel.

Attached is a copy of the statement which he prepared and presented at that discussion. I did not see it before it was given but have read it since, and it has so impressed me as being a clear and persuasive statement of Forest Service position that I want all of our people to have it.

Enough copies are being made available with this letter for you to supply all of your technical personnel. I would like to ask that each of them read this paper and think about it. It may be published later in one of the forestry journals, but it answers so well the arguments that are sometimes directed at our position that I wanted to get it into the hands of all Forest Service personnel.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Lyle F. Watts

LYLE F. WATTS, Chief

Enclosure

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION - 1319 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W. - WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

30 - FC - 8
March 5, 1952

To: Federated Associations and NLMA Committee on
Forest Conservation

Subject: FOREST SERVICE POSITION ON FOREST REGULATION

Attached for your information is a copy of a paper prepared by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service, at a panel discussion on forest regulation before the Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, December 5, 1951. Since copies of this paper were transmitted to regional foresters and directors by Chief Forester Watts, who stated that Crafts represented the Forest Service on the panel and described the paper as being "a clear and persuasive statement of Forest Service position", the paper takes on considerable significance. It deserves your careful study.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Attachment
3877

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION1319 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W. - WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

72 - FC - 13

April 8, 1952

To: Members, Forest Conservation Committee

Copy to: Federated Associations
Members, NLMA Board of Directors

Attached are copies of letters relating to the address of Dr. Edward C. Crafts before the Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, which was sent you with our letter of March 5, 30-FC-8. Since it is not practicable to schedule a meeting of the Forest Conservation Committee at this time, you are urged to reread Dr. Crafts address and make such recommendations as you think appropriate to Clyde Martin (Chairman, NLMA Committee on Forest Conservation), c/o Weyerhaeuser Timber Company, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Washington, and send a copy to this office, so that he may make a report and recommendations to the NLMA Board of Directors meeting in Saint Louis on May 10.

Your prompt cooperation will be appreciated.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Attachments

39-41

AMERICAN FOREST PRODUCTS CORPORATION
 1 Montgomery Street
 San Francisco
 Zone 4

office of the President

March 21, 1952

Mr. Harry T. Kendall
 National Lumber Manufacturers Association
 1319 - 18th Street N.W.
 Washington 6, D.C.

Dear Harry:

This refers to a circular sent out by the NLMA March 5 on the subject of Forest Service Position on Forest Regulation, to which was attached letter from Chief Forester, Lyle Watts, to Regional Foresters and Directors dated January 10 endorsing and commending an address by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, at Yale University December 5, 1951.

Since Watts placed so much emphasis on Crafts' address as fully setting forth his views and those of the U.S. Forest Service, I read Crafts' address, which was also enclosed, very carefully and it struck me as being a well prepared and presented expose of the policy of the Forest Service not only toward our industry and the associations composing it but of the whole program of forest regulations and primarily as to who should do the regulating with the conclusion that this of necessity must be done by the U.S. Forest Service.

Since I can only agree in part with Crafts' conclusions and disagree radically with much of his philosophy and conclusions, I have written a statement of my impressions and enclose a copy for your review. Now, I am not laboring under any philosophical, psychological and emotional reactions nor am I thinking in terms of what might be the most remunerative thing for me to do and certainly I am not being influenced by what might be the easiest approach from the angle of getting along with that all-powerful Forest Service with whom, because of their monopoly, we must try to live in peace, but I am rather motivated in expressing myself by a deep conviction that men who think as Crafts are leading us straight into a totalitarian government and ultimately socialism with the final result that the kind of freedom which existed when I was first introduced into this world is about to become extinct so long as men occupying his high position pursue a philosophy such as he brings out upon a class of young Yale students seeking guidance for their future thinking and action.

Because I think Crafts is a dangerous man in the position he occupies I am passing on to you my thoughts and reaction to his speech. It may be that others in our organization may have reactions different from mine, in which event I would certainly like to know them. As a matter of fact, I will appreciate your own reaction if you find time to express yourself.

Warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

WSJ:P

Walter S. Johnson

This refers to an address by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service before Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, December 5, 1951, which address was endorsed by Lyle F. Watts, Chief Forester, and commended to wide publicity among all Forest Service Personnel. Crafts finds barriers to forest regulations are for philosophical, psychological and emotional grounds. He recites the necessity of restraining liberty as populations increase to protect society at large and reminds us anarchy is unrestrained liberty while "free enterprise" represents considerable regulation. Then he jumps into the form of argument he complains of as being often used by opponents of forest regulations, namely ridicule of such opponents. He says this is a customary maneuver in debate and is evidence of emotional resistance. It would seem he is referring to himself as well as those he attacks. Next he tells us "Totalitarian" applies to highly centralized government controlled by one political party with no representation of other parties permitted. This statement just about describes what the executive branch of our government has given us these last twenty years.

Next Crafts discusses socialism and assures us forest regulation does not permit it, but rather encourages the capitalistic system in which ownership of land and natural wealth is entrusted to individuals. The phrase "entrusted to individuals" bothers me a lot for it implies that somebody is conceding something to someone that already owns it. The individual, whether he owns part or all of a farm, an industry, a business, a house or an opportunity has, if we are to believe history, proven to be the best owner and my conviction is that all of our lands and natural resources would better serve the people in private hands. Where the government owns the timber a monopoly exists just as dangerous as where owned by a person or a small group. The individual left to his own devices will sometimes do damage to his fellow citizens and so will a government. Where a citizen is involved the government should intervene but where government is involved there is no means of relief short of an Act of Congress that takes years and a fortune to accomplish.

Reasonable regulation by states is the proper approach to regulations and the Federal Forest Service organization should join wholeheartedly with our lumber industry to get all states not yet doing so to start such programs of regulation as we have here in California.

The great unwritten compact between the dead, the living and the unborn that we leave the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources is subscribed to wholeheartedly by most of us in the lumber industry, but what about our Federal government's extravagance which is leaving for the unborn a debt so astronomical as to be beyond human comprehension, and whose only approach to the conservation of our natural resources is one of monopoly. The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has always encouraged its members to take the initiative in forest conservation movements. If it has objected to Federal regulation it is for the same reason I oppose federal regulation, namely because I believe the States should do the regulating by way of preventing the Federal Government from monopolizing us. Mr. Crafts should be specific when he says the N.L.M.A. has issued a fence-straddling policy statement.

Crafts admits that growth will step up as old growth is cut. This being so, he and the Forest Service should make available its past old growth forests to the lumber operators on a selective cutting basis and thus add to the growth factor by way of getting drain and growth in balance. My observations are that the public cooperative aids rendered by the U.S. Forest Service are done half-heartedly and always with a control string attached.

Crafts is right in saying industry cannot do the job itself because there are too many small owners of timber growing land who will not submit to regulation by industrial owners whose guiding motive is profit to themselves, but does he mean to object to operators making a profit? Surely profit is necessary even if for no other reason than to furnish tax sources for our extravagant government.

If the Forest Service believes as Crafts says, then there should be state forest regulations administered by the states, then why does he go on to say such state laws should be in turn regulated by Federal Statute? Does he think the Congressmen of the Atlantic Seaboard are better qualified to preserve California forests than the elected lawmakers of our state, or is it because he just cannot endure to see the Forest Service lose its monopolistic controls?

Crafts is indulging in mind-reading when he accuses lumbermen of seeking state regulations in preference to Federal Regulations as an avenue of escape. He has no basis for such a statement, nor is it true. Who can be more concerned about future forests than the operators who depend upon them for their future existence?

The founders of our nation feared placing any power in the hands of the Federal Government that could be as well administered by the States. They sought to prevent totalitarian government and to establish a balance and check on power, and let us do nothing to destroy what they tried to build, for it was done to preserve freedom.

C O P Y

WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION

Yeon Building - Portland 4, Oregon

March 28, 1952

Mr. Walter S. Johnson
American Forest Products Corp.
#1 Montgomery St.
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Walter:

I have read with a great deal of interest your letter of March 21st to Harry Kendall and your attached memorandum commenting on Edward G. Crafts' address before the Yale Forestry Group at Yale University.

I, of course, am entirely in accord with your views as to the Forest Service philosophy as expressed by Mr. Crafts and also believe that something should be done, if possible, to counteract this type of rather insidious propaganda.

It seems to Ernie Kolbe and I that probably the most effective way to get some governmental reaction to this philosophy would be to get one or two members in Congress to place Mr. Crafts' address on record for printing in the Congressional Record and at the same time comment upon it. It seems to us that someone in the NIMA, with possibly some help from AFPI, could act as ghost writer for a selected senator and congressman who would handle this job. Nibs Fuller would probably be the man to designate the senator and congressman to handle it.

If you feel that this is the approach, would you let Harry Kendall know.

Best personal wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

S.V. Fullaway, Jr.
Secretary-Manager

SVP ln
cc-Harry T. Kendall

C O P Y

April 2, 1952

Mr. Walter S. Johnson, President
American Forest Products Corporation
1 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 4, California

Dear Walter:

I was not at all surprised to receive your letter of March 21, which I read with great interest, and also the accompanying statement on the address of Edward C. Crafts.

I read this statement of Mr. Crafts over two weeks ago, and since then I have been warning everybody on the National staff, and every lumberman I could talk to that hidden in this address was the old-time program of taking over everything -- not only the individuals, but the states as well.

I don't know exactly how to proceed. I have been told by our people that we are making considerable progress with the forestry department. I was inclined to believe this, but this belief was certainly jarred by the Crafts statement, which was so wholeheartedly subscribed to by Mr. Watts.

Today and tomorrow in Washington Mr. Veach and one or two staff representatives will be meeting with the Forest Service on the subject of a timber survey, and later on this month a large group of us is going to meet with the Forest Service group to discuss the southern situation. This latter has been greatly aggravated by the passing of stumpage into the hands of paper and pulp people, and the over-cutting of young trees for pulp wood in many localities.

My suggestion is that before we make any move to answer Mr. Crafts, we refer this whole matter to the Association's Forestry Committee with instructions for them to bring in a recommendation of procedure at the May meeting of the Board of Directors.

There are so many facets to this forestry situation, I need not tell you that the number of lumbermen who are under positive obligations to the Forest Service is increasing every year.

I know you have read Mr. Hagenstein's testimony on the access road congressional hearing. I thought he made a wonderful statement, but to my surprise it has caused some very adverse comment simply on the ground that Mr. Hagenstein proposed the Forest Service sell more of its timber in large blocks so as to permit the purchaser to cut the stumpage under a long-time plan. This seemed a very logical statement. He didn't by any means propose that all the stumpage be sold on this basis, but he did warn the Forest Service of something I have been conscious of for a long time, namely, selling a large part of the stumpage in small lots to small operators who are not able to make the maximum use of the log, is not practicing the efficient forest utilization the Service is constantly preaching and other countries, such as those of northern Europe, have found absolutely necessary to follow. This simple statement of selling large lots raised some protests as an exhibition of the fact that the National is dominated by the big operators and the little fellow hasn't a chance.

Mr. Walter S. Johnson
Page 2.

April 2, 1952

In any event, whether Mr. Martin's committee brings you a recommendation or whether it doesn't, this matter will be discussed by the Board of Directors, and, if possible, an agreement reached as to what we should do.

Like you, I don't think we should let this Crafts statement stand without some reply. It is full of holes and can be easily and successfully attacked.

HTK:AW

cc Messrs. Hillman Lueddemann
John B. Veach
S. V. Fullaway, Jr.
Charles Gray
Henry Bahr

from United States Code, 1970 edition

§ 526

TITLE 16.—CONSERVATION

Page 3828

§ 528. Development and administration of renewable surface resources for multiple use and sustained yield of products and services; Congressional declaration of policy and purpose.

It is the policy of the Congress that the national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes. The purposes of sections 528 to 531 of this title are declared to be supplemental to, but not in derogation of, the purposes for which the national forests were established as set forth in section 475 of this title. Nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish on the national forests. Nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the use or administration of the mineral resources of national forest lands or to affect the use or administration of Federal lands not within national forests. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 1, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SHORT TITLE

Sections 528 to 531 of this title are popularly known as the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 529, 530, 531, of this title.

§ 529. Same; authorization; consideration to relative values of resources; areas of wilderness.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to develop and administer the renewable surface resources of the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtained therefrom. In the administration of the national forests due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas. The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of sections 528 to 531 of this title. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 2, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 528, 530, 531 of this title.

§ 530. Same; cooperation with State and local governmental agencies and others.

In the effectuation of sections 528 to 531 of this title the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with interested State and local governmental agencies and others in the development and management of the national forests. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 3, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 528, 529, 531 of this title.

§ 531. Same; definitions.

As used in sections 528 to 531 of this title the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Multiple use" means: The management of all the various renewable surface resources of the national forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

(b) "Sustained yield of the several products and services" means the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of the national forests without impairment of the productivity of the land. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 4, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

Nelson to Bodine

February 21, 1955

Re. Conference with McArdle and Mason, February 17, 1955

When completed, he said, they can obtain a copy. There was considerable "ring around the rose" on this one.

3) The multiple use bill. This is the proposal advanced by the wildlife-conservationists group but which has not yet been introduced in Congress. I asked McArdle how he felt about the proposed measure and he said "Just between you and me, I don't like it". He said that the Advisory Council provision of the measure was just "window dressing" and the real purpose was to try to get into law as a major use wildlife and recreation activities.

4) The Three Sisters wilderness area proposal. He referred to the hearing in Eugene, Oregon that has just been completed and showed a strong feeling that the wildlifers were going to fail in trying to dictate how the Forest Service should handle the question of wilderness areas. He implied that the Forest Service was more or less pushed into this hearing against their will and indicated that he would not permit unreasonable volumes of timber to be tied up in wilderness areas if he could help it. I would judge that the Forest Service may stand pat with regard to their proposal on this matter.

5) Sub-Committee on Interior of the House Appropriations Committee. McArdle stated that the maneuver whereby Forest Service appropriation matters were transferred from the Sub-Committee on Agriculture to the Sub-Committee on Interior was political and was Representative Cannon's work. He stated that some people at first thought that this was a step in the direction of transferring the Forest Service to the Interior Department but he has become convinced that there is nothing of that sort behind it. He said that Cannon was anxious to put all public power matters in one committee, the Committee on Public Works, and he had done this by taking out of the Sub-Committee on Interior all electric power matters. This left the Interior Sub-Committee with not enough to do. So Cannon then more or less arbitrarily said "This can be taken care of by transferring Forest Service over to the Interior Sub-Committee". McArdle implied that the republicans could make some hay over the matter if they so desire by pointing out to the democrats that the democrats have now transferred Forest Service appropriation matters to the Interior Sub-Committee which has been termed by the democrats the Sub-Committee ruling

I had not been very long with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation when it became apparent that there was a great need for professionalization in recreation especially among resource-oriented graduates. It seems to me that in a growing field such as this, we have one of our greatest educational needs. As a corollary one of our greatest deficiencies exists here at the moment.

For some time I have been advocating the desirability of a national conference on higher education in recreation and had hoped that one might be held this year. This was one of the items discussed a few months ago at our conference at Syracuse with the deans of three Forestry or Natural Resource schools, and with recreation leaders in several walks of life. Out of this came a decision to hold a conference on recreation research at Ann Arbor this coming May sponsored jointly by the University of Michigan and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

It was also felt that the subject was too big to cover both research and education in a single conference. I think it not unlikely at Ann Arbor, however, that a decision may be made by the organizing committee to sponsor a somewhat similar conference within a year on recreation education.

First, just a word about the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and its functions. I have no way of knowing how well informed you are on this. I assume you know that several years ago the Congress created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission made up of certain Members of Congress and citizens appointed by the President. That Commission a little over a year ago completed its task in a report that has been widely received and highly applauded called "Outdoor Recreation for America." Following this major report, there have been issued a series of about 20 supplemental reports on a variety of subjects studied by the Commission. One of the major recommendations was the creation of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to be charged with several functions.

These include the promotion of coordination among the 20-odd Federal agencies engaged in some form of outdoor recreation, the stimulation of and provision for technical assistance to State governments in this field, the conduct and sponsorship of research, the carrying out of a long-range planning and surveys of outdoor recreation needs and resources, and the development of outdoor recreation programs.

Our orientation is that of a small policy, planning and coordinating agency. We recognize the pivotal role of State and local governments and the primary contribution made by private enterprise. We are not a land managing agency. But we are distinctly more than an advisory agency and through the medium of a Presidential Cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Council and other mechanisms such as budget, legislative and program review, we are in a position to exercise a great deal of influence on the recreation policies of the Federal Government.

During the past year, we have operated with a small budget of something over \$1 million. We have about 100 people on our payroll, most of whom are in Washington. We have the nucleus of five field offices. The approach of the Outdoor

Recreation Resources Review Commission and our own approach has been a bipartisan, professional career approach. My sincere hope is that outdoor recreation, like forestry, may become established professionally in the Federal Government as a non-political, bipartisan career activity.

I would hope that the main report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is required reading for all students in the School of Forestry. If it is not, it should be. Unfortunately, but understandably, the Commission did not include a report or study on educational needs in recreation among its numerous supplemental appendices. But let me describe briefly to you from the very practical standpoint of the administrator of the newest conservation bureau in the Federal Government what we are faced with in trying to staff adequately.

As I said, we have about 100 people. Probably in about another year, we will double this 100 and then level off. We have had to staff from the top down because we started a new organization from scratch. This doesn't happen very often in the field of public conservation. We did not have a nucleus of employees to promote from within as is the traditional pattern in firmly established agencies such as the National Park Service, Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

I am a forester and a number of recreation professionals have questioned the propriety of a forester to head the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This, I think, should give foresters some pause for thought.

The Associate Director is a geographer. One of the Assistant Directors is a forester, and the second Assistant Director is a fish and wildlife biologist. Our chief administrative officer is a public accountant.

We have key personnel whose primary disciplines and experience have been in public administration, in landscape architecture, in law, in journalism, in biology, physical education, economics, and so on. We are currently seeking personnel with orientations in sociology, psychology, and mathematics. We have had to assemble our key personnel from a variety of basic disciplines for the simple reason that there does not exist an available pool of educated and qualified recreation professionals with the kind of background and training that is needed.

There has been no lack of applicants--perhaps six or seven hundred in all. But most of these have been people we didn't want for one reason or another.

Perhaps I should remind you that the use of land resources for recreation has expanded tremendously since World War II, that recreational use of these resources more and more frequently is becoming the primary use, that the recreation business has a major economic impact on many States and on the Nation, and that this is a relatively new development.

We foresee a tripling of outdoor recreation needs in the next 40 years. Currently, some \$20 billion are spent annually by consumers of recreation in all of the multitudinous outdoor recreation activities. The hard core of activities are driving for pleasure, walking and water-based recreation. Winter sports are coming up rapidly. The more traditional activities such as picnicking, camping, fishing and hunting while likewise increasing, are not at the top insofar as the number of recreation experiences go. Ninety percent of our population takes part each year.

When I was a student at the University of Michigan, one course was given in the Forestry School on recreation administration. I shall never forget one day when Dean Sam Dana, my long time friend, substituted for the regular professor, and said that teaching the course that day was indeed a recreational experience. He was contrasting it to forest management with the possible inference that it was an easy course and the subject was somewhat lighthearted and frivolous. This was the concept in those days.

This particular course was a favorite pipe course for students in difficulty and enjoyed a reputation as did another course, "The History of Roman Band Instruments" as being a favorite of athletes with scholastic problems. The situation has changed drastically since those days.

There is nothing frivolous about the pursuit of recreation at the present time. It is therapy of the finest type. It is an answer in part to the increased leisure time available to most citizens. The wise use of this leisure time is the object of sober thought by more and more persons.

I commend to you Walter Kerr's book on the "Decline of Pleasure," and a recent 20th Century Fund book, "Of Time, Work and Leisure." There are moral, physical, and spiritual attributes of recreation that are becoming increasingly recognized. No longer do we consider recreationists to be slackers in the shade.

To help meet this sociological need, there is no question in my mind but what we need educated professionals. There is likewise no question that if the demand is such and the needs made sufficiently clear, the Universities will respond in adopting their curricula accordingly.

I do not feel that recreation organizations should have to depend indefinitely on the assembly of a diverse group of disciplines such as I enumerated before. Some of this will and should continue. But I also feel that we need to have a recreation discipline in itself much more clearly defined and broadly oriented than now exists. I think that higher-level education with a recreation orientation is going through the birthing pains of professionalism much as forestry did 50 years ago.

I cannot tell you what the demand is or may be in numbers of persons. The American Recreation Society estimates about 25,000 full-time workers at the present time in activity-type recreation. But this takes little or no account of resource-oriented recreation. There are now about 20,000 foresters in the United States and a fair share of these have some responsibility in recreation.

C
O
P
Y

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN FOREST REGULATION ^{1/}

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you here this evening, and to participate on behalf of the Forest Service in this panel discussion of forest regulations. I shall try to explain to you the position of the Forest Service in this matter.

In the brief time available, I want to touch on four items:

- (1) The philosophical barrier to forest regulation;
- (2) Why some form of regulation of forest practices on private lands is needed;
- (3) What does the Forest Service mean when it advocates forest regulation; and
- (4) Why is Federal participation in Forest regulation necessary?

Some of the views I shall espouse probably will be in the minority. However, I believe they are soundly conceived, are in the interest of the Nation at large, and in the long run, time will prove them correct.

Over the years forest regulation has been a controversial issue. During the past decade, however, the area of disagreement has narrowed. The issue today largely centers around whether and to what extent the Federal Government should participate in public regulatory measures in forestry rather than the former issue of whether any public regulation of forestry on private lands is desirable.

The Philosophical Barrier to Forest Regulation

One of the greatest barriers to forest regulation, both in the past and today, is that much opposition is based on philosophical, psychological, and emotional grounds rather than on objective reasoning. I think proponents of regulation have rested their case largely on the forest situation in this country, and have given insufficient attention to philosophical barriers.

However it may be sugar-coated, regulation is an impairment of individual freedom. Our Nation was conceived in revolution against restrictions on individual liberties, and no one—Americans least of all—like to be told what to do. That is simply human nature.

There was a great deal of individual liberty in the United States as our young Nation progressed through its initial period of settlement and development. Like all nations, however, as population pressures grow, as technological developments bring people in closer proximity to each other, and as the Nation's commerce impinges on its natural resources, there must be more and more restrictions on individual actions in the interest of society at large.

^{1/} Paper presented by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief, Forest Service, USDA, at panel discussion on forest regulation, before the Yale Forestry Club and the Yale Conservation Club, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., Dec. 5, 1951.

Anarchy offers the maximum of individual freedom. Acceptance of government, - any form of government, - as a necessary institution of mankind is acceptance of the need for regulation of the individual for the benefit of society. Thereafter, matters of regulation relate only to degree. For example, the phrase "Free enterprise" actually represents a considerable degree of regulation, although it is often cited as epitomizing just the opposite.

When facts are against them or logic fails, opponents of forest regulation often resort to ridicule, or inaccurate and derogatory use of unpopular terms such as "totalitarian," "socialistic," and "anti-democratic" in an effort to discredit the proposal. This is a customary maneuver in debate, and is evidence of emotional resistance.

When used correctly, such terms are not descriptive of the proposals for forest regulation. "Totalitarian" applies to a highly centralized government controlled by one political party with no representation of other parties permitted. Forest regulation does not affect in any way our democratic government and two-party system in which the people retain supreme power through periodically renewed representation and delegated authority.

"Socialism" signifies government ownership and management of essential means for production and distribution of goods. Forest land and timber qualify as essential; but regulation of private forestry aims to keep private timber land sufficiently productive so government ownership is not necessary. Thus, forest regulation does not promote the socialization of private timberland but encourages the capitalistic system in which ownership of land and natural wealth is entrusted to individuals.

In 1944 Fortune Magazine, which is a spokesman not for government, not for labor, but for business management -- the group that traditionally oppose government controls most vigorously -- stated:

"Enterprise must make up its mind that it must conform to a planned program which takes into account the proper use of our resources.
 --In principle Americans have a neat choice here between the spiritual values of fewer regulations and the material values of more potatoes.
 --Above a certain level the national output we can have is a tight function of the control we are willing to take.--The purpose of government regulation is to keep the behavior of one individual from damaging too severely the welfare of other individuals.--The notion that there is a complete and universal coordination of individual and social aims --is more often asserted than seriously argued. The fact is that the individual, left to his own devices, will in some circumstances do damage to his fellow citizens. The government must intervene on behalf of the community as a whole.--"

I give you this rather long quotation because it testifies to the change in progressive thinking within the last decade among one of the most conservative groups in our country.

On the legal side the constitutionality of forest regulation has been established by the Washington Supreme Court in a decision upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. According to the New York Times, the principle established was that "private owners of the Nation's renewable natural resources do not have the unqualified liberty to use and destroy them as they see fit." Said the Washington

Court, the "great unwritten compact --- between the dead, the living, and the unborn --- requires that we leave to the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources. Surely, where natural resources can be utilized and at the same time perpetuated for future generations what has been called 'constitutional morality' requires that we do so."

The specific and widespread endorsement of forest regulation by many organizations and groups is further evidence that --- at least for the record --- the philosophical barrier to forest regulation per se has been largely overcome. The Society of American Foresters, American Forestry Association, the C.I.O., the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Lawyers' Guild, the Isaak Walton League, and numerous other groups at one time or another have endorsed the principle of public regulation. Even the West Coast Lumbermen's Association and the Western Pine Association supported the Washington law when it was before the Supreme Court of that State.

The National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, one of the prime opponents of forest regulation in the past, no longer opposes it outright, but has issued a fence-straddling policy statement.

The Forest Industries Council, representing the American Pulp and Paper, American Pulpwood, and National Lumber Manufacturers' Associations, has advocated State forest regulation when deemed necessary or desirable by people of the State. The Council of State Governments has urged each State to consider forest regulation, and the Association of State Foresters recognizes the necessity in some States. The latter group could hardly do otherwise when one recalls that a third of the States already have regulatory laws of various sorts on their statute books.

Thus, I feel that a great step forward has been made in the last decade. Thinking Americans now pretty largely recognize the public interest stake in the individual forest enterprise. They recognize that a proper function of government is regulation to see to it that an individual does not destroy or leave in unproductive condition renewable natural resources on lands which he may own in fee simple.

However, a formidable psychological barrier still exists when one proceeds from the question of public forest regulation in general to Federal participation in such regulation.

Why Forest Regulation Is Needed

Despite the general acceptance that forest regulation is desirable in principle, let us examine briefly why it is needed. The need for forest regulation hinges on three points:

- (1) The Nation needs forest resources and forest products;
- (2) The condition of the Nation's private forest land to supply its share of those resources and products is unsatisfactory; and
- (3) Measures other than regulation will not by themselves assure the level of productivity on private forest lands required to meet the Nation's need for forest resources and products.

In the time available, I must dispense with No. 1. I think you all recognize it and accept it. The indispensability -- and I use that word advisedly -- of forest resources and products to the Nation's well-being and security is manifest to all of us.

As to the second point, the condition of the Nation's private forest land, here are only a few of the most basic facts. Three-fourths of our forest land is in private ownership. Therefore, if forest resources and products are essential to the national welfare, the healthy condition of private forest lands is likewise essential to the Nation. The latest surveys show -- and practically all authorities agree on the basic figures -- that the drain of sawtimber trees substantially exceeds growth. This is partially explained by the large areas of old-growth in the West, where there is little appreciable net growth. But these areas alone are not sufficient when they come into productivity to bring growth and drain into balance. Also, our present levels of drain are at a substantially lower level than the Nation may need in the future. Thus, we have a situation in which we are gradually using up our capital growing stock of the larger and better trees.

Do not let the near balance between growth and drain of all trees, small as well as large, deceive you. The smaller trees included in such a calculation are suitable for firewood and pulpwood but not for manufacture into lumber. And even here the total figures conceal a deficit of desirable softwoods which is largely offset by a surplus of less desirable hardwoods.

On private forest land two-thirds of the cutting is poor or worse; and 62 million acres -- or 18 percent of our private commercial forest area -- is poorly stocked or nonproductive.

Those who argue that all is well because the gap between growth and drain appears to be closing are practicing self-deception. The "closing of the gap" theory is based on trends derived from comparing past and recent growth-drain estimates. Such comparisons have little meaning for several reasons. The earlier estimates were little more than guesses; over-all comparisons conceal questions of quality and kind of timber; growth is bound to step up as mature old-growth is cut and replaced by young growth; and the level at which a balance may be achieved is ignored. Growth and drain would be in balance even if they were both zero.

The significant facts are that (1) the most recent estimates show a deficit of growth in relation to drain and, (2) the best forecasts of the future likewise show a significant deficit. Looking 20 to 25 years ahead and making generous allowance for present trends and improved practices, sawtimber growth may still need to be stepped up 70 percent above prospective levels at that time or twice 1945 levels. Likewise, if growth and drain of all trees -- small as well as large -- are to be in balance, growth will need to increase 10 percent above estimated future levels.

As to the third point, regulation is needed to restore lands to productivity because other forestry measures alone will not do the job. This country has an extensive system of public forests -- national and State. We are also embarked on an extensive system of public cooperative aids and services to private owners -- inducements, if you please, to get private owners to practice forestry. These cooperative aids and services include among other measures fire, insect and disease control, large-scale public forest research, individual technical advice and service, public education and demonstration, and planting aids.

Substantial progress has been made in recent years, particularly by the larger forest owners and operators, but relatively the progress has been much less among the million of farmers and small forest property holders. That is where the basic problems lie.

Industry can't do the job itself. It controls only about one-fourth of the private forest land and includes less than one percent of the owners. The 4 or 5 million small non-industrial owners, farmers, small town businessmen, absentee city folk, summer recreationists, and others, are not going to submit to direction by the small fraction of industrial owners, whose guiding motive is profit for themselves.

Those who say let public forests, cooperative aids and services, and private initiative do the whole job are being unrealistic. Public forests occupy largely the poorer lands. They will never be sufficiently large nor productive to meet the Nation's needs by themselves; and they should not be expanded to the point where they can. After a half century of public forests and after 25 years of the Clarke-McNary law, which is the basic authority for public cooperative aids and services, we still have an unsatisfactory forest situation. The outlook for two decades hence is continued unbalance of growth and drain despite progressive trends.

Public forests and cooperative aids and services have not done the job by themselves in the past and I believe they cannot do so in the future. The many groups, organizations, and States that are on record favoring public regulation hold this same view. (Otherwise, why should they favor it?) This viewpoint is the consensus of informed judgment in the United States today.

In some instances pleas for delay in regulation in order to give other methods more time may be based not on a sincere belief that other measures will do the job, but on a desire to procrastinate and evade the issue.

There is still another factor. The public is spending millions of dollars a year in cooperative aids and services. I understand it is not possible by contract or otherwise to establish a covenant running with the land for such services. You who are paying the bill should be protected in some way so that the private individual cannot take full advantage of public inducements and subsidies and yet turn right around and destroy his timber resource and the productivity of his land. You, the taxpayer, have a stake in that.

What Does the Forest Service Mean When It Advocates Forest Regulation?

The Forest Service believes public forest regulation, as needed in this country, is only one of a series of forestry measures necessary to keep our forest land in productive condition and to result in forest growth equal to our national needs. Forest regulation is not a panacea. It is not a substitute for other forestry measures. It is a complementary measure of coordinate importance with public ownership and public cooperative aids and services to private owners.

The forest regulation contemplated by the Forest Service does not involve volume or area regulation or sustained yield. In other words, the control exercised would not tell a man where, when, or how much he could cut.

The Forest Service believes that there should be State forest regulation, administered by the State. But it also believes, and this is where the issue lies -- that these State laws should be within the framework of certain over-all standards prescribed by Federal statute. It believes that State regulatory activities meeting

the Federal standards should be matched with Federal funds made available to the State. It believes the Federal Government should have authority to step in and administer regulation meeting the standards if the States fail to do so within a reasonable time. Should this happen, and the States subsequently enact State statutes meeting the standards, the Federal Government would in due course step out.

The Forest Service is sometimes represented as favoring straight Federal regulation without State action. This is not true.

The Forest Service believes the over-all basic framework as expressed in the Federal statute should be in general terms to provide where applicable for adequate re-stocking, to prohibit premature or wasteful cutting in young stands, to reserve for growth and subsequent cutting sufficient growing stock of thrifty trees to keep the land as productive as practicable, to prevent undesirable logging methods that will cause avoidable damage to young growth, to regulate grazing and prevent unreasonable damage to tree growth, to prevent clear cutting except where silvi-culturally desirable, and to provide for methods of protecting lands against fire, insects, and disease. It believes that the State statute, in addition to meeting these standards of forest practice, should also provide for administration by a single State agency, employment of competent technical personnel, and for advice and technical assistance of forest operations. It believes that different rules of forest practices should be established for different areas of the country; that there should be authority to except certain areas, that area advisory boards should be established to help formulate desirable rules of practice; and that working plans for individual forest properties may be approved in lieu of the standard rules of forest practice. This is the regulation that the Forest Service advocates.

It has been alleged that the Forest Service would favor a provision in the Federal statute that would permit the Federal Government to withhold any cooperative forestry assistance being rendered by it to a State unless the State enacts regulatory legislation meeting Federal standards. This is not the position of the Forest Service, and it would not favor such action.

Now I want to ask you to do something. At your leisure and when you are alone, take the trouble sometime to examine - critically but objectively - these regulatory proposals that the Forest Service stands for. You owe it to yourself and the forestry profession which you are about to enter to do so. Do not brush them aside because you may personally be philosophically opposed to regulation. Think them through one by one and try as you do so to offer constructive alternatives which in the aggregate will accomplish with surety the over-all objective of bringing our forest land to reasonably productive condition and preventing deterioration. If you do this, I think you will find there is little in these proposals that the professional forester or expert in public administration can constructively criticize.

Why Is Federal Participation Necessary

May I say first that Federal participation in forest-regulation is the official position of the Department of Agriculture, has been supported by the four most recent secretaries of Agriculture, by five Chiefs of the Forest Service, including two of your most eminent alumni - Gifford Pinchot and Henry Solon Graves, by the present Secretary of the Interior, and by the late President Roosevelt.

There are two reasons for Federal participation: (1) National interests; are involved, and (2) the States themselves will not do the job.

As to the first point, I think we all recognize that forest resources are a basic National resource. Fire, insects, and disease do not respect State lines. Neither do rivers, whose headwaters arise on forest lands. Forest products enter into interstate commerce. The amount, kind, and price to the eastern consumer. National security is not a State responsibility; yet adequate forest resources and products are essential to National security. And, again, the Federal Government is investing so much in cooperative aids and inducement programs that each citizen has a stake in what happens to all forest resources. The Government would be derelict in its position of public trust if it did not seek to protect that public investment.

Some 16 States now have laws aimed at the control of destructive forest practices. I do not wish to belittle the progress that has been made, but the standards of none of these acts measure up to the standards visualized by the Federal Government. Only about half of these involve any compulsion at all. Enforcement where compulsion is involved or application where the law is voluntary has not been notable. A Federal statute would strengthen resistance of State officials to local pressures.

Most of the State laws have been enacted since 1940, and some State officials will agree that one reason for this recent activity has been the desire to avoid a Federal law. I think it not improbable that some of the organizations and groups which have embraced public regulation publicly in the last decade and then have plumped for State regulation have done so in the belief that such action would be an avenue of escape and a means of forestalling Federal participation.

If those who profess to support the principle of public regulation do so wholeheartedly, I have difficulty understanding why they object to Federal participation of the type I have just outlined. The standards proposed for the Basic Federal statute are not severe; the Federal Government would participate in the costs; the States would have full administrative responsibility under those standards; and the Federal Government would step in only where some difficulty arose in a State. If public regulation is really needed and the States are competent to do the job, what is the logical or factual objection to such a proposal?

My conclusion is that the position of those who profess adherence to public regulation and mean State regulation without Federal participation is explained by one or more of the following: (1) They give lip service only and seek State regulation as an avenue of escape. (2) They are confronted with philosophical and psychological barriers in thinking of Federal regulation which prevents their recognition of the National responsibility involved. (3) They are revealing their own lack of confidence in competence of the States to do the job; because in a competent State the only Federal participation after approval of the State statute would be financial; or (4) They lack faith in our own democratic system of representative government wherein the legislative arm expresses the will of the people and serves as a check to prevent excessively restrictive administration of regulatory or other laws by the executive branch.

C
O
P
YUNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service

Washington 25, D. C.

C
SUPERVISION
Programs

January 10, 1952

Regional Foresters
and Directors

Dear Sir:

Last December the Forest Service was asked by Yale University to participate in a panel discussion of forest regulation. I asked Crafts to represent us on this panel.

Attached is a copy of the statement which he prepared and presented at that discussion. I did not see it before it was given but have read it since, and it has so impressed me as being a clear and persuasive statement of Forest Service position that I want all of our people to have it.

Enough copies are being made available with this letter for you to supply all of your technical personnel. I would like to ask that each of them read this paper and think about it. It may be published later in one of the forestry journals, but it answers so well the arguments that are sometimes directed at our position that I wanted to get it into the hands of all Forest Service personnel.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Lyle F. Watts

LYLE F. WATTS, Chief

Enclosure

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION - 1319 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W. - WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

30 - FC - 8
March 5, 1952

To: Federated Associations and NLMA Committee on
Forest Conservation

Subject: FOREST SERVICE POSITION ON FOREST REGULATION

Attached for your information is a copy of a paper prepared by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service, at a panel discussion on forest regulation before the Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, December 5, 1951. Since copies of this paper were transmitted to regional foresters and directors by Chief Forester Watts, who stated that Crafts represented the Forest Service on the panel and described the paper as being "a clear and persuasive statement of Forest Service position", the paper takes on considerable significance. It deserves your careful study.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Attachment
3877

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION1319 EIGHTEENTH STREET, N. W. - WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

72 - FC - 13

April 8, 1952

To: Members, Forest Conservation Committee

Copy to: Federated Associations
Members, NLMA Board of Directors

Attached are copies of letters relating to the address of Dr. Edward C. Crafts before the Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, which was sent you with our letter of March 5, 30-FC-8. Since it is not practicable to schedule a meeting of the Forest Conservation Committee at this time, you are urged to reread Dr. Crafts address and make such recommendations as you think appropriate to Clyde Martin (Chairman, NLMA Committee on Forest Conservation), c/o Weyerhaeuser Timber Company, Tacoma Building, Tacoma, Washington, and send a copy to this office, so that he may make a report and recommendations to the NLMA Board of Directors meeting in Saint Louis on May 10.

Your prompt cooperation will be appreciated.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Attachments

39-41

AMERICAN FOREST PRODUCTS CORPORATION
 1 Montgomery Street
 San Francisco
 Zone 4

office of the President

March 21, 1952

Mr. Harry T. Kendall
 National Lumber Manufacturers Association
 1319 - 18th Street N.W.
 Washington 6, D.C.

Dear Harry:

This refers to a circular sent out by the NLMA March 5 on the subject of Forest Service Position on Forest Regulation, to which was attached letter from Chief Forester, Lyle Watts, to Regional Foresters and Directors dated January 10 endorsing and commending an address by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, at Yale University December 5, 1951.

Since Watts placed so much emphasis on Crafts' address as fully setting forth his views and those of the U.S. Forest Service, I read Crafts' address, which was also enclosed, very carefully and it struck me as being a well prepared and presented expose of the policy of the Forest Service not only toward our industry and the associations composing it but of the whole program of forest regulations and primarily as to who should do the regulating with the conclusion that this of necessity must be done by the U.S. Forest Service.

Since I can only agree in part with Crafts' conclusions and disagree radically with much of his philosophy and conclusions, I have written a statement of my impressions and enclose a copy for your review. Now, I am not laboring under any philosophical, psychological and emotional reactions nor am I thinking in terms of what might be the most remunerative thing for me to do and certainly I am not being influenced by what might be the easiest approach from the angle of getting along with that all-powerful Forest Service with whom, because of their monopoly, we must try to live in peace, but I am rather motivated in expressing myself by a deep conviction that men who think as Crafts are leading us straight into a totalitarian government and ultimately socialism with the final result that the kind of freedom which existed when I was first introduced into this world is about to become extinct so long as men occupying his high position pursue a philosophy such as he brings out upon a class of young Yale students seeking guidance for their future thinking and action.

Because I think Crafts is a dangerous man in the position he occupies I am passing on to you my thoughts and reaction to his speech. It may be that others in our organization may have reactions different from mine, in which event I would certainly like to know them. As a matter of fact, I will appreciate your own reaction if you find time to express yourself.

Warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

WSJ:P

Walter S. Johnson

This refers to an address by Edward C. Crafts, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service before Yale Forestry Club at Yale University, December 5, 1951, which address was endorsed by Lyle F. Watts, Chief Forester, and commended to wide publicity among all Forest Service Personnel. Crafts finds barriers to forest regulations are for philosophical, psychological and emotional grounds. He recites the necessity of restraining liberty as populations increase to protect society at large and reminds us anarchy is unrestrained liberty while "free enterprise" represents considerable regulation. Then he jumps into the form of argument he complains of as being often used by opponents of forest regulations, namely ridicule of such opponents. He says this is a customary maneuver in debate and is evidence of emotional resistance. It would seem he is referring to himself as well as those he attacks. Next he tells us "Totalitarian" applies to highly centralized government controlled by one political party with no representation of other parties permitted. This statement just about describes what the executive branch of our government has given us these last twenty years.

Next Crafts discusses socialism and assures us forest regulation does not permit it, but rather encourages the capitalistic system in which ownership of land and natural wealth is entrusted to individuals. The phrase "entrusted to individuals" bothers me a lot for it implies that somebody is conceding something to someone that already owns it. The individual, whether he owns part or all of a farm, an industry, a business, a house or an opportunity has, if we are to believe history, proven to be the best owner and my conviction is that all of our lands and natural resources would better serve the people in private hands. Where the government owns the timber a monopoly exists just as dangerous as where owned by a person or a small group. The individual left to his own devices will sometimes do damage to his fellow citizens and so will a government. Where a citizen is involved the government should intervene but where government is involved there is no means of relief short of an Act of Congress that takes years and a fortune to accomplish.

Reasonable regulation by states is the proper approach to regulations and the Federal Forest Service organization should join wholeheartedly with our lumber industry to get all states not yet doing so to start such programs of regulation as we have here in California.

The great unwritten compact between the dead, the living and the unborn that we leave the unborn something more than debts and depleted natural resources is subscribed to wholeheartedly by most of us in the lumber industry, but what about our Federal government's extravagance which is leaving for the unborn a debt so astronomical as to be beyond human comprehension, and whose only approach to the conservation of our natural resources is one of monopoly. The National Lumber Manufacturers Association has always encouraged its members to take the initiative in forest conservation movements. If it has objected to Federal regulation it is for the same reason I oppose federal regulation, namely because I believe the States should do the regulating by way of preventing the Federal Government from monopolizing us. Mr. Crafts should be specific when he says the N.L.M.A. has issued a fence-straddling policy statement.

Crafts admits that growth will step up as old growth is cut. This being so, he and the Forest Service should make available its past old growth forests to the lumber operators on a selective cutting basis and thus add to the growth factor by way of getting drain and growth in balance. My observations are that the public cooperative aids rendered by the U.S. Forest Service are done half-heartedly and always with a control string attached.

Crafts is right in saying industry cannot do the job itself because there are too many small owners of timber growing land who will not submit to regulation by industrial owners whose guiding motive is profit to themselves, but does he mean to object to operators making a profit? Surely profit is necessary even if for no other reason than to furnish tax sources for our extravagant government.

If the Forest Service believes as Crafts says, then there should be state forest regulations administered by the states, then why does he go on to say such state laws should be in turn regulated by Federal Statute? Does he think the Congressmen of the Atlantic Seaboard are better qualified to preserve California forests than the elected lawmakers of our state, or is it because he just cannot endure to see the Forest Service lose its monopolistic controls?

Crafts is indulging in mind-reading when he accuses lumbermen of seeking state regulations in preference to Federal Regulations as an avenue of escape. He has no basis for such a statement, nor is it true. Who can be more concerned about future forests than the operators who depend upon them for their future existence?

The founders of our nation feared placing any power in the hands of the Federal Government that could be as well administered by the States. They sought to prevent totalitarian government and to establish a balance and check on power, and let us do nothing to destroy what they tried to build, for it was done to preserve freedom.

C O P Y

WESTERN PINE ASSOCIATION

Yeon Building - Portland 4, Oregon

March 28, 1952

Mr. Walter S. Johnson
American Forest Products Corp.
#1 Montgomery St.
San Francisco, Calif.

Dear Walter:

I have read with a great deal of interest your letter of March 21st to Harry Kendall and your attached memorandum commenting on Edward G. Crafts' address before the Yale Forestry Group at Yale University.

I, of course, am entirely in accord with your views as to the Forest Service philosophy as expressed by Mr. Crafts and also believe that something should be done, if possible, to counteract this type of rather insidious propaganda.

It seems to Ernie Kolbe and I that probably the most effective way to get some governmental reaction to this philosophy would be to get one or two members in Congress to place Mr. Crafts' address on record for printing in the Congressional Record and at the same time comment upon it. It seems to us that someone in the NIMA, with possibly some help from AFPI, could act as ghost writer for a selected senator and congressman who would handle this job. Nibs Fuller would probably be the man to designate the senator and congressman to handle it.

If you feel that this is the approach, would you let Harry Kendall know.

Best personal wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

S.V. Fullaway, Jr.
Secretary-Manager

SVP ln
cc-Harry T. Kendall

C O P Y

April 2, 1952

Mr. Walter S. Johnson, President
American Forest Products Corporation
1 Montgomery Street
San Francisco 4, California

Dear Walter:

I was not at all surprised to receive your letter of March 21, which I read with great interest, and also the accompanying statement on the address of Edward C. Crafts.

I read this statement of Mr. Crafts over two weeks ago, and since then I have been warning everybody on the National staff, and every lumberman I could talk to that hidden in this address was the old-time program of taking over everything -- not only the individuals, but the states as well.

I don't know exactly how to proceed. I have been told by our people that we are making considerable progress with the forestry department. I was inclined to believe this, but this belief was certainly jarred by the Crafts statement, which was so wholeheartedly subscribed to by Mr. Watts.

Today and tomorrow in Washington Mr. Veach and one or two staff representatives will be meeting with the Forest Service on the subject of a timber survey, and later on this month a large group of us is going to meet with the Forest Service group to discuss the southern situation. This latter has been greatly aggravated by the passing of stumpage into the hands of paper and pulp people, and the over-cutting of young trees for pulp wood in many localities.

My suggestion is that before we make any move to answer Mr. Crafts, we refer this whole matter to the Association's Forestry Committee with instructions for them to bring in a recommendation of procedure at the May meeting of the Board of Directors.

There are so many facets to this forestry situation, I need not tell you that the number of lumbermen who are under positive obligations to the Forest Service is increasing every year.

I know you have read Mr. Hagenstein's testimony on the access road congressional hearing. I thought he made a wonderful statement, but to my surprise it has caused some very adverse comment simply on the ground that Mr. Hagenstein proposed the Forest Service sell more of its timber in large blocks so as to permit the purchaser to cut the stumpage under a long-time plan. This seemed a very logical statement. He didn't by any means propose that all the stumpage be sold on this basis, but he did warn the Forest Service of something I have been conscious of for a long time, namely, selling a large part of the stumpage in small lots to small operators who are not able to make the maximum use of the log, is not practicing the efficient forest utilization the Service is constantly preaching and other countries, such as those of northern Europe, have found absolutely necessary to follow. This simple statement of selling large lots raised some protests as an exhibition of the fact that the National is dominated by the big operators and the little fellow hasn't a chance.

Mr. Walter S. Johnson
Page 2.

April 2, 1952

In any event, whether Mr. Martin's committee brings you a recommendation or whether it doesn't, this matter will be discussed by the Board of Directors, and, if possible, an agreement reached as to what we should do.

Like you, I don't think we should let this Crafts statement stand without some reply. It is full of holes and can be easily and successfully attacked.

HTK:AW

cc Messrs. Hillman Lueddemann
John B. Veach
S. V. Fullaway, Jr.
Charles Gray
Henry Bahr

from United States Code, 1970 edition

§ 526

TITLE 16.—CONSERVATION

Page 3828

§ 528. Development and administration of renewable surface resources for multiple use and sustained yield of products and services; Congressional declaration of policy and purpose.

It is the policy of the Congress that the national forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes. The purposes of sections 528 to 531 of this title are declared to be supplemental to, but not in derogation of, the purposes for which the national forests were established as set forth in section 475 of this title. Nothing herein shall be construed as affecting the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the several States with respect to wildlife and fish on the national forests. Nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the use or administration of the mineral resources of national forest lands or to affect the use or administration of Federal lands not within national forests. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 1, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SHORT TITLE

Sections 528 to 531 of this title are popularly known as the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960.

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 529, 530, 531, of this title.

§ 529. Same; authorization; consideration to relative values of resources; areas of wilderness.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to develop and administer the renewable surface resources of the national forests for multiple use and sustained yield of the several products and services obtained therefrom. In the administration of the national forests due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas. The establishment and maintenance of areas of wilderness are consistent with the purposes and provisions of sections 528 to 531 of this title. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 2, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 528, 530, 531 of this title.

§ 530. Same; cooperation with State and local governmental agencies and others.

In the effectuation of sections 528 to 531 of this title the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with interested State and local governmental agencies and others in the development and management of the national forests. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 3, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 528, 529, 531 of this title.

§ 531. Same; definitions.

As used in sections 528 to 531 of this title the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Multiple use" means: The management of all the various renewable surface resources of the national forests so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people; making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for periodic adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions; that some land will be used for less than all of the resources; and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the productivity of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output.

(b) "Sustained yield of the several products and services" means the achievement and maintenance in perpetuity of a high-level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of the national forests without impairment of the productivity of the land. (Pub. L. 86-517, § 4, June 12, 1960, 74 Stat. 215.)

Nelson to Bodine

February 21, 1955

Re. Conference with McArdle and Mason, February 17, 1955

When completed, he said, they can obtain a copy. There was considerable "ring around the rose" on this one.

3) The multiple use bill. This is the proposal advanced by the wildlife-conservationists group but which has not yet been introduced in Congress. I asked McArdle how he felt about the proposed measure and he said "Just between you and me, I don't like it". He said that the Advisory Council provision of the measure was just "window dressing" and the real purpose was to try to get into law as a major use wildlife and recreation activities.

4) The Three Sisters wilderness area proposal. He referred to the hearing in Eugene, Oregon that has just been completed and showed a strong feeling that the wildlifers were going to fail in trying to dictate how the Forest Service should handle the question of wilderness areas. He implied that the Forest Service was more or less pushed into this hearing against their will and indicated that he would not permit unreasonable volumes of timber to be tied up in wilderness areas if he could help it. I would judge that the Forest Service may stand pat with regard to their proposal on this matter.

5) Sub-Committee on Interior of the House Appropriations Committee. McArdle stated that the maneuver whereby Forest Service appropriation matters were transferred from the Sub-Committee on Agriculture to the Sub-Committee on Interior was political and was Representative Cannon's work. He stated that some people at first thought that this was a step in the direction of transferring the Forest Service to the Interior Department but he has become convinced that there is nothing of that sort behind it. He said that Cannon was anxious to put all public power matters in one committee, the Committee on Public Works, and he had done this by taking out of the Sub-Committee on Interior all electric power matters. This left the Interior Sub-Committee with not enough to do. So Cannon then more or less arbitrarily said "This can be taken care of by transferring Forest Service over to the Interior Sub-Committee". McArdle implied that the republicans could make some hay over the matter if they so desire by pointing out to the democrats that the democrats have now transferred Forest Service appropriation matters to the Interior Sub-Committee which has been termed by the democrats the Sub-Committee ruling

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT of the INTERIOR

★ news release

For Release to PM's, MARCH 13, 1963

REMARKS OF EDWARD C. CRAFTS, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE A PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY FORESTRY CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY PARK, PENNSYLVANIA, MARCH 13, 1963

Your Director, Pete Fletcher, and I have been friends for quite a few years so I know he will excuse my reference to a most interesting letter I received from him several months ago. In writing me about this Forestry Convocation he explained that almost all of the sophomores, juniors, and seniors of the School of Forestry are required to attend. And, furthermore, that you receive no academic credit for doing so.

This means that you are here this morning as a captive audience. It also means that talks such as mine and others that you hear during these convocations are not rated too highly by your faculty. If they were, you might get some credit for attendance.

In a way, this gives me a comfortable feeling because I know you won't walk out on me. At the same time, perhaps my remarks can be made sufficiently interesting so that you may feel they are worthwhile regardless of credit.

In a more serious vein, I welcome more than most of you know this opportunity to talk to a group of forestry students. I am a forester myself out of Dartmouth and Michigan about 30 years ago. Ever since getting involved in this new venture of outdoor recreation, I have been looking forward to a chance to talk to a group of forestry students and incidentally through them to your collective faculties throughout the country.

I did have a chance to attend a meeting of the Council of Forestry School Executives last fall, but had to forego it because of conflicts. Since then, I have been privileged to spend a day or two on the campuses of both Syracuse and Utah State Universities. Both of these occasions, however, were in the nature of either conferences on particular subjects or brief meetings with individual faculty members. At neither time did I have an opportunity to talk to a group of students. There would have been another chance at Yale last week except that that occasion likewise had to be cancelled because of a conflict.

Therefore, some the things that I intend to say this morning have been stored up for some time.

The primary subject that I would like to discuss is professional education in recreation.

I had not been very long with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation when it became apparent that there was a great need for professionalization in recreation especially among resource-oriented graduates. It seems to me that in a growing field such as this, we have one of our greatest educational needs. As a corollary one of our greatest deficiencies exists here at the moment.

For some time I have been advocating the desirability of a national conference on higher education in recreation and had hoped that one might be held this year. This was one of the items discussed a few months ago at our conference at Syracuse with the deans of three Forestry or Natural Resource schools, and with recreation leaders in several walks of life. Out of this came a decision to hold a conference on recreation research at Ann Arbor this coming May sponsored jointly by the University of Michigan and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

It was also felt that the subject was too big to cover both research and education in a single conference. I think it not unlikely at Ann Arbor, however, that a decision may be made by the organizing committee to sponsor a somewhat similar conference within a year on recreation education.

First, just a word about the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and its functions. I have no way of knowing how well informed you are on this. I assume you know that several years ago the Congress created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission made up of certain Members of Congress and citizens appointed by the President. That Commission a little over a year ago completed its task in a report that has been widely received and highly applauded called "Outdoor Recreation for America." Following this major report, there have been issued a series of about 20 supplemental reports on a variety of subjects studied by the Commission. One of the major recommendations was the creation of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior to be charged with several functions.

These include the promotion of coordination among the 20-odd Federal agencies engaged in some form of outdoor recreation, the stimulation of and provision for technical assistance to State governments in this field, the conduct and sponsorship of research, the carrying out of a long-range planning and surveys of outdoor recreation needs and resources, and the development of outdoor recreation programs.

Our orientation is that of a small policy, planning and coordinating agency. We recognize the pivotal role of State and local governments and the primary contribution made by private enterprise. We are not a land managing agency. But we are distinctly more than an advisory agency and through the medium of a Presidential Cabinet-level Recreation Advisory Council and other mechanisms such as budget, legislative and program review, we are in a position to exercise a great deal of influence on the recreation policies of the Federal Government.

During the past year, we have operated with a small budget of something over \$1 million. We have about 100 people on our payroll, most of whom are in Washington. We have the nucleus of five field offices. The approach of the Outdoor

Recreation Resources Review Commission and our own approach has been a bipartisan, professional career approach. My sincere hope is that outdoor recreation, like forestry, may become established professionally in the Federal Government as a non-political, bipartisan career activity.

I would hope that the main report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission is required reading for all students in the School of Forestry. If it is not, it should be. Unfortunately, but understandably, the Commission did not include a report or study on educational needs in recreation among its numerous supplemental appendices. But let me describe briefly to you from the very practical standpoint of the administrator of the newest conservation bureau in the Federal Government what we are faced with in trying to staff adequately.

As I said, we have about 100 people. Probably in about another year, we will double this 100 and then level off. We have had to staff from the top down because we started a new organization from scratch. This doesn't happen very often in the field of public conservation. We did not have a nucleus of employees to promote from within as is the traditional pattern in firmly established agencies such as the National Park Service, Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

I am a forester and a number of recreation professionals have questioned the propriety of a forester to head the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This, I think, should give foresters some pause for thought.

The Associate Director is a geographer. One of the Assistant Directors is a forester, and the second Assistant Director is a fish and wildlife biologist. Our chief administrative officer is a public accountant.

We have key personnel whose primary disciplines and experience have been in public administration, in landscape architecture, in law, in journalism, in biology, physical education, economics, and so on. We are currently seeking personnel with orientations in sociology, psychology, and mathematics. We have had to assemble our key personnel from a variety of basic disciplines for the simple reason that there does not exist an available pool of educated and qualified recreation professionals with the kind of background and training that is needed.

There has been no lack of applicants--perhaps six or seven hundred in all. But most of these have been people we didn't want for one reason or another.

Perhaps I should remind you that the use of land resources for recreation has expanded tremendously since World War II, that recreational use of these resources more and more frequently is becoming the primary use, that the recreation business has a major economic impact on many States and on the Nation, and that this is a relatively new development.

We foresee a tripling of outdoor recreation needs in the next 40 years. Currently, some \$20 billion are spent annually by consumers of recreation in all of the multitudinous outdoor recreation activities. The hard core of activities are driving for pleasure, walking and water-based recreation. Winter sports are coming up rapidly. The more traditional activities such as picnicking, camping, fishing and hunting while likewise increasing, are not at the top insofar as the number of recreation experiences go. Ninety percent of our population takes part each year.

When I was a student at the University of Michigan, one course was given in the Forestry School on recreation administration. I shall never forget one day when Dean Sam Dana, my long time friend, substituted for the regular professor, and said that teaching the course that day was indeed a recreational experience. He was contrasting it to forest management with the possible inference that it was an easy course and the subject was somewhat lighthearted and frivolous. This was the concept in those days.

This particular course was a favorite pipe course for students in difficulty and enjoyed a reputation as did another course, "The History of Roman Band Instruments" as being a favorite of athletes with scholastic problems. The situation has changed drastically since those days.

There is nothing frivolous about the pursuit of recreation at the present time. It is therapy of the finest type. It is an answer in part to the increased leisure time available to most citizens. The wise use of this leisure time is the object of sober thought by more and more persons.

I commend to you Walter Kerr's book on the "Decline of Pleasure," and a recent 20th Century Fund book, "Of Time, Work and Leisure." There are moral, physical, and spiritual attributes of recreation that are becoming increasingly recognized. No longer do we consider recreationists to be slackers in the shade.

To help meet this sociological need, there is no question in my mind but what we need educated professionals. There is likewise no question that if the demand is such and the needs made sufficiently clear, the Universities will respond in adopting their curricula accordingly.

I do not feel that recreation organizations should have to depend indefinitely on the assembly of a diverse group of disciplines such as I enumerated before. Some of this will and should continue. But I also feel that we need to have a recreation discipline in itself much more clearly defined and broadly oriented than now exists. I think that higher-level education with a recreation orientation is going through the birthing pains of professionalism much as forestry did 50 years ago.

I cannot tell you what the demand is or may be in numbers of persons. The American Recreation Society estimates about 25,000 full-time workers at the present time in activity-type recreation. But this takes little or no account of resource-oriented recreation. There are now about 20,000 foresters in the United States and a fair share of these have some responsibility in recreation.

The same is true of the landscape architects and the other disciplines I mentioned, particularly numerous biologists engaged in fish and wildlife activities.

It has become more and more apparent to me in recent months that higher level recreation education is going down two largely separate and divergent avenues. One is activity or people-oriented; the other is resource-oriented. The completeness of the divergence is, I think, unfortunate. Some remedy is needed. Let me explain what I mean.

There are numerous recreation organizations knowledgeable in the field of activity-oriented recreation such as the National Recreation Association, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, and the American Recreation Society, to say nothing of the various park groups and associations.

Figures available from these groups indicate that about 75 institutions of higher learning offer degrees in recreation and graduate about 500 students a year, including a fair portion of Masters and Doctoral candidates.

This is the activity-oriented group. These curricula are found most frequently in the Colleges of Physical Education of which recreation is often a division or a unit. Sometimes these curricula are found in the Departments of Sociology or Liberal Arts. Frequently they originated as a tacked-on appendage to some major department.

There is here at Pennsylvania State, a curriculum in recreation education which includes a park and recreation administration option. This work is headed by Professor Fred Coombs, one of the most eminent professors in the field. Graduates through this avenue are frequently instructors in municipal playgrounds, at city parks, active in hospital recreation, playground management, camp counselors, take part in community theaters, in dance activities, and so on. They fill a very real need. This is what is commonly meant by the recreation professional. They are primarily oriented to the individual, but normally have little knowledge of the land or water resources.

On the other hand, we have the resource manager who comes mostly from schools of landscape architecture or forestry, whose primary interest is management of the resource, and who is not normally oriented toward the individual human being except as he exerts an impact on the resource. Frequently these schools, particularly the forestry schools, give a course or two in recreation. A few have or are developing recreation curricula or options. There may be one or two which give degrees in recreation. To my knowledge, Syracuse University, the University of Michigan, Utah State and Pennsylvania State, are among those forestry or natural-resource schools which are moving most aggressively in this field.

I have been privileged to see sample curricula that are being developed at two of these institutions.

Too often the same university will offer curricula or courses in activity-oriented recreation such as in a college of physical education and also resource-oriented recreation in a school of forestry with neither students nor the professors really knowledgeable about what is going on in the other department. This is a rather frequent occurrence.

I know of one Big Ten university which has appointed a coordinator of research on recreation. This professor happens to be in a Department of Agricultural Economics of the College of Agriculture. Yet recreation research in that university is being carried on not only in the Department of Agricultural Economics, but in the School of Education, Department of Rural Sociology, School of Commerce, Department of Horticulture, Department of Wildlife Management, and the University Extension Division.

What I am trying to say in a nutshell is that apparently there is considerable and well developed instruction in activity-oriented recreation. There is just beginning to be substantial instruction in resource-oriented recreation. Frequently these two approaches are occurring at the same institutions; and I have been surprised at the numerous occasions where the two groups of students and professors are not closely integrated nor really knowledgeable of what the other is doing. A National Conference on Recreation Education would do much to bring the two groups together and help remedy the situation.

Some of you interested in Federal work may wonder whether Civil Service examinations are given for recreation. From time to time, announcements are made of examinations for "recreation specialists" but up to now these covered entirely activity-oriented recreation. To quote from one official announcement, the major areas of specification include "arts and crafts, dramatics and theater, general, music, radio and television, roving leadership, social activities and sports." There is no recognition here of the resource oriented recreation needs.

There is, of course, the general Federal Service Entrance examination for the lower grades from which the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation could draw candidates, as well as the special registers for foresters, biologists, landscape architects, and so on. If our demand is sufficient--and we are considering these matters now with the Civil Service Commission--I believe it may be possible to arrange for a special examination to meet the particular needs of the Federal Government for recreation specialists with some resource orientation. This could cover needs not only of our small Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, but also the much larger needs for recreation specialists of major land-managing Bureaus such as the National Park Service, Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

On the matter of accreditation, there is some activity underway at the present time by the American Recreation Society. I do not know too much about it because I think it is just in its preliminary stages. But I believe that again the orientation is primarily toward activity-oriented recreation.

Numerous studies of education needs are made from time to time and as the need arises. It is possible that some Foundation or University or even a Federal bureau may undertake a thorough analysis of many of the problems that I am outlining here this morning.

For instance, I am thinking of something parallel to "The Education of Businessmen" by the Committee for Economic Development, various reports on career development in Federal agencies, studies of the need for specialists in public administration, or the "Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education." Perhaps some of you have seen the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel called "Personnel for the New Diplomacy" which discusses personnel needs and qualifications primarily for work in the State Department in the diplomatic field.

Possibly I have not been very constructive this morning, but let me offer a few ideas.

First, I wish it were possible for a university to provide correlated instruction in both activity-oriented recreation and resource-oriented recreation, and to develop joint curricula in order to give students a better balance. I think it highly important that the faculties in these two major branches become better known to each other and mix more effectively.

The trouble with most professionals who come out of the resource schools and who get into the recreation field is that their interest is primarily in managing the resource for the sake of the resource, rather than for the sake of the people.

The trouble with the activity-oriented recreationist is that in most cases, he knows little or nothing about resources.

If I were drafting a curriculum for a recreation specialty, I would think it highly important for students to have exposure to political science, economics, psychology, and sociology even at the sacrifice of some instruction in biologically-oriented subjects. This idea comes hard, I know, for foresters with traditional--and to my mind--excessive preoccupation with biological subjects. But if we were to develop a prescription for a Civil Service Register for a recreation specialist to meet our needs in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, we certainly would include certain requirements in these other fields.

May I also say to forestry students and to forestry school Deans that I think they face a very real problem and challenge in shaping their curricula to the needs of today and the future under the growing impact of higher population.

To put it bluntly, foresters with only traditional training are too much oriented to trees. I heard one economist say once that the forester's philosophy was "Hurrah for Trees." In a sense the very connotation of forestry unfortunately carries that meaning. As forest land is used more and more for recreation and water, preoccupation with silviculture, timber growing and forest management becomes relatively less important.

I think in the field of politics, business, and government, that policy decisions affecting forest lands and other land used for recreation, are commonly made by lawyers, economists, businessmen, legislators, and not too frequently by foresters. This, again, is a reflection of educational emphasis on technocracy rather than on people and policy. The practice of political science by a forester is rare indeed.

In my judgment, forestry educators and forestry organizations urgently need to broaden their concepts if they are to serve effectively in supplying professionals who in the years ahead will be determining the policy of our Government and our businesses in the development and administration of land, including the supplying of outdoor recreation for an ever-growing population.

I have probably talked too long and said too much. But I have at least unburdened myself of an accumulation of thoughts and impressions that have been growing in my mind, particularly in the last year since I have been Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

I do hope that some nourishment may be found in these thoughts by students and educators upon whom public officials must rely to supply our professional needs. The calibre of our personnel in turn largely determines the quality of administration and our service to the public.

x x x

The same is true of the landscape architects and the other disciplines I mentioned, particularly numerous biologists engaged in fish and wildlife activities.

It has become more and more apparent to me in recent months that higher level recreation education is going down two largely separate and divergent avenues. One is activity or people-oriented; the other is resource-oriented. The completeness of the divergence is, I think, unfortunate. Some remedy is needed. Let me explain what I mean.

There are numerous recreation organizations knowledgeable in the field of activity-oriented recreation such as the National Recreation Association, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, and the American Recreation Society, to say nothing of the various park groups and associations.

Figures available from these groups indicate that about 75 institutions of higher learning offer degrees in recreation and graduate about 500 students a year, including a fair portion of Masters and Doctoral candidates.

This is the activity-oriented group. These curricula are found most frequently in the Colleges of Physical Education of which recreation is often a division or a unit. Sometimes these curricula are found in the Departments of Sociology or Liberal Arts. Frequently they originated as a tacked-on appendage to some major department.

There is here at Pennsylvania State, a curriculum in recreation education which includes a park and recreation administration option. This work is headed by Professor Fred Coombs, one of the most eminent professors in the field. Graduates through this avenue are frequently instructors in municipal playgrounds, at city parks, active in hospital recreation, playground management, camp counselors, take part in community theaters, in dance activities, and so on. They fill a very real need. This is what is commonly meant by the recreation professional. They are primarily oriented to the individual, but normally have little knowledge of the land or water resources.

On the other hand, we have the resource manager who comes mostly from schools of landscape architecture or forestry, whose primary interest is management of the resource, and who is not normally oriented toward the individual human being except as he exerts an impact on the resource. Frequently these schools, particularly the forestry schools, give a course or two in recreation. A few have or are developing recreation curricula or options. There may be one or two which give degrees in recreation. To my knowledge, Syracuse University, the University of Michigan, Utah State and Pennsylvania State, are among those forestry or natural-resource schools which are moving most aggressively in this field.

I have been privileged to see sample curricula that are being developed at two of these institutions.

Too often the same university will offer curricula or courses in activity-oriented recreation such as in a college of physical education and also resource-oriented recreation in a school of forestry with neither students nor the professors really knowledgeable about what is going on in the other department. This is a rather frequent occurrence.

I know of one Big Ten university which has appointed a coordinator of research on recreation. This professor happens to be in a Department of Agricultural Economics of the College of Agriculture. Yet recreation research in that university is being carried on not only in the Department of Agricultural Economics, but in the School of Education, Department of Rural Sociology, School of Commerce, Department of Horticulture, Department of Wildlife Management, and the University Extension Division.

What I am trying to say in a nutshell is that apparently there is considerable and well developed instruction in activity-oriented recreation. There is just beginning to be substantial instruction in resource-oriented recreation. Frequently these two approaches are occurring at the same institutions; and I have been surprised at the numerous occasions where the two groups of students and professors are not closely integrated nor really knowledgeable of what the other is doing. A National Conference on Recreation Education would do much to bring the two groups together and help remedy the situation.

Some of you interested in Federal work may wonder whether Civil Service examinations are given for recreation. From time to time, announcements are made of examinations for "recreation specialists" but up to now these covered entirely activity-oriented recreation. To quote from one official announcement, the major areas of specification include "arts and crafts, dramatics and theater, general, music, radio and television, roving leadership, social activities and sports." There is no recognition here of the resource oriented recreation needs.

There is, of course, the general Federal Service Entrance examination for the lower grades from which the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation could draw candidates, as well as the special registers for foresters, biologists, landscape architects, and so on. If our demand is sufficient--and we are considering these matters now with the Civil Service Commission--I believe it may be possible to arrange for a special examination to meet the particular needs of the Federal Government for recreation specialists with some resource orientation. This could cover needs not only of our small Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, but also the much larger needs for recreation specialists of major land-managing Bureaus such as the National Park Service, Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

On the matter of accreditation, there is some activity underway at the present time by the American Recreation Society. I do not know too much about it because I think it is just in its preliminary stages. But I believe that again the orientation is primarily toward activity-oriented recreation.

Numerous studies of education needs are made from time to time and as the need arises. It is possible that some Foundation or University or even a Federal bureau may undertake a thorough analysis of many of the problems that I am outlining here this morning.

For instance, I am thinking of something parallel to "The Education of Businessmen" by the Committee for Economic Development, various reports on career development in Federal agencies, studies of the need for specialists in public administration, or the "Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education." Perhaps some of you have seen the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Personnel called "Personnel for the New Diplomacy" which discusses personnel needs and qualifications primarily for work in the State Department in the diplomatic field.

Possibly I have not been very constructive this morning, but let me offer a few ideas.

First, I wish it were possible for a university to provide correlated instruction in both activity-oriented recreation and resource-oriented recreation, and to develop joint curricula in order to give students a better balance. I think it highly important that the faculties in these two major branches become better known to each other and mix more effectively.

The trouble with most professionals who come out of the resource schools and who get into the recreation field is that their interest is primarily in managing the resource for the sake of the resource, rather than for the sake of the people.

The trouble with the activity-oriented recreationist is that in most cases, he knows little or nothing about resources.

If I were drafting a curriculum for a recreation specialty, I would think it highly important for students to have exposure to political science, economics, psychology, and sociology even at the sacrifice of some instruction in biologically-oriented subjects. This idea comes hard, I know, for foresters with traditional--and to my mind--excessive preoccupation with biological subjects. But if we were to develop a prescription for a Civil Service Register for a recreation specialist to meet our needs in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, we certainly would include certain requirements in these other fields.

May I also say to forestry students and to forestry school Deans that I think they face a very real problem and challenge in shaping their curricula to the needs of today and the future under the growing impact of higher population.

To put it bluntly, foresters with only traditional training are too much oriented to trees. I heard one economist say once that the forester's philosophy was "Hurrah for Trees." In a sense the very connotation of forestry unfortunately carries that meaning. As forest land is used more and more for recreation and water, preoccupation with silviculture, timber growing and forest management becomes relatively less important.

I think in the field of politics, business, and government, that policy decisions affecting forest lands and other land used for recreation, are commonly made by lawyers, economists, businessmen, legislators, and not too frequently by foresters. This, again, is a reflection of educational emphasis on technocracy rather than on people and policy. The practice of political science by a forester is rare indeed.

In my judgment, forestry educators and forestry organizations urgently need to broaden their concepts if they are to serve effectively in supplying professionals who in the years ahead will be determining the policy of our Government and our businesses in the development and administration of land, including the supplying of outdoor recreation for an ever-growing population.

I have probably talked too long and said too much. But I have at least unburdened myself of an accumulation of thoughts and impressions that have been growing in my mind, particularly in the last year since I have been Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

I do hope that some nourishment may be found in these thoughts by students and educators upon whom public officials must rely to supply our professional needs. The calibre of our personnel in turn largely determines the quality of administration and our service to the public.

x x x

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR EDWARD C. CRAFTS

Crafts, Edward C. "A Forest Industry and Its Dependent Population."
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1933.

A copy of this study could not be located.

_____. "Proper Utilization of Bunchgrass Range." Journal of Forestry
36, no. 4 (April 1938): 432-434.

_____. "Height-Volume Distribution in Range Grasses." Journal of
Forestry 36, no. 12 (December 1938): 1182-1185.

_____. "Forest Service Holds Range Research Seminar." Journal of
Forestry 38, no. 3 (March 1940): 282-283.

_____. "Some Social and Economic Effects of Timber Utilization and
Management in Modoc County, California." Berkeley, California,
1942.

A copy of this study could not be located.

_____. "Some Effects of Defense on Wood Utilization in California."
Journal of Forestry 40, no. 4 (April 1942): 285-290.

_____. "The Case for Federal Participation in Forest Regulation."
Paper presented before Yale Forestry Club and the Yale Conservation
Club, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, December 5, 1951.
Reprinted in American Forests 58, no. 5 (May 1952): 26.

_____. "American Forest Policy." Journal of Forestry 50, no. 3
(March 1952): 223-224.

Crafts discusses the role of the federal government in forestry.

_____. Review of American Forest Policy a Study of Government
Administration and Economic Control by Luther Gulick, in Journal
of Forestry 50, no. 3 (March 1952): 223-224.

This article discusses the role of the federal government in
forestry.

_____. "Public Forest Policy in a National Emergency." Journal of Forestry 50, no. 4 (April 1952): 266-270.

_____, and Chapman, H. H. "Do We Need Federal Forest Regulation?" American Forests 58, no. 5 (May 1952): 26-44.

Crafts argues yes, and Chapman argues no.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Forest Products Laboratory, 1954," by Edward C. Crafts and Verne L. Harper. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

Crafts, Edward C. "Crafts Discusses Multiple-Use Bill." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 5 (June 1960): 3.

U. S. Department of Interior. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. "News Release." Remarks by Edward C. Crafts before a Pennsylvania State University Forestry Convocation, University Park, Pennsylvania, 13 March 1963.

Crafts, Edward C. "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962." Tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library.

_____. "Brinkmanship in Our Forests." American Forests 75, no. 8 (August 1969): 19-52.

This article is based on testimony by Crafts before subcommittee on forests of the House Committee on Agriculture on a bill to establish a High-Yield Timber Fund.

_____. Tape-recorded interview in 1969 by David G. McComb. Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, Austin, Texas.

_____. Tape-recorded interview in 1969 by William W. Moss. John F. Kennedy Library, Waltham, Massachusetts. 1972.

_____. Tape-recorded interview in 1970 by William W. Moss. John F. Kennedy Library, Waltham, Massachusetts. 1972.

The preceding three interviews concern Dr. Crafts's seven years with the Department of Interior.

_____. "Saga of a Law." American Forests. Part I, 76, no. 6
(June 1970): 13-54. Part II, 76, no. 7 (July 1970): 29-35.

Excellent legislative chronicle of the passage of the 1960
Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act.

SELECTED READINGS ON MULTIPLE USE

The following is a list of selected readings on the history of multiple use of the national forests. It was compiled by Barbara Holman, a graduate of Sacramento State College with a major in history, and Susan Schrepfer, who received her doctorate in history from the University of California, Riverside.

The listing was compiled in the course of the research preparatory to interviews made by the Forest History Society in cooperative agreement with the United States Forest Service on the subject of multiple use of the national forests. The interviewees selected for the project were Edward C. Crafts, Frederick W. Grover, Verne L. Harper, Earl S. Peirce, Hamilton K. Pyles, and J. Herbert Stone. This bibliography is not exhaustive. It is limited by time and the need to shape research according to the interviewee's backgrounds. It is hoped, however, that it might offer a brief introduction to any scholar brave enough to embark upon a study of multiple use.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

GOVERNMENTAL AND NONGOVERNMENTAL

Unpublished material relevant to the history of multiple use was found in archival collections of the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California. These collections include the papers of the American Forestry Association, the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, and the Society of American Foresters.

Also consulted was Record Group 95 (U. S. Forest Service), in the Federal Records Center in San Francisco, California, and in the National Archives in Washington, D. C. Outstanding material found in these collections are listed below.

Pyles, Hamilton K. "Training Needs to Make Multiple Use Work." Speech delivered at meeting of regional foresters and station directors, U. S. Forest Service, 29 February to 4 March 1960.

Stone, J. Herbert. "Multiple Use--What is It? How is it Applied in Region 6?" Speech delivered at Symposium, Green River Community College, Auburn, Washington, 17 October 1960. A copy of this speech is to be placed in the Appendix of the typed transcript of the interview with J. Herbert Stone conducted by Elwood R. Maunder in October 1971, Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.

Twight, Ben W. "The Tenacity of Value Commitment: The Forest Service and the Olympic National Park." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Washington, 15 November 1971.

In this dissertation the author asserts that the U. S. Forest Service's primary commitment has been to the concept of timber as a crop to be harvested. As a result of this commitment, the service failed to respond adequately to the values and expectations of recreation-oriented groups with regard to the Olympic National Forest.

U. S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. "Recreation Uses on the National Forests: A Study of their Extent and Character With a Discussion of Public Policies and Recommendations as to Methods of Development and Administration, 1917," by Frank A. Waugh. Typed. Forest History Society Library, Santa Cruz, California.

Here is a very interesting early report with numerous photographs with identification.

_____. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, Range, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Pacific Northwest Region, 1937," by Earl S. Peirce and Earl W. Loveridge. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

_____. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Northeastern Region, 1938," by Christopher M. Granger and Earl S. Peirce. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

_____. "A Primer for Water Management on Cleveland National Forest," by Hamilton K. Pyles. May 1948. Typed. Copy in the Office of the Forest Supervisor, Cleveland National Forest, San Diego, California.

_____. "Plan for Management of the Southern California Forests," by Clare Hendee and Stephen N. Wyckoff. 1953. Typed. The original study is held in the Office of the Forest Supervisor, Cleveland National Forest, San Diego, California.

Hamilton Pyles participated in the formulating of this plan.

_____. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Forest Products Laboratory, 1954," by Edward C. Crafts and Verne L. Harper. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

_____. "Pacific Northwest Region, 1958," by J. Herbert Stone. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

_____. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Eastern Region and Northwest Forest Experiment Station, 1958," by Verne L. Harper and Russell B. McKennan. Typed General Integrating Inspection Report. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

Hamilton Pyles was regional forester of the Eastern Region at the time this report was made.

_____. "A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Northwest Region and Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, 1958, by Edward P. Cliff and Russell B. McKennen. Typed General Integrating Inspection Report. National Archives, Record Group 95, Records of the Office of the Chief.

Attached to this report is a memorandum written by J. Herbert Stone.

_____. "A Servicewide Plan to Gear Multiple Use Management of the National Forests to the Nation's Mounting Needs." 1960. Typed. Archives Branch of the Federal Records Center, San Francisco, California, Record Group 95.

_____. "Forest Service-National Park Service Relationships." Office Memorandum by Richard E. McArdle, 12 February 1960, Washington, D. C. Archives Branch of the Federal Records Center, San Francisco, California, Record Group 95.

_____. "Guide for the preparation of a Ranger District Multiple-Use Management Plan. [1960]. Typed. Archives Branch of the Federal Records Center, San Francisco, California, Record Group 95.

_____. "Multiple Use Practices, Problems, and Opportunities in Southern Forests." By A. W. Greeley. At the Georgia Forests Research Council-Georgia Forestry Association Conference on Multiple Use of the Southern Forests, at Calloway Gardens, Pine Mountain, Georgia, 5 November 1969. Mimeographed.

U. S. Department of Interior. National Park Service. "Primary Use vs. Multiple Use," by Howard Stagner. At Visitor Services Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, 30 November 1959. Typed. Archives Branch of the Federal Records Center, San Francisco, California, Record Group 95.

_____. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. "News Release." Remarks by Edward C. Crafts before a Pennsylvania State University Forestry Convocation. University Park, Pennsylvania, 13 March 1963. A copy is to be placed in the Appendix of the typed transcript of the interview with Edward C. Crafts conducted by Susan R. Schrepfer in August 1971, Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.

Wilson, Carl N. "Decision Making and Multiple Use Management in the United States Forest Service." M.A. thesis, University of Montana, 1967.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

One Third of the Nation's Land: A Report to the President and to the Congress by the Public Land Law Review Commission. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1970.

U. S. Congress. Senate. A National Plan for American Forestry. S. Doc. 12, 73rd Cong., 1st sess., 1933. Also known as the "Copeland Report."

U. S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. The Use Book. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1907.

_____. Future Land Use in the U. S. Circular No. 159. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

_____. "Forest Grazing Control Aids Tree Growth." Yearbook of Agriculture, 1926. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1926.

_____. Forest Outings by Thirty Foresters. Edited by Russell Lord. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

V. L. Harper was one of the foresters who worked on this project.

_____. "Projects of Many Uses: Other Federal Forests," by F. W. Grover. In Trees: The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1949. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1949.

_____. U. S. Forest Service Manual. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.

_____. National Forest Program for the Shawnee Hills of Southern Illinois. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1963.

F. W. Grover participated in this study.

_____. Cooperative Forest Fire Control: The History of its Origins and Development Under the Weeks and Clarke-McNary Acts. Compiled by Earl S. Peirce and revised by William J. Stahl. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

- _____. A National Forestry Research Program. Miscellaneous Publication No. 965. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, May 1964.
- U. S. Department of Commerce. Study of Public Land Timber Policy, 4 vols. By George Banzhaf and Company. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U. S. Department of Interior. Bureau of Land Management. Man and the Forest: A Conference on Multiple Use Management of Forest Lands. Denver, Colorado, 17-19 April 1967. Denver, Colorado: U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, 1967.
- U. S., Statutes at Large, Vol. 74. "Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960," 12 June 1960, p. 215. U. S. Code, Title 16, Sec. 528 (1970).

BOOKS - NONGOVERNMENTAL PUBLICATIONS

Forest Policy Statement: Florida Section. Society of American Foresters, 1968.

V. L. Harper wrote this statement.

"Multiple-Use Forestry in the Changing West." Proceedings: Society of American Foresters Meeting. Salt Lake City, Utah, 1958.

Multiple Use of Forest Lands: Proceedings of the Fifth World Forestry Congress. Seattle, Washington, 1960. University of Washington, September 1962. Three volumes.

V. L. Harper was chairman of the Executive Committee.

Pyles, Hamilton K. "What's Ahead for Our Public Lands?" A Summary Review of the Activities and Final Report of the Public Land Law Review Commission. Washington, D. C.: Natural Resources Council of America, 1970.

Reed, Waller. "Forest: Pressure for Multiple Use of Forest Land." In the Western Forestry and Conservation Association, Proceedings of the 46th Annual Western Forestry Conference. Portland, Oregon, 7-9 December 1955. 65-66.

Roberts, Paul H. Hoof Prints on the Forest Range: The Early Years of the National Forest Range Administration. San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Company, 1963.

Smith, Frank E. ed. Conservation in the United States, A Documentary History: Land and Water 1900-1970. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1971.

Stone, J. Herbert. "A First Look at the Resources of the Northwest." In the Western Forestry and Conservation Association, Proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference. Portland, Oregon, 1951.

PERIODICALS AND NEWSPAPERS

All issues of American Forests from 1920 to 1960 were carefully surveyed for articles, editorials, and news items bearing on the development of multiple use in the national forests. The Journal of Forestry and Living Wilderness were explored for these same years on an intermittent basis. The Sierra Club Bulletin from the early sixties provided provocative information. The most outstanding articles from these and other magazines are listed below.

Albright, Horace M. "Highest Use vs. Multiple Use." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 4 (April-May 1960): 3-7.

Albright discusses the history of relations between the National Park Service and the U. S. Forest Service, focusing on the controversy over the extension of the park service into forest service lands.

Antrei, Albert. "A Western Phenomenon, The Origin and Development of Watershed Research: Manti, Utah, 1889." American West 8, no. 2 (March 1971): 42-59.

"A Program for American Forestry." American Forests 65, no. 7 (July 1959): 17-25.

Forest protection, improvement of the national timber crop, forest research, and multiple-use management of forest resources are explored in this article.

"Bulletin Board." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 4 (April-May 1960): 15.

This is a short paragraph on passage of the multiple-use bill.

Butler, Ovid. "Forest Situation Exposed: Exhaustive Report by Forest Service to Congress Lays Forest Troubles to Private Ownership of Land. Huge Program of Public Ownership is Proposed." American Forests 39, no. 5 (May 1933): 204-236.

This article discusses "A National Plan for American Forestry" otherwise known as the Copeland Report. According to the article the report reveals "a critical breakdown of forest land management." There is only brief mention of recreation, range, wildlife, and watershed.

Callison, Charles H. "The 86th Congress and Conservation." Sierra Club Bulletin, no. 5 (June 1960): 8.

Chapman, H. H. "Recreation as a Federal Land Use." American Forests 31, no. 378 (June 1925): 349-380.

Author recognizes the importance of recreation to the national forests and discusses the question of how much forest land should be preserved from cutting.

Clawson, Marion. "A Public Land Review." American Forests. Part I 71, no. 3 (March 1965): 11-57. Part II 71, no. 4 (April 1965): 34-63. Part III 71, no. 5 (May 1965): 51-95. Part IV 71, no. 6 (June 1965): 20-59. Part V 71, no. 7 (July 1965): 26-63. Part VI 71, no. 8 (August 1965): 12-61.

This series of articles by economist Marion Clawson of Resources for the Future highlights some problems likely to be encountered by the Public Land Law Review Commission in its Review of the public lands and administration and management in the United States. Clawson explores taxation of public lands, user payment, management problems, land exchanges, reorganization of federal resource agencies, and the future of public lands.

Cliff, Edward P. "Changes in the Status of Wildlife and Its Habit in the Northwest." The University of Washington Forest Club Quarterly 9, no. 3 (1935-36): 25-30.

_____. "The National Forests Serve." Journal of Forestry 53, no. 2 (February 1955): 112-115.

Cliff discusses briefly the development of The Use Book and of the various multiple uses.

_____. "The Role of Forest Recreation in Forest Land Management." Journal of Forestry 59, no. 7 (July 1961): 491-492.

Competition for forest lands intensifies, especially for wild lands. According to Cliff, the growing need for recreation offers a challenge to the profession of forestry. Foresters must be sensitive to social as well as economic values.

"Communities and Commodities." American Forests 69, no. 1 (January 1963): 11.

This article concerns the four-point program of the lumbering industry and multiple use.

"Conference Advances New Ideals in Forestry." American Forests 36, no. 6 (June 1930): 336-360.

This article reports the proceedings of a meeting of the American Forestry Association. The menace of stream and lake pollution was discussed as was the importance of forest recreation and wildlife. The association also put on record its opposition "to every bill in Congress for admission to the National Park system of areas which fail to meet completely the accepted National Park standards."

"Congratulations, Mr. Benson." American Forests 65, no. 4 (April 1959): 11.

Ezra Taft Benson proposes a program to provide more timber, water, recreation, wildlife, and other renewable natural resources. The writer of this editorial exclaims this is a "working model for balanced use on forest land."

Connaughton, Charles A. "Watershed Management--More than Mere Protection." Journal of Forestry 37, no. 4 (April 1939): 341-342.

This article discusses the importance of watershed management as restorative, protective and improvement.

_____. "Yield of Water as an Element in Multiple Use of Wild Land." Journal of Forestry 41, no. 9 (September 1943): 641-644.

_____. "The Triumphant Years." American Forests 61, no. 10 (October 1955): 20-95.

This is the story of Region 8, the southern region.

_____. "What is Multiple Use?" American Forests 65, no. 7 (July 1959): 30-61.

Connaughton clarifies the term multiple use.

_____. "The Forestry Profession and Land Use Pressures." Journal of Forestry 5, no. 3 (March 1960): 233.

This article discusses land management problems and the pressures brought on by the users of the various uses.

"Conservation in Congress." American Forests 47, no. 4 (April 1941): 182-200.

The recommendations of the Joint Congressional Committee on

forestry included: "More intensified management of timber, forage, wildlife, recreation and watershed resources on national forests." However, timber management and protection were the prime considerations of the committee with little consideration of the multiple uses.

"Crafts Discusses Multiple Use Bill." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 5 (June 1960): 3.

Edward Crafts discusses various questions on the multiple-use bill put to him by the Board of Directors of the Sierra Club.

"Crafts, Edward C. "Brinkmanship in Our Forests." American Forests 75, no. 8 (August 1969): 19-52.

This article is based on testimony by Crafts before Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture on a bill to establish a High Yield Timber Fund.

_____. "Saga of a Law." American Forests. Part I 76, no. 6 (June 1970): 13-54. Part II 76, no. 7 (July 1970): 29-35.

Craig, James B. "Bills, Bills, Bills." American Forests 66, no. 7 (July 1960): 22-96.

Edward C. Crafts helps Congress ride herd on all the bills affecting forest service programs.

_____. "Editorial." American Forests 72, no. 12 (December 1966): 12-13.

The American Forestry Association advocates that the North Cascades, in their entirety, remain national forest and therefore under multiple-use management.

_____. "Las Vegas--Where the Action Is." American Forests 74, no. 1 (January 1968): 16-63.

This article covers the 92nd annual meeting of the American Forestry Association and the association's discussions of the Bureau of Land Management's multiple-use practices.

_____. "North Cascades: A Different Kind of Country." American Forests 74, no. 7 (July 1968): 18-35.

This article centers on a move by some conservationists to turn the

Pacific Northwest's North Cascades into a national park, thereby removing it from forest service control. Craig discusses charges that the forest service permitted mining and logging in this wilderness area.

Dana, Samuel Trask. "The Early Years, Forest Service." Forest History 10, no. 2 (July 1966): 2-14.

This article contains excerpts from oral history interviews with Mr. Dana by Elwood R. Maunder and Amelia R. Fry.

Dresser, William T. "Design for Multiple Use." American Forests 70, no. 7 (July 1964): 13-15.

Dresser discusses the Los Angeles forests and the population that depends upon them.

Fischer, Virilis L. "Conservation: What Definition Do You Use?" American Forests 66, no. 6 (June 1960): 6-42.

"Five Leading Presidential Candidates Express Support for Multiple Use of Forests." Gulf Coast Lumberman 60, no. 12 (March 1972): 20.

The five candidates included Senator Edmund S. Muskie, represented by Representative Peter Kyros; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey; Senator George McGovern; Representative Paul N. McCloskey; and Governor George Wallace.

"Forest Protection--Past and Future." American Forests 42, no. 10 (October 1936): 458.

This editorial relates how forest protection results in improved streamflow protection, opportunities for recreation, and other economic and social returns.

Glascocock, H. R. "The View From Here: A Concept in Search of a Method." Journal of Forestry 70, no. 4 (April 1972): 194.

Goddard, Maurice K., and Widner, Ralph R. "The Job Ahead for AFA." American Forests 69, no. 12 (December 1963): 6-48.

This is a discussion of the Fifth American Forestry Congress in Washington, D. C., 28 October 1963.

Goldman, Don P. "But WHICH People?" American Forests. Part I 74, no. 3 (March 1968): 14-48. Part II 74, no. 4 (April 1968): 30-58.

In this two-part article multiple use is discussed in relation to the national parks.

Greeley, Arthur W. "Proving Grounds for Multiple Use." American Forests 63, no. 10 (October 1957): 24-83.

The use of the national forests in the Lakes States is the topic of this article.

_____, and Neff, L. P. "Forestry Decisions in the Light of Multiple Products (A Case Study)." Journal of Forestry 66, no. 10 (October 1968): 788-791.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area in northern Minnesota is taken as an example of multiple-use forest management.

Hall, Albert G. "Conservation Organizations Are Carefully Studying a Multiple-Use Bill." American Forests 60, no. 12 (December 1954): 6.

This is a short report on progress of multiple-use legislation.

_____. "The First Major Land-Use Act of the 85th Congress." American Forests 64, no. 4 (April 1958): 12.

Public Law 85-337 enacted by the 85th Congress and signed by the president in February 1958 has provisions for multiple-use management of such lands that might be set aside for military purposes, to the extent that multiple use is consistent with the military purpose for which the land is withdrawn.

_____. "Multiple Use: A Concept of National Forest Management." American Forests 66, no. 2 (February 1960): 10.

This article notes that: "It is expected that the recreational 'threat' to the national forests will result in consideration this year of a bill to give Congressional blessing to the multiple-use concept."

_____. "Multiple Use Bills Receive Hearings." American Forests 66, no. 4 (April 1960): 9-10.

_____. "The Multiple-Use Bill." American Forests 66, no. 5 (May 1960): 7-8.

Hall relates how the "equal status concept" of multiple use received strong opposition, and that the wood industries opposed providing for all uses, including recreational, which they argue the forest service has been doing for a long time.

_____. "Passage of the Multiple Use Bill." American Forests 66, no. 7 (July 1960): 9-10.

This article discusses the June 1960 passage of the multiple use bill.

Harper, V. L. "What's Ahead for Watershed Management Research on Forest and Range Lands?" In Proceedings Society of American Foresters, meeting 15-17 October 1956, Memphis, Tennessee. Washington, D. C.: Society of American Foresters, 1957.

_____. "The Fifth World Forestry Congress." American Forests 62, no. 11 (November 1956): 6-55.

This article discusses the purposes and history of the congresses.

_____. "The New Forestry." Journal of Forestry 63, no. 10 (October 1965): 752-754.

Harper discusses the existing confusion over the proper role of forestry.

"Johnston Re-Elected AFA President." American Forests 66, no. 3 (March 1960): 26-61.

At a board meeting in February 1960 the American Forestry Association voted full support for the proposed multiple use-sustained yield bill.

Kelso, M. M. "Current Issues in Federal Land Management in the Western United States." Journal of Farm Economics (November 1947): 1295-1313.

Kneipp, L. F. "Forestry and Recreation." American Forests 30, no. 270 (October 1924): 585.

Here is an early example of the U. S. Forest Service's awareness of the great value of combined uses as a management principle for the national forests. Recreation and watershed are emphasized.

_____. "Public Forests in the National Land Plan." American Forests 40, no. 4 (April 1934): 147-188.

The above article discusses planned land use to provide social and economic stability.

Mann, Walter. "America's Other Face." American Forests 65, no. 2 (February 1959): 12-46.

Mann, chief of forestry division in Bonn, Germany, visited America and was impressed by the multiple-use practices. He expressed the desire of having such practices applied in Germany.

McCloskey, J. M. "Note and Comment: The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960." Oregon Law Review 41 (1961): 49-78.

This article was one of the most outstanding encountered on multiple use. McCloskey traces the legal and administrative aspects of the U. S. Forest Service's development of multiple use.

McConnell, Grant. "The Conservation Movement--Past and Present," in Ian Burton and Robert Kates, Readings in Resource Management. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

McFee, Roy E. "American Primeval Forest." Living Wilderness 24, no. 68 (Spring 1959): 35-37.

David Brower criticizes the Cascades Glacier Peak Wilderness Area proposal announced by J. Herbert Stone because it did not include vast acreages of actual wilderness beyond the Glacier Peak area.

"Meeting of Minds Sought on H. R. 10465." American Forests 66, no. 5 (May 1960): 6-62.

This article reveals the differences of opinion between the U. S. Forest Service and representatives of the lumber industry over the proposed multiple use-sustained yield bill.

"More Muscle for Multiple Use." American Forests 76, no. 8 (August 1970): 7.

Interior Secretary Hickel's proposal to reduce the allowable cut on Oregon's O & C forest lands is discussed here.

"Multiple Use Act is Passed." Living Wilderness 25, no. 73 (Summer 1960): 27-28.

This short article discusses wilderness as one of the uses named in the act.

"Multiple Use Analyzed." Living Wilderness 25, no. 72 (Spring 1960): 40-44.

Grant McConnell analyzes the bill and the ability of the U. S. Forest Service administration to deal with problems of conflict of land use.

"Multiple Use Bill Advanced." Living Wilderness 25, no. 72 (Spring 1960): 40-44.

This article discusses the multiple use bill proposal of April 20, 1960.

"Multiple Use Gets Confidence Vote." American Forests 66, no. 4 (April 1960): 31-67.

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Forests of the House Committee on Agriculture brought nearly unanimous support from congressmen and representatives of conservation and trade associations. McArdle argues on behalf of multiple use.

"Multiple Use is Here to Stay." American Forests 66, no. 6 (June 1960): 9.

This is a short essay together with a full-page cartoon concerning the American Forestry Association's support of multiple-use management.

"Multiple Use of Forest Lands." American Forests 59, no. 12 (December 1953): 14-40.

At the Fourth American Forestry Congress a session was dedicated to the discussion of multiple use.

"Multiple-Use Plans Replace 'Limited Areas'." Living Wilderness 25, no. 74 (Autumn-Winter 1960-61): 40-41.

J. Herbert Stone announces that limited area status of certain California and Oregon national forests has been replaced by multiple-use planning.

"National Forests Use: Privilege or Right?" American Forests 65, no. 5 (May 1959): 11.

This editorial discusses the challenges to the multiple-use proposal of the wilderness bill. American Forestry Association spokesmen declare that wilderness areas are not multiple-use areas.

"National Land, Water Policy Urged." American Forests 56, no. 12 (December 1950): 25.

The Natural Resources Council of America adopts a platform on resource management.

Navon, Daniel I. "Activity Analysis in Wildland Management." Annals of Regional Science 3, Part 2 (December 1969): 75-84.

"Olallie Ridge Multiple Use Plan Approved." Living Wilderness no. 77 (Summer-Fall 1961): 34-35.

This plan was approved by J. Herbert Stone in August 1960. It states in part that timber occupies a major portion of this land area and that the plan can be carried on with due consideration of the other uses.

Pomeroy, Kenneth B. "Forester's Notebook." American Forests 62, no. 3 (March 1957): 30.

H. R. 3831, "Public Use of National Forests," declares it to be the

policy of Congress that all resources of the national forests shall be so managed as to assure maximum public multiple use thereof and that recreation, hunting, fishing, and wildlife habitat enjoyment are proper uses of such lands.

_____. "Accent on Research." American Forests 69, no. 1 (January 1963): 31-51.

This article discusses the November, 1962 meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Department of Agriculture wherein multiple use was strongly supported.

_____, and Howard Zahniser. "Exclusive Use or Multiple Use?" American Forests 63, no. 4 (April 1957): 6-7.

This article presents comments by Pomery and Zahniser on wilderness at a Society of American Foresters meeting.

Pratt, George D. "A New Program for New Forests." American Forests 30, no. 372 (December 1924): 707-709.

Here is an example of early awareness of the importance of recreation and watershed on the national forests. It discusses reasons for the establishment of national forests near centers of population in the East, South, and Midwest.

Redington, P. G. "Fifty Years of Forestry." American Forests 32, no. 396 (December 1926): 719-750.

Redington outlines the history of the national forests. He explains that the two main principals that governed the U. S. Forest Service's administration are the use of forest resources in a way to insure their perpetuity and the administration of the forests for the greatest good for the greatest number. There was to be no monopoly of resources and no destructive exploitation.

Rosecrans, W. S. "Logging in Recreational Forests." American Forests 63, no. 5 (May 1957): 20-59.

Rosecrans focuses on the forests of southern California, an area where watershed control, recreation, and logging are combined.

San Francisco Chronicle. "Critics Wonder if Smokey's Still Guarding the Forest." May 9, 1971.

The topic here is the clear cutting by commercial loggers on national

forest lands in the Bitterroot Valley of Montana. The article claims that the Bitterroot "is not an isolated case of abuse" but rather an example of the fact that "the Forest Service in recent years has fallen into the clutches of the timber lobby."

Shaw, Charles L. "Foresters Soften Multiple-Use Position." Forest Industries 98, no. 13 (December 1971): 25.

Speeches at the annual meeting of the Canadian Institute of Forestry stressed the problems that equal value of the multiple uses has on the lumber industry.

Shoenfeld, Clay. "Let's Cut Out the Numbers Game Nonsense." American Forests 74, no. 5 (May 1968): 10-56.

If foresters are truly to practice multiple-use forestry they must recognize all the parts and uses of woodlands and manage them in a rational program that brings out the fullest economic, ecological, and esthetic values without destroying the resource.

"Society Meets at Salt Lake." American Forests 64, no. 11 (November 1958): 8-34.

At the Society of American Foresters's annual meeting there are comments on the importance of multiple use.

Stagner, Howard. "A Second Look at Multiple Use." American Forests 66, no. 2 (February 1960): 24-25.

This is an address originally given by Stagner before the National Park Service's biennial visitor services meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Stone, J. Herbert. "Multiple Use and the Forester." Journal of Forestry no. 56 (September 1958): 699-701.

Application of the multiple-use concept as discussed by Stone is to provide the greatest good to the greatest number.

_____. "Herb Stone's Baedeker." American Forests 74, no. 6 (June 1968): 18-40.

Here Stone surveys the multiple uses of the Oregon Cascades.

_____. "Forest or Park: A Former Regional Forester's View." Journal of Forestry 66 (July 1968): 527-532.

Stone makes recommendations for the future of the North Cascades.

"The Big 'Multiple Use' Threats to the North Cascades." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 3 (March 1960): back cover.

Timber, mining, and water are mentioned in this short article.

"The Higgins Lake Proposals." American Forests 52, no. 11 (November 1946): 520-543.

This article contains a proposal by national leaders in conservation, government, and industry. In the proposal is a section on management for multiple use.

"The Land that Nobody Wanted." Living Wilderness 31, no. 98 (Autumn 1967): 27-30.

"The U. S. National Forests, the Greatest Good for the Greatest Number in the Long Run." Time 74, no. 3 (July 20, 1959): 17.

"The Wilderness Bill: Nobody Wants It but the People." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 3 (March 1960): 2.

Grant McConnell states that the proposed multiple-use bill does not define the multiple-use concept but leaves it to be played by ear.

Totman, Colonel Clayton O. "The Navy and Conservation." American Forests 64, no. 9 (September 1958): 16-55.

Colonel Totman declares that "In the future, where practicable, the soil, water, forests, grasslands, fish and wildlife existing on our installations shall be subject to multiple-use management."

Ullman, Al. "Multiple Use and the Proposed Wilderness Preservation System." Living Wilderness 24, no. 71 (Winter 1959-60): 30-33.

Some people believe that wilderness is becoming unduly subordinated to other uses of federal lands. An analysis of the wilderness system is presented here by Mr. Ullman.

"Urban Growth and Natural Resources." American Forests 64, no. 6 (June 1958): 24-45.

This article covers the growth of our population, effects on natural resources, and what must be done.

van Dresser, Cleveland. "Multiple Use Wildlife Refuge." American Forests 65, no. 3 (March 1959): 20-48.

van Dresser explores the merits of St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as an area that provides recreational pastime for visitors.

Von Ciriacy-Wantrup. "Multiple and Optimum Use of Wildlife Under Different Economic Conditions." Journal of Forestry 36, no. 7 (July 1938): 665.

"What's Ahead?" American Forests 77, no. 3 (March 1971): 42-43.

"Wilderness and Multiple Use." Living Wilderness 24, no. 70 (Autumn 1959): 26-27.

Here Ernest Swift's editorial in Conservation News for September 1, 1959 is discussed. He argues on behalf of the wilderness bill.

"Wilderness Bill Probed." American Forests 62, no. 8 (August 1956): 8-56.

The American Forestry Association discusses its opposition to a National Wilderness Preservation System as it would be inconsistent with multiple use. The association concludes by making their own proposal for a wilderness bill that would provide for multiple-use practices.

"Wilderness Needs a Multiple-Use Hearing." Sierra Club Bulletin 45, no. 5 (June 1960): 2.

This article discusses the lack of wilderness muscle in the multiple-use bill.

"Wirth Strikes Back." Ye Daily Ranger. (1 December 1959).

This news bulletin from Colonial National Historical Park in Williamsburg, Virginia expounds on the National Park Service - U. S. Forest Service feud.

"Your National Forests." American Forests 28, no. 341 (May 1922): 276-277.

Here is an editorial describing the fact that the national forests are dedicated to the continuous supply of timber, the protection of the nation's water supply, and recreation.

Zahniser, Howard. "A Basic Concept." Living Wilderness 25, no. 72 (Spring 1960): inside front cover.

The concept of wilderness is discussed here.

Zivnuska, John A. "People, Progress, and Preservation." American Forests 74, no. 9 (September 1968): 36-52.

Zivnuska discusses California and the changes in the land brought on by emigration, the gold rush, timber cutting, and sheep grazing.

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEWS

- Bhadran, C. A. R.** Tape-recorded interview in 1960 by Hardin R. Glascock, Jr., at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, Seattle, Washington. Copy held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.
- Chandler, William Geoffrey.** Tape-recorded interview in 1960 by Hardin R. Glascock, Jr., at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, Seattle, Washington. Copy held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.
- Crafts, Edward C.** "Congress and the Forest Service, 1907-1962." Tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library University of California.
- Durgnat, Peter.** Tape-recorded interview in 1960 by Hardin R. Glascock, Jr., at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, Seattle, Washington. Copy held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.
- Eldridge, Inman F. [Cap].** Typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Elwood R. Maunder. Forest History Society. Santa Cruz, California, 1959.
- Frølund, Hakon.** Tape-recorded interview in 1960 by Hardin R. Glascock, Jr., at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, Seattle, Washington. Copy held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.
- Harris, Allan, and Robak, Hakun.** Tape-recorded interview in 1960 by Hardin R. Glascock, Jr., at the Fifth World Forestry Congress, Seattle, Washington. Copy held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.
- Heyward, Frank.** "The Forest Management Advocate: Frank Heyward Speaks of Austin Cary's Forestry Crusade in the South." Typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Roy R. White. Forest History Society. Santa Cruz, California, 1971.

INDEX

- Adams, Sherman, 101
- AFL, see American Federation of Labor
- Agricultural Adjustment Administration, U. S., 20, 22
- Agricultural Research Service, 118
- Agriculture, U. S. Department of, xii, 16, 17, 34n, 36n, 43, 46-9, 68-9, 75-6, 81, 84-5, 97, 117-19, 121-122n, 127, 129, 138-9
- see also Forest Service, U.S.
- Alaska, 33
- Al Sarena case, 48-9
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, 144
- American Farm Bureau Federation, 124
- American Federation of Labor, 62-3
- American Forest Products Corporation, 132, 135-6
- American Forestry Association, xii, 3, 48, 53-4, 60, 62, 64-5, 102, 124
- American Forests [and Forest Life], 3, 24, 31n, 36n, 52n, 54, 68n, 89
- American Institute of Park Executives, xii
- American Mining Congress, 48, 97
- American Pulp and Paper, 124
- American Pulpwood Association, 124
- American Recreation Society, xii, 143-5
- Anderson, Clinton, 84
- Appalachian Trail, 72
- Arizona, 11, 17, 18-22, 85
- Armour and Company, 9
- Ashe commission, 117
- Ashe, R. L., 117n
- Aspinall, Wayne, 57, 100
- Association of State Foresters, 124
- Bahr, Henry, 137
- Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, 28n, 49n
- Bankhead Jones farm-tenant lands, 76

- Bank of America, 55
- Barrett, Frank A., 46
- Benson, Ezra Taft, 32, 54-5, 85-6, 102
- Besley, Lowell, 48
- Beveridge, Bill, 11
- Biological Survey, U. S. Bureau of, 28
see also Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Bureau of
- Bitterroot National Forest, 115-6
- Bodine from Nelson (correspondence), 53, 139
- Bolle, Arnold W., 115
- Boone and Crockett Club, 62
- Boundary Waters Canoe Area, 3, 76
- Brandborg, Guy M., 116
- Brandborg, Stewart, 116
- Budget, U. S. Bureau of the, 44, 55, 59, 61, 95-6
- Bureau. For all government bureaus, see under the names of the subjects with which they deal: e.g. Land Management, U.S. Bureau of
- Burks, George, 50
- Burton, Ian, 83n
- California, 31n, 49n, 53n-4
 redwood state parks, 72
- California Experiment Station at Berkeley, U.S. Forest Service, 29
- California (Region 5), 19, 29
- California, University of, 28n, 49n, 54
- Callison, Charles, 103
- Canada, 3, 70
- Capper Report, 36
- Cascade Mountains, see North Cascades National Park
- CCC, see Civilian Conservation Corps
- Chapline, W. R., 9, 19, 36
- Chapman, H. H., 31
- CIO, see Congress of International Organization
- Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, xi, 46, 113
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 22-4, 65, 78
- Civil Works and Natural Resources, Division of Bureau of the Budget, 95
- Clapp, Earle H., 25-7, 30-1
- Clarke-McNary Act, 126
- Cliff, Edward, 37, 55, 80, 101, 121

- Coconino National Forest, 22
- Coke, Earle, 54
- Colorado, 3, 18
- Colorado State, xii
- Combe, Mrs. Martha, 43, 50
- Congress, see U. S. Congress
- Congress of Industrial Organization, 62-3, 124
- Conservation Foundation, 73, 90
- conservation organization, xii, 64, 70, 83, 103, 120-21
- see also wildlife conservation organizations, preservation, names of individual organizations
- conservation, proposed U. S. department of, 27, 117-20
- Coombs, Fred, 144
- Cooperrider, C. K., 11, 17-9
- coordinated use, 8, 93
- Copeland Report, see National Plan for American Forestry
- Cordon, Guy, 46
- Corps of Engineers, see Engineering, U. S. Army Corps of
- Cosmos Club, xii
- Council of Forestry School, 140
- Council of State Governments, 124
- Crafts, Edward C.
- quality of recollections, 1
- birth and childhood, xi, 2
- education, xi, 2, 8
- summer employment, xi, 3, 9-11
- selecting a career, 3-4
- law school, xi, 4-6, 11-12
- grazing research, USFS, viii, xi, 9-19
- training assignment, USFS, Southwest, viii, xi, 19-22.
- oral interviews with, x-xi, 28, 49.
- Division of Forest Economics, USFS, viii - ix, 29-30, 38-9
- assistant chief, USFS, viii, xi, 31-2, 43-112
- consultant to governor of Puerto Rico, xii
- consultant to U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, xii
- director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, xi, 25, 112-3, 140-7
- "The Case for Federal Participation in Forest Regulations," 31
- "Saga of a Law," 52, 54-5, 57-8, 72, 90, 95, 99
- Multiple Use Act (1960), 52-106, 109-110, 113
- North Cascades Study Report, 68n
- "The Case for Federal Participation in Forest Regulation," 122-37
- speech before Pennsylvania State University Forestry Convocation, 140-7
- character of forestry and recreational education, 140-7
- consultant, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, xi

- Current River, 71
- Dana, Samuel T., 4, 9, 83-4, 143
- Dartmouth College, xi, 2-4, 140
- Decline of Pleasure, 143
- D'Ewart, Wesley, 45, 48
- Democratic Party, 99, 139
- 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
- departmental reorganization, 27, 117-20
- depression, the (1930s), 20, 76
- disease control, 22, 78, 128
- Division of Range Research, see Range Research, U. S. Forest Service, Division of
- dominant use, 55, 58, 77, 106-7
- Douglas-fir, 33
- Droege, Richard F., vi
- Drury, Newton, 26
- Duddleson, William, 90
- education, 4-9, 140-7
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. and administration, 32, 53, 76, 101
- Engineering, U. S. Army Corps of, 23, 28, 74-5, 104
- European forestry, 41-2, 136
- federal regulation of private forestry, see public regulation of timber practices
- Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, 70
- Fifth World Forestry Congress, 58-9, 81-2n
- Finnish forestry, 41
- fire prevention and suppression, 13, 22, 30, 78, 128
- fishing, 60, 143
- Fletcher, Pete, 140
- Florance, Reynolds, vi, 43, 50, 80, 90
- Forest and Range Policy, 83
- forest economics, 5, 29-30, 104-5
- Forest Economics, U.S. Forest Service, Division of, xi, 29-30, 38-40
- Forest History Society, i-ii, vii, xii-xiii, 31n, 53n
- Forest Industries Council, 124
- forest insurance, 29
- Forest Products Research Division, U.S. Forest Service, 19
- forest research, see timber management, Range Research Division, Forest Service, range management

- Forest Reserve Act (1897), 77, 82
- Forest Service, United States, i, vi-vii, xii, 3-5, 9, 11, 17, 20, 32, 38, 46-7, 77, 81-6, 101-2, 113-4, 122n, 126-30, 132-4, 136-9, 142, 145-6
- A National Plan for American Forestry, 34n
- appropriations, 36-9, 44
- cost-benefit ratio, 105-6
- departmental reorganization, 117-20
- discretionary power of, 83-90
- foreign forestry, 29
- Forest Economics, Division of, 29
- Forest Products Research Division, 19
- future of, 120-1
- geographical pressures on, 119-20
- grazing, 9-17, 20-1, 24, 28, 35-6, 44, 77
- history of, 30, 78
- land acquisitions, 33-5, 44
- leadership in, 80
- legislative and program divisions, 43-7
- mining, 47-50
- multiple use, 8, 20, 35, 39, 52-109, 111-2, 114-6
- national grasslands, 76
- national recreation areas, 113
- New Deal legislation, 22-3
- political influences upon, 16
- pressure from local counties, 38
- public opinion and, 86-8, 110
- public regulation of private forestry, 30-2
- recreation, 22-4, 27, 34, 36, 44, 65-6
- regional forester's role, 91-3
- relations with other government bureaus, 28, 74-7
- relations with Park Service, 26-8, 66-73
- research, 16-20, 22, 29-30, 32, 44
- state and private forestry, 44
- The Use Book, 8
- The Western Range, 35-6
- Timber Resource Review, 36, 44, 50, 53-7
- Timber Resources for America's Future 36
- watershed, 78
- wilderness areas, 39-40, 57-60, 71, 102
- wildlife, 14-5, 20-1, 28, 33
- forest taxation, 29, 35, 76
- forestry education, 4-9, 140-7
- Forsling, C. L., 16, 19, 119
- Fort Valley Experiment Station, 11-2, 18-9, 22
- Fortune Magazine, 123
- Fox, Gordon D., vi
- French forestry, 41-2
- Fry, Amelia Roberts, x, 28n, 49n
- Fullaway, Jr., S.V., 135-7
- Fuller, Nibs, 135
- Garratt, George A., vii
- General Counsel, U. S. Office of, 43
- General Land Office, U.S., 16

- German forestry, 41-2
- Gila Primitive Area, 40
- Gottschalk, John, 119
- Grand Canyon National Forest, 15, 26
- Graves, Henry Solon, 4, 127
- Gray, Charles, 137
- grazing, 5, 11-7, 20-1, 24, 28, 39-40, 44, 48, 58, 60, 63, 76, 77-9, 81, 85, 94, 97, 107
 education in, 6
 grazing fees, 16
 grazing insurance, 5
 grazing surveys, 20-1
 Multiple Use Act (1960), 103
 research, 9-12, 20-1
 Stockmen's Grazing Bill, 45-6
The Western Range, 35-6
see also range management, Grazing Service
- Grazing Service, U.S., 16, 119
- Great Basin Forest and Range Experiment Station, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18-9
- Great Basin, proposed national park, 69
- Greeley, Arthur W., vi, 68n
- Hagenstein, W. D., 136
- Hardin, Clifford M., 87-8
- Harper, Verne L., vi, 80
- Hartzog, George B., 26, 68n
- Hartzog, Jr., George B., 68n
- High-Timber Yield Bill (1969), 113
- homesteaders, 13
- Hoover commission, first and second, 117
- Humphrey, Hubert, 103
- hunting, 14, 27, 60, 143
 European, 41-2
see also wildlife conservation organizations
- Ice Age National Park, 69
- Ickes, Harold L., 26
- Idaho, 69
- Illinois, 1-2
- Indiana, 72
- industrial use, 97-8
- insect control, 22, 128
- Interior, U.S. Department of, xii, 15-6, 44, 46-9, 68-9, 72, 76-7, 85, 96-7, 112n, 117-9, 140
 Multiple Use Act (1960), 100
 political influences upon, 16
see also Grazing Service, General Land Office, Park Service, Land Management Bureau

- Intermountain Experiment Station, 16
- Izaak Walton League, xii, 56, 124
- Jackson Lake, 60
- Johnson, Walter S., 132, 136-7
- Kaibab National Forest, 15
- Kates, Robert W., 83n
- Kendall, Harry T., 132, 135
- Kerr, Walter, 143
- Kings Canyon National Park, 25
- Klamath National Forest, 47
- Kneipp, Leon F., 23
- Kolbe, Ernie, 135
- labor unions, 62-3, 124
- Lake Mead Recreation Area, 71
- Land and Water Conservation Fund, 34, 66, 82, 112
- Land Management, U.S. Bureau of, 16, 44, 46-7, 75-7, 142, 145
- departmental reorganization, 117-8
- political influences upon, 16
- recreation, 24
- see also Grazing Service
- Lands, USFS, Division of, 24
- land-utilization districts, U.S. Department of Agriculture, 76
- Lassen National Park, 25
- Lawyers' Guild, 124
- Legislative Division, U.S. Forest Service, 43-51
- Lexen, Bert, 19
- Lincoln Homesite, 72
- livestock, see grazing and range management
- Loveridge, Earl, 37, 80
- Lueddemann, Hillman, 137
- lumber industry, 13, 24, 28, 33, 35, 39-40, 63, 89, 102-3
- attitude toward Multiple Use Act, 65, 93-4, 113-4
- public regulation of private forestry, 122-37
- see also public regulation of private timber practices
- Management and Budget, U.S. Office of, 86
- Manti National Forest, 10
- Marsh, R.E., 31
- Marshall, Robert, 36
- Marshall, Howard E., vi
- Martin, Clyde, 131, 137
- Matthews, Donald M., 5

- Maunder, Elwood R., vi-vii
- Mazamas, 70
- McArdle, Richard E., vi, 32, 34, 37, 43, 53, 55, 58-9, 61, 80-2, 93, 101-3, 111, 139
- McCarren, Senator Patrick, 16
- McConnell, Grant, 89-90
- McGuire, John R., vi
- McSweeney-McNary forest research act. see Reforestation and Forest Products Act (1928)
- Merriam, John C., 26
- Merrick, Gordon, 11
- Metcalf, Lee, 46, 116
- Michigan, University of, 2, 4-6, 140-1, 143 - 4
- Miller, Clem, 90
- Mines, U.S. Bureau of, 49
- mining
 - American Mining Congress, 48, 97
 - mining laws, 47-9, 97
 - Multiple Surface Use Act, 47-9, 52, 65, 101
 - Multiple Use Act of 1960, 96-7
- Minnesota, 3
- Mission 66, 26, 67
- Missouri, 71
- Montana, 33, 45-6
- Montana School of Forestry, 116
- Mormons, 85-6
- Morton, Rogers C.B., 16
- Multiple Surface Use Act (1955), 47-9, 52, 65, 101
- multiple use, 46, 51, 56, 65, 68n, 70, 74, 77, 82, 87, 88-9, 112-4, 138-9
 - Bitterroot National Forest controversy, 115-6
 - cost-benefit ratio, 104-5
 - decisions and reviews, 108-10
 - definition of, 58-9, 61, 78-82, 89-90, 100-1, 106-7, 138
 - departmental reorganization for, 117-20
 - early use of the word, 8, 20
 - federal regulation, 35
 - Forest Service, U.S., appropriations for, 37, 39, 79
 - forest taxation, 35
 - in forestry education, 7-8
 - in the 1940s, 39
 - legislation, 45, 52-106
 - multiple-use advisory councils, 86-7, 111
 - multiple-use plans, 80-1, 108
 - New Deal legislation, 22-3
 - on private lands, 32-3, 35
 - technology for, 107-8
 - Third World Forestry Conference, 41-2
 - wilderness, 58-60
- see also range management, recreation, timber management, watershed management, wildlife management, Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960

- Multiple Use Mining Act, see
Multiple Surface Use Act
- Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act
(1960), 36, 49, 52-106, 109-10,
120, 138-9
- High-Timber Yield Bill, 113
- National Conference on State
Parks, xii
- National Environmental Policy Act
(1969), 114
- National Forest Reservation
Commission, 33
- national forests, 8, 12-4, 17,
22-5, 27-8, 30, 32, 37,
39-40, 44, 46, 49-50, 54-5,
58, 61, 64-8, 70-2, 74-7,
79, 92, 97, 103-4, 113-4,
116-8, 138
- see also Forest Service, names
of individual national forests
- national grasslands, 75-7
- National Lumber Manufacturers
Association, 31n, 89, 93,
102, 124, 130-2, 135
- national monuments, 67, 71-2
- National Park Service, see
Park Service
- National Park Service Act
(1916), 67, 71
- national parks, 25-7, 60-1, 66-7,
69-71, 117
- see also Park Service
- National Parks and Recreation
Association, xii, 73
- National Plan for American Forestry,
34n, 35-6
- National Rifle Association, 62
- national trails system, 71-2, 113
- Nation's Business, 117n
- natural resources, proposed U.S.
department of, 27, 117-20
- Nelson to Bodine (correspondence),
53, 139
- Neuberger, Maurine Brown, 69
- Neuberger, Richard Lewis, 49, 69
- Nevada, 16, 69
- New Deal, 20, 22-3
- New Hampshire, 3-4
- New Mexico, 11, 20-1, 40
- New York, 71
- New York Times, 123
- Nixon, Richard and administration,
16, 84, 117n-8
- North Cascades Conservation
Council, 70

- North Cascades National Park,
25, 68, 70-1
- North Cascades Study Report, 68n
- Northern Redwoods Purchase Unit,
68-9
- O&C Railroad Lands, see Oregon
and California Railroad Lands
- Of Time, Work and Leisure, 143
- Office of General Counsel, U.S.,
43
- Office of Management and
Budget, U.S., 86
- Ohio, 11
- Oklahoma, 28
- Olympic National Park, 25
- Omnibus Act (1958 & 1962),
50-1
- Oregon, 46-8, 55, 69-70, 74,
85, 93, 135, 139
- Oregon and California Railroad
Lands, 46-7, 91
- Oregon Dunes National Seashore,
69-70
- Orell, Bernie, 36-7, 89, 93-4,
102
- Outdoor Recreation Resources
Review Commission, 56-7,
66-7, 73, 111-2, 142
- Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Bureau
of, 25, 66, 68, 112-3, 140-2,
145
- Owsley, Clifford D., vi
- Ozark Mountains, 71
- Park Service, National, 24, 32,
44, 56-7, 59-60, 70-3, 82,
142, 145
- departmental reorganization,
117-8
- Mission 66, 26, 67
- relations with Forest Service,
25-8, 66-73, 75
- see also national parks,
national monuments, wild and
scenic rivers system,
national trails system
- Parker Creek Experiment Station,
16, 22
- Pearson, G.A., 12, 18-19
- Peirce, Earl S., vi
- Penfold, Joe, 56-7, 66, 90
- Pennsylvania State, 144
- Pennsylvania State University, 140
- Peterson, Irvin, 55
- Phi Kappa Phi, xii
- Pinchot, Gifford, 8, 127
- Pinkett, Harold T., vii

- Plains States, 76, 119
see also names of individual states
- Politics of Conservation, 98-9
- Pomeroy, Kenneth, 60
- ponderosa pine, 11
- Prescott National Forest, 11
- preservation, 40, 67, 70, 83, 87-9, 94, 103, 112-21
see also Outdoor Recreation Bureau, Park Service, recreation, wilderness areas, Wilderness Act, wildlife conservation organizations, conservation organizations, names of individual conservation groups
- President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, 66
- primitive areas, U.S. Forest Service, 39-40, 59
- Princeton University, xli
- Program Division, U.S. Forest Service, 43
- Proxmire, William, 103
- Public Domain, 15, 17, 30, 47, 97
- Public Land Law Review Commission, 106-7
- public regulation of private timber practices, 30-2, 35, 53, 122-37
- pulp and paper industry, 136
- Pyles, Hamilton K., vi
- Rainier National Park, 25
- Rainy Lake, 3
- Randles, Quincy, 12
- range management, 5, 12-6, 20-1, 39, 44, 48, 54, 96, 119, 138
 education in, 6, 9
 Forest Service, U.S. appropriations for, 37-8
 research, 9-12, 20-1
 Stockmen's Grazing Bill, 45-6
The Western Range, 35-6
- Range Research, U.S. Forest Service, Division of, 9
- Rasmussen, Boyd, 16, 119
- Readings in Resource Management and Conservation, 83n
- Reclamation, U.S. Bureau of, 23, 28, 75, 104
- recreation, 23-4, 27, 34, 36, 40, 44, 54, 56-8, 60, 65-7, 75-8, 94, 104, 107, 112, 138-47
 Civilian Conservation Corps, 22
 education in, 6
 Forest Service, U.S. appropriations for, 38-9

- in Europe, 41-2
wilderness, 103
- see also wilderness areas
- Redwood National Park, 64,
68-9, 72
- redwood region (California), 33
- redwoods, California state
parks, 72
- Reforestation and Forest
Products Act (1928), 30n
- Republican party, 139
- research, see timber management,
Range Research Division,
Forest Service, range manage-
ment
- Rockefeller, family, 73
- Rocky Mountain National Park, 3
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 25, 27,
127
- Sampson, Arthur, 18
- San Francisco Chronicle, 115n
- Sarena, Al, case of, 48-9
- Save-the-Redwoods League, viii
- Scandinavian forestry, 41-2
- Selke, George A., 68n
- Sequoia National Park, 25
- Shanklin, John F., vii
- Shepherd, Fenton, 61, 95
- Shields, Chester, vi
- Sierra Ancha Experiment Station, 17
- Sierra Club, xii, xiii, 70
- Sierra Club Bulletin, 83n, 89
- Sigma Phi, xii
- Sigma Xi, xii
- Silcox, F.A., 30
- silvicultural practices, see timber
management
- single use, see dominant use
- Sitka spruce, 13
- Siuslaw National Forest, 69
- Skyline Ranch, 3
- Small Watershed Act, 75
- Smith, Frank E., 98-9
- socialism, 123, 133
- Society of American Foresters,
xii, 64-5, 124
- Soil Conservation Service, 75, 118
- South, 119, 136
- Southwest Forest and Range Experi-
ment Station, U.S. Forest
Service, 11

- Southwestern Forest and Range Experiment Station, 11-21
- Southwestern Region (Region 3), U.S. Forest Service, 11-22, 24
- Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Bureau of, 28, 119
- Sport Fishing Institute, 62
- sportsmen, see hunting, wildlife conservation organizations
- state regulation of private forest practices, 124, 126-8
- see also public regulation of private timber practices
- stockmen, see grazing
- Stockmen's Grazing Bill, 45-6
- Stone, J. Herbert, vi, 93
- Stratton, Owen S., 68n
- Stuart, Robert Young, 9
- Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill (1897), 77, 82
- sustained yield, 98-9, 107, 138
- Swedish forestry, 41
- Syracuse University, 140, 144
- tax delinquent lands, 34
- see also forest taxation
- Taylor Grazing Act, 15-7
- Taylor grazing lands, 117
- Tennessee Valley Authority, 23
- Texas, 74
- Third World Forestry Conference, Helsinki (1949), xi, 41-2
- Three Sisters wilderness area proposal, 139
- timber management, 11-2 14, 19, 30, 33, 39, 54, 57-8, 77-9, 81, 96, 107, 119, 136, 138, 145
- allowable cut, 114
- Civilian Conservation Corps, 22
- clear cutting, 33, 42, 116
- education in, 5, 8, 20
- European, 42
- Forest Service, U.S. appropriations for, 37-8
- forest survey, 29
- timber operators, see lumber industry
- Timber** Reappraisal Report, 36
- Timber Resource Review, 36, 44, 50, 53-4, 56-7, 66, 112
- Timber Resources for America's Future, 36
- Tonto National Forest, 17
- totalitarianism, 123, 133
- Trayer, George, 19
- Tusayan National Forest, 15

- TVA, see Tennessee Valley Authority
- Umpqua National Forest, 49
- United States. For all federal departments and bureaus, see under the names of the subject with which they deal: e.g., Forest Service, United States
- Upton, Arthur, 19
- U.S. Congress, 24, 27-8n, 32, 34n, 35n, 37-8, 43-50, 54-5, 57-8, 62, 65-6, 71-2, 75, 81-8, 90-2, 94, 99-100, 103, 107, 113, 117, 119-21, 134-5, 138-9
- see also names of individual legislation
- U.S. Constitution, 88
- U.S. Supreme Court, 123-4
- Utah, 10
- Utah State colleges, 140, 144
- Veach, John B., 136-7
- Voyageurs National Park, 3
- Wagon Wheel Gap Experiment Station, 18
- War Production Board, 29
- Washington, state of, 59, 82n, 85, 93
- watershed management, 10, 14, 17, 20, 23, 33, 39, 42, 58, 60-1, 75-8, 94, 96, 104-7, 119, 138, 144
- education in, 8
- erosion from clear cutting, 33
- Forest Service, U.S., appropriations for, 37-9
- Watts, Lyle F., 30-1, 37, 129-30, 132-3, 136
- Weeks Act of 1911, 8n, 30, 33-4, 77, 82, 97
- West Coast Lumberman's Association, 124
- West Virginia, 33
- Western Pine Association, 124, 135
- Weyerhaeuser Lumber Company, 36, 93, 131
- Wheeler Peak, proposed national park, 69
- White House, the, 85-6
- Wichita Wildlife Refuge, 28
- wild and scenic rivers system, 71-2, 113
- Wilderness Act (1964), 57-9, 61-2, 83
- wilderness areas, U.S. Forest Service, 33-4, 39-40, 57, 58-60, 63, 70-1, 102-4, 107, 138-9
- wilderness organizations, see conservation organizations

- Wilderness Society, The, xii, 57,
70, 116
- wildlife conservation organizations,
52, 63, 120-1
- see also hunting, preservation,
conservation organizations,
names of individual organiza-
tions
- Wildlife Federation, 62
- wildlife management, 14-5, 20-1
28, 33, 40, 52, 58, 60, 63,
67, 77-8, 119, 138-9
- education in, 5-6
Forest Service, U.S., appropria-
tions for, 37-8
- Wildlife Management Institute, 62
- Winema National Forest, 47
- Wirth, Conrad, 26, 59, 73
- World War I, 13
- World War II, 13, 20, 29, 39-40,
65-6, 78, 142
- Wyoming, 3, 33, 46
- Yale University, vii, 3-4, 31,
122n, 129-30, 132-3, 135, 140
- Yellowstone National Park, 25
- Yosemite National Park, 25
- Zahniser, Howard, 61, 103