Frederick W. Grover

MULTIPLE USE IN U.S. FOREST SERVICE LAND PLANNING

An Interview Conducted by

Elwood R. Maunder

Produced Under
Cooperative Agreement
Between
The United State Forest Service
and the
Forest History Society

Forest History Society
Santa Cruz, California

1972

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 noteably 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

Frederick Williamson Grover is a quiet-spoken man who typifies a large contingent of professional foresters who entered upon a long career of public service in the U.S. Forest Service at the advent of the Great Depression. As many of his contemporaries who have completed forty or more years in the Forest Service, he has traveled a long trail from summer student employment, to ranger district, national forest headquarters, regional office staff assignment, and on to top administrative positions in the Washington office.

"Fred Grover is one of the men I have always turned to when I've been faced with a particularly sticky problem," says newly appointed Chief Forester John R. McGuire. "You can always feel confident that he will give clearly-stated, honest answers to your questions. He radiates that quality of calm good judgment that comes with years of dealing with a wide variety of problems and thorny administrative decisions."

Sitting comfortably in an easy chair looking out over the emerald fairways of the Inn at Rancho Bernardo a dozen miles northeast of San Diego, California, Fred Grover reminisced during two oral history interview sessions with me on January 15 and 16 concerning his forty-one years in the Forest Service. The focus of the interview, as that which has been employed in the entire series of six interviews with retired Forest Service men of which it is a part, was upon the unfolding of the multiple-use concept and its adoption as a vital part of Forest Service and national forest policy.

The interview began with a brief account of the respondent's early years in Nevada City, California, of attending high school and of being drawn by a keen love of the outdoors to enroll in the highly regarded University of California School of Forestry at Berkeley. There, under the influence of Dean Walter Mulford, Grover went on to gain in 1930 his Bachelor of Science degree.

Jobs in forestry were hard to get as the national economy plunged with that of the world in general into a cataclysmic slump. The young graduate passed the civil service examination and qualified for a position as assistant ranger on the Trinity National Forest in the summer of 1930 and his professional career was launched. He remained on the Trinity National Forest until 1935 as assistant ranger and ranger. In 1935 he was

transferred to the Klamath National Forest as staff assistant in forestry and lands and later, in 1936, was assigned to Berkeley's California Forest and Range Experiment Station to participate in a special study of national forest contributions to local governments.

The next step up the ladder came in 1937 when he went to the Region 5 headquarters in San Francisco. There he became part of the staff of the assistant regional forester for Recreation and Lands specializing in land exchange, land purchase, and forest land planning. His abilities in these sensitive areas brought the attention of the Forest Service Washington office, and in 1945 he was transferred there and subsequently made director of the Division of Lands, later called Land Acquisition. For more than ten years he served in that post and also as Secretary of the National Forest Reservation Commission. This position provided staff services and expertise to the chief forester in the fields of forest land planning, land exchange, purchase and transfer, national forest establishment and boundaries, and determination of land status. The assignment also carried the further responsibilities to recommend and implement policies and programs for these activities carried out by the field offices of the Forest Service, and the coordination of regional programs with policies and procedures that underlaid them. Much of the work and thought that led to the present system of multiple-use planning and execution took the form of more clearly defined, formal plans.

In 1958 Grover was made director of the Division of Land Classification, a newly created division in the Washington office. The purpose of this office was to provide staff service as well as operational direction in forest land planning, location of national forests and determination of their boundaries, as well as to staff out and recommend actions on proposed interagency adjustments between the Forest Service and other agencies of the federal government such as the National Park Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of Land Management. Also involved were questions of federal conservation land uses and proposals for state or private transfers to and from national forests and national recreation areas. Here basic questions of multiple use versus limited or special purpose use came into consideration and Grover's talents for working out agreements that led to substantial enlargement of both national forests and grasslands and national parks were widely recognized.

In this period, 1958 to 1969, Grover made significant contributions to many studies and a considerable number of published agency papers that sharpened both the concept and direction of multiple-use planning and application. One of the most notable of these studies dealt with the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee. This was an interagency, interdepartmental study in which Grover was one of

the Steering Group. Its report was published in 1970 by the U.S. Senate as a report of the Committee on Public Works.

In 1965 Grover was assigned by the chief forester to represent the Forest Service in a comprehensive U.S. Forest Service-National Park Service study of the Sawtooth Mountains-Salmon River Country in Idaho. This evolved from proposals for a national park, national recreation area, and other special designations for land use.

Other areas in which Grover had impact included proposals for new national forests in the Shawnee Hills of southern Illinois in 1963, the Mountaineer Unit proposed for addition in 1962 to the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia, and the Redbird Purchase Unit in Kentucky. He was involved also in studies of national recreation areas at the Shasta, Clair Engle, and Whiskeytown lakes in northern California; the Mount Rogers area of Virginia; and the Flaming Gorge Reservoir in Utah and Wyoming; all of which were established by Congress.

In the process of planning national forest systems, including the modification of formerly established national forests as well as the creation of new national forests, Grover gave attention to all forest resources and their potential for public use. His work during the last decade of his professional career put him at the center of the unfolding multiple-use idea. He retired in January 1970 at the age of sixty-three after forty-one years of service.

Mr. Grover now resides at 12419 Nacido Drive, Rancho Bernardo, San Diego, California, with his wife, who has been his devoted companion since their marriage in 1935. The Grovers have two children--Dr. Robert Baker, Professor of Forestry at Stephen Austin University in Texas, and Dr. Frederick L. Grover, a surgeon on the staff of the University of Texas Medical College at San Antonio. They are also proud grandparents of two boys and a girl.

The tapes from this interview were transcribed by Barbara D. Holman. Susan R. Schrepfer edited the manuscript and sent it to Mr. Grover for review. With minor revisions he returned it to the Forest History Society, where it was given final typing by Claudia Mehl. Copies of the interview, 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 Frederick W. Grover.

Elwood R. Maunder
July 19, 1972

Elwood R. Maunder was graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1939 with a B.A. in journalism. He was a reporter and editor of the Minnesota Daily and an officer of his class. From 1939 to December, 1941, he was a reporter and feature writer for the Minneapolis Times-Tribune and the Minneapolis Star-Journal. He enlisted in the U.S. Coast Guard December 21, 1941, and served as a combat correspondent in both the European and Mediterranean theaters of war on landing craft for infantry and combat transports. He was editor of the Ninth Naval District's magazine, Soundings, at the conclusion of the war. He was graduated from Washington University at St. Louis in 1947 with an M.A. in history. He attended the London School of Economics and Political Science for one year and worked as a freelance foreign correspondent and British Gallup Pollster. He was a member of the staff of the U.S. Department of State during the Meeting of Foreign Ministers in London in 1947 and 1948. Returning to the United States he was named director of Public Relations for the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, later director of public relations for the Ohio area of the Methodist Church. In 1952 he was appointed executive director of the Forest History Society. He is the author of many articles, has produced more than one hundred oral history interviews, and edited with Margaret G. Davidson A History of the Forest Products Industries: Proceedings of the First National Colloquium, sponsored by the Forest History Society and the Business History Group of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. He is the publisher and long-time editor of Forest History, quarterly journal of the Forest History Society. He is an Honorary Member of the Society of American Foresters and a Fellow of the Forest History Society.

FORESTRY EDUCATION

Early Years

Elwood R. Maunder: I am speaking from the Rancho Bernardo Inn in San Diego, California, where I am beginning today an oral history interview with Fred W. Grover, who is a retired U.S. Forest Service man living in Rancho Bernardo at 12419 Nacido Drive. If you would begin by telling us where and when you were born and something about your background.

Frederick W. Grover: I was born in Nevada City, California, which happens to be the headquarters of the Tahoe National Forest, and has been for many, many years. Nevada City was and is a delightful small town in the Mother Lode country of California. When I was growing up, it was chiefly oriented to gold mining. My father was also born and raised there and worked the mines as a means of livelihood. I graduated from the Nevada City High School in 1925 and was the fortunate recipient of a scholarship amounting to all of $225.00, and on that and my summer's wages working for the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, I ventured to go to the University of California at Berkeley, where I started in the college of electrical engineering. After trying that for a year I decided that electrical engineering was not for me.

University of California, School of Forestry

In the meantime I had become interested in forestry, partly because of the location of the Tahoe forest headquarters at Nevada City and my stints of fire fighting when I was in high school, and partly because I was a good friend of Normal Farrell, who is still in the Forest Service in San Francisco and whose uncle was Evan Kelley, at the time regional forester at Missoula, Montana. Norman was interested in forestry as a career, and I became interested in it, too. So I transferred to the School of Forestry in the College of Agriculture at Berkeley in 1927, at the beginning of my sophomore year. I graduated

from the School of Forestry with a bachelor of science in forestry degree about the last of May, 1930.

ERM: Who among your professors at the university were you most influenced by?

FWG: I believe that the most influential was Dean Walter Mulford. I was among the group known as Daddy Mulford's boys at the time. He was both a good friend and a good advisor and a fatherly sort of a person who took a real, continuing interest in his students. He was also a man of very high principles and moral integrity and managed, I am sure, to get those types of messages into all the relationships with his students. He was a devoted conservationist and truly believed that forestry was a public service career of high importance. I think that influenced me, too, to endeavor to join the Forest Service.

Of course, at that time there wasn't much opportunity for forestry graduates other than the government services, although some of the forestry graduates did go into private employment or business. Charlie Tebbe, who was a schoolmate and graduated the year before, did go to work for the Red River Lumber Company at the time. But most of the class went into government service.

ERM: Were there other people at Cal who made any really profound impact on your life as a student?

FWG: At that time the faculty was quite limited as the enrollment was relatively small. I worked and enjoyed studying with such men as Fred Baker, who was professor of silviculture and forest management; Myron Kreuger, who taught forest management, forest engineering, and logging; and Emanuel Fritz, who taught wood utilization and also some of the manufacturing processes such as milling and wood identification. I was well acquainted with Dr. Baker and Myron Kreuger, and they were quite influential on my thinking at the time.

ERM: Did you engage in any work in the field of forestry while you were a student?

FWG: During the summer between my junior and senior year I worked for the California Forest and Range Experiment Station. I worked for a short time on a mill-scale study being carried out in cooperation with the Pickering Lumber Company at Strawberry, on the Tuolumne River in Stanislaus National Forest. Then I worked the balance of the summer with Duncan Dunning, who had charge of the research into silvicultural systems and reproduction of pine and mixed conifer

forests through the Sierra. Dunc was a real fine person with extensive knowledge of California silviculture and quite interested in forestry students. With a fellow named Pieter Van Huizen, who was a classmate of mine in forestry school, we checked sample plots and that type of work both in the Stanislaus National Forest and around the Quincy area of the Plumas National Forest.

Then when I returned to college that fall, I worked for the experiment station, on a per hour basis, on the data accumulated at the mill-scale study. Charles Buck, who later became intimately involved with fire research at the experiment station and in the Washington office, and I had temporary Forest Service appointments to work up and tabulate the board-foot volumes and other details of this mill-scale study. We would work weekends and afternoons, often at night, converting two-by-twelve-by-sixteen-foot planks into board feet and recording the results. That was very important and very gratefully accepted employment at the time because I had virtually no money. As a matter of fact, I probably would not have finished my forestry school education had it not been for the extra income that the station, under Ed Kotok and Cary Hill, extended to me through that employment.

ERM: That experience also must have been very valuable to you as you went on into the service.

FWG: It gave me an acquaintanceship with the Forest Service and some of the people who were in the Forest Service at the time, particularly on the research side.

Multiple Use and Forestry Education, 1920s

ERM: Would you say that at that time the main thrust of forestry education was in the direction of timber management?

FWG: No, I wouldn't say that. I know that forest schools have been accused of it in more recent times. Included in the curriculum I completed, there was considerable emphasis on timber management, of course, and on timber utilization. After all, in the late twenties the lumber business was an important segment of California's economy, and private lumbering practices provided massive evidence of the need

for getting modern forestry into the woods. We also were given considerable training in range management, fire protection, some zoology, considerable botany along with basic economics, ecology, and dendrology. There was emphasis on basics. The thing that wasn't in the curriculum at that time was the specialized courses in outdoor recreation management that forest schools now offer.

ERM: What about watershed management and wildlife management?

FWG: We didn't have wildlife management as such, other than the courses in the zoology department, which were on the economic values of wildlife and their habitat. Technical wildlife management was not part of the curriculum. It came in the forties. The same is true of what you might call the techniques of recreation use and management.

ERM: Was there awareness among forestry educators at that time of multiple use?

FWG: I would say, yes, in the context of what were considered the valuable uses of the forests at the time. Professor Mulford, for example, was very interested in watershed policies and uses. I dredged up a copy of a paper he presented to the Society of American Foresters in 1930, which was the year I graduated from college, in which he emphasized the concern of the people of California with better management of their mountain watersheds and the responsibility of foresters in that field.* He gave warning that there were moves afoot to stop all timber cutting in the Sierra or, at the other extreme, to concrete over southern California forest lands so as to avoid the loss of water from the brush stands and so forth.

There was emphasis on range, which was considered one of the major uses of the forests. It actually wasn't in California, but it was considered one of them. I took range management from Arthur Sampson, who had a reputation at the time in the range management field. Range use and watershed protection were closely linked.

Wildlife was viewed more from the economic standpoint--hunting, fishing, and fur production--rather than from the aesthetic or recreational interests of today. But there was recognition of the interrelationships of renewable resources, although emphasis on and concern with this relationship was understandably much less than now.

---

*Walter Mulford, "The Water User's Point of View as to the Public Land Policies of the United States," Journal of Forestry 29, no. 3 (March 1931): 356-362.

ERM: If you figured it on a percentile scale, do you have any kind of a rough estimate of how these various uses might have been weighed in your education at that time?

FWG: If you consider insect and disease control as part of the timber management picture, I'd say probably 50 to 60 percent was on the timber, including the growing of timber, the protection of timber, the harvest and utilization of timber. Probably the next, without putting a percentage on it, was range and watershed. Those two went pretty much together. The wildlife and the other types were much smaller percentages, but they were in the picture. But such an analysis is rather simplistic, for such subjects as systematic botany, dendrology, forest history and policy, statistical analysis, and so forth are as basic to management of intangibles as to timber use.

ASSISTANT RANGER TO RANGER, TRINITY NATIONAL FOREST, 1930 to 1934

Assistant Ranger, Hayfork District, 1930 to 1932

ERM: After you finished your work at Berkeley, in the spring of 1930, you went as assistant ranger to the Trinity National Forest in northern California, and you were there for about four years, is that right?

FWG: That's right. It was just about four years. In January, 1930, I took the forest ranger examination. It was the next to the last forest ranger examination offered, on behalf of the Forest Service, by the Civil Service Commission, and I passed it. I also took the junior forester examination later in the spring. I received appointment as assistant ranger on the Hayfork District of the Trinity National Forest on the basis of the forest ranger examination, which was one of those in which you not only had to display an acquaintance with forestry and range management, but also give the proper recipe for making baking powder biscuits and some things like that, which were later somewhat irrelevant. I reported to the ranger in Hayfork the first of June, 1930, as assistant ranger.

ERM: Who was the ranger at that time?

FWG: The ranger was Harry Everest, and I had a room in the ranger station with the Everest family. I retain very fond memories of Harry and the family, too, particularly Mrs. Everest. Harry Everest was one of the breed that we like to call old-time rangers. He had no professional training, but had a good mind, was very literate, and had a considerable amount of energy and push. He had gravitated to the then wild Trinity country as a young man. He was an immigrant from England, as I recall. He married a lady who had lived on a small farm at Don Juan Creek on the Trinity River at the time when the only way to get out of there to Weaverville, the county seat, was on muleback for at least twenty-five miles.

At the time I was at Hayfork, Mrs. Everest doubled as telephone operator and frequently fire dispatcher and various other functions when the ranger was away. She was an extremely charming and hospitable person, who herself had quite a store of the lore of the Trinity River country. Her maiden name had been Huestis. Wilber

Huestis, who was her brother, was an engineer in the regional office of the Forest Service. Her father had this little place down on the Trinity River; he was one of the pioneers in the area. So she had much to tell of the early fire-fighting days of the service and before, even going back to the time of her father's early life and Indian fights there. That was my introduction to the Forest Service.

ERM: What kinds of things were you called upon to do in that first job?

FWG: The Trinity at that time was quite remote. The main highway into the area from Redding, on Highway 99, was only then being oiled and paved. There was little demand for the Trinity's resources except for the range resources and the very good hunting and fishing, which attracted some visitors. A few, small sawmills cut timber for local consumption. So the job was, in current phraseology, largely custodial. There was considerable work on trail construction and maintenance, telephone line construction and maintenance, and grazing regulation. We maintained several campgrounds on the district at the time. They were maybe a little crude but were used. We had one summer home colony, a place called Forest Glen, on the south fork of the Trinity. But the major endeavors were fire protection, fire suppression, improvement construction and maintenance, range inspection, and control of livestock. Fire control predominated everything, and the late twenties and early thirties were bad fire years. The years 1930 and 1931 saw serious incendiarism in the Hayfork area. There were still some June 11th homestead entries being perfected; by June 11th, I mean tracts classified and filed under the Act of June 11, 1906--the Forest Homestead Act.*

A lot of the assistant ranger's work went into such things as telephone line maintenance, work with the local people, and to a considerable extent, the servicing of lookouts, servicing of trail crews, presuppression activities, fire suppression, land-line surveys, and fire trespass cases. That time was really the beginning of the depression, I guess, and in the backcountry there was a rash of incendiaries and other types of fires. Besides the lightening fires and the careless fires, we had a real problem with incendiary fires.

ERM: Mainly to create jobs?

FWG: Mainly to create jobs, I would say, and partly through the feeling that the country should be burned over occasionally to get rid of the

---

*Forest Homestead Act of 11 June 1906, 34 Stat. 233.

brush, snakes, "varmints," and, to some extent, just to bedevil the Forest Service, I am sure, because at least some fires were set by youngsters. But mainly the motive was to get work fighting fires or to rent livestock or vehicles.

ERM: You said that part of your work was with the local community. What did that involve?

FWG: It involved various things. One segment, of course, was the hiring and servicing of work crews for building telephone lines and trails; we hired local folks for that. Another was on fire prevention, working with key people there on the matter of: Who is doing this? Why are they doing it? and What should we do about? I need to say, however, that this endeavor was not very productive. I recall, too, the annual fair at Hayfork; I guess it's still held there. We had exhibits at that. And we worked with the agricultural people.

ERM: This was almost entirely, I would assume, an agricultural area.

FWG: Yes, a rather poor agricultural area. There were some fairly good farms. There was quite a lot of livestock raising with various size ranches, from those with a few head of stock to some that were fairly prosperous. Other people made their living working with the Forest Service or the county. It was a remote and not prosperous area.

ERM: You were one of the principal sources of employment then?

FWG: The Forest Service was one of them, yes.

ERM: There was no substantial mining industry or anything like that?

FWG: A little mining, but not very much. The main sources of income were public programs of one type or another or ranching, farming, and trapping.

Ranger, Big Bar District, 1932 to 1934

ERM: You became ranger on this district in this period of time, did you not?

FWG: I transferred from the Hayfork District to Big Bar on the main Trinity

River, west of Weaverville, in May, 1932. There had been a Big Bar Ranger District early in the history of the Trinity forest, but it had been abolished and consolidated with the two adjoining districts. Then, under Supervisor Millard Barnum, it was reconstituted in 1932, largely because of a serious fire situation on the Trinity River. I was given the district ranger's job, the job, actually, of reestablishing the district.

The Great Depression

ERM: Wasn't this a direct result of the depression?

FWG: Yes, I would say so. Looking back at it now, the depression really hit those types of areas before it became apparent elsewhere. By the time that I got to Big Bar, though, it was in pretty good swing in the cities. We had a relatively large number of refugees from the cities--people who had lost their homes or jobs and had no basis of subsistence in an urban community where they couldn't get credit or couldn't dig subsistence out of the land. They had migrated into the backcountry. Up and down the Trinity River and on the side streams people were living in huts, shacks, tents, whatever they could cobble together.

Some of them went to the trouble of filing a mining claim and others didn't. I suspect over a period of time, most of them did file a mining claim to give some legitimacy to their occupancy. They were living on what they could dig out of the gravel bars with dip boxes and small sluice boxes, and on fish, when the fish ran, and old does when they could find them. Some of them, I recall, told me they could make as much as fifteen or twenty dollars a month along the streams with the dip boxes or other crude mining.

ERM: But there was very little other employment?

FWG: There was very little other employment. What little there was was taken by people who were more permanent residents of the area. Pacific Gas and Electric Company employed some people, and the highway department employed some people. The county, of course, did road maintenance, but there was little county road there. As I remember, there was one operating mine. But, generally speaking,

there was little local employment outside of that, and most of these people that moved in didn't get that type of employment.

ERM: What was the relationship between the settlers of the area and this influx of squatters?

FWG: I don't recall any real controversies between them or real resistance to them or dislike of them. The people more or less accepted the fact that they were there. And to the extent that they had any money, I guess, they were welcome customers at the local stores.

ERM: But they were competitors for the jobs. Did this cause any difficulty? You were in the employment business.

FWG: Yes. The first year I was at Big Bar we had to depend upon Forest Service appropriations and programs for such employment as was offered, which was rather small. We had a small fire-suppression crew there. The majority of its members were people who had lived in the Trinity County area for many years, mostly people who had grown up there. An exception was one forestry student from Oklahoma. Then we had some trail work and fire-suppression guards. We filled those mainly from the local pool of manpower, principally for the reason that those people knew the country and knew what they were doing and were adapted to that type of work. It was pretty sparse pickings for anyone at that time.

CCC and ECW Camps

ERM: Did you ever have any WPA or CCC or any of that?

FWG: In 1933 one of the first CCC camps in California was established at Big Bar. I spent the next year or so working with that, largely. Later we had another program, first called the CWA and then later the ECW. They were crews that were on sort of a rationed work basis, so many hours a week, perhaps sixteen hours in two workdays. The purpose was to give some work relief to people not eligible for the CCC program.

ERM: This wasn't the old Public Works Administration?

FWG: No, the PWA, as I remember it, dealt with major construction works--

the post offices and courthouses, highways, and so forth. This was an ECW, Emergency Conservation Work program, in which you devised a local project and applied for financing. It was administered by the Forest Service, with funds provided by the Emergency Conservation Work organization, whatever it might have been. At Big Bar we laid out some short roads on which we could provide hand labor for these people or used them on cleanup or fire-hazard reduction.

ERM: Did this make any provision for building recreation areas?

FWG: Yes. Well, back up on that. The main recreation improvement job was done by the three Cs from the two-hundred-man camp. I don't have the exact date, but it was in the spring of 1933 when the camp moved in. We worked those boys; first in importance was, of course, fire suppression. And the Cs really put an end to the incendiary fire problem in the area. With the camp in existence the Forest Service no longer had to depend on locally hired fire fighters. Also, we had a quota of locally skilled people that we could enroll in the Cs, and we did put into the organization quite a few of the younger people who were living in the area and trying to eke out a living in various ways. We also put some of the local folks in as foremen, which was considered a pretty good job at that time. Fire suppression; road, trail, and administrative facility construction; telephone line construction; and campground construction were the principal endeavors of the CCC.

The ECW work we used more on cleanup along roadsides oriented toward fire-hazard reduction and toward the trails and roads that could be easily reached, where we could utilize hand labor. The Cs built several campgrounds in this rather small ranger district during the time I was there, all of which are still utilized. They have been rebuilt, I guess, because some of the concepts of campground improvement then were a little crude by the standards of today. But they were in accord with standards of the region developed by its recreation planner from the Golden (Colorado) School of Mines, Olé Friedhoff and others working with him. Among them were the Big Flat Campground, Hayden Flat Campground, and Big Bar Campground. The Cs also built the Big Bar Station and several lookouts. Looking back at my old diaries at the time, I noted considerable supervision of the work in those campgrounds and also time spent on preparing reports for withdrawing recreation sites along the river there, in other words, withdrawing them from mineral entry or location.

ERM: What would you say the nation gained from the work done by the CCCs?

FWG: Well, I think--because I have seen it in other places of the country, too, in subsequent years--there were three or four very important results from it. One of them, of course, was doing much of the work that enabled increased protection and utilization of the national and state forests and parks, and I don't mean, particularly, utilization of timber, either, because the trails and roads that we built in that period of the early 1930s have probably been used more by people seeking recreation than they have for utilization of timber.

As a matter of fact, these roads weren't designed for utilization of timber; they were designed to protect the basic resource of vegetation and soil from fires and to get the people into the country where they could enjoy it. And many of the campgrounds, picnic areas, lakes and ponds, and other facilities for recreationists were still being used twenty-five years after the Cs closed. That was one result. You see that, not only in California, but all over the West. Another was the improvement of the forest resources, which is very strikingly illustrated in the East, particularly in the Lake States and the southern states where you go for miles through plantations of trees that were not there before the Cs's work, and in ranges and watersheds of the national grasslands and public lands where erosion control and grassland vegetation was accomplished on millions of acres.

A third very important result, in my opinion, was the development of those people who were the enrollees of the CCC and the foreman structure. I know that during the life of the Big Bar CCC camp, which I helped start, considerable numbers of these lads developed into semiskilled or skilled workmen. They were taught to operate power shovels, bulldozers, and trucks, how to handle powder on the road construction, and how to use hand tools. And many of them were trained in types of clerical work. They learned how to work. They were self-supporting; many were helping their home folks financially, and they were off the streets.

Then when World War II came along, many of the enrollees--foremen and superintendents--moved into defense construction or military organizations. The Big Bar camp engineer, Boyd Fisher, who recently retired as regional engineer in Denver, came into the Forest Service through a CCC program; and he went into the Seabees from there. I know, because I met some of the boys later, that many of them went into various types of useful work in connection with the war efforts or in the services, and later carried on in civil life.

ERM: While you were enhancing the quality of the forests, you were also educating people.

FWG: That's right. The army ran the camps at the time, and the army had an educational program which it made available to those who wanted to improve their skills in reading and writing and other subjects. The Forest Service handled the work training program.

ERM: What do you think all this did in the realm of public education about the forests and the Forest Service? Did it do any good?

FWG: It inevitably had to have a beneficial effect. We graduated from those camps hundreds of thousands of young people who were introduced to the outdoors and to the problems of managing wild lands and to the objectives of the Forest Service and to state forestry and the Park Service, as well, and who came out of it with some concept of the urgency of conservation of natural resources.

ERM: You say it also worked to overcome fire problems. How do you explain that?

FWG: Well, it's simple. When the Cs were there, the Cs did the fire fighting on a thirty-dollar-a-month basis, and we didn't have to employ local people, with some few exceptions, such as packers. That removed the incentives for the incendiary sets, for one thing. I don't mean to imply it solved the fire problem, but it resolved the problem of incendiary fires in that particular area for two reasons. One was that it removed the incentive because we didn't have to hire people; we used the Cs. If there weren't enough in one camp, the dispatcher moved them in from another. The other was that we were able to include in the CCCs quite a few people from the local area. We had quotas of local people. As a matter of fact, most of us liked to include as many of the local people as possible. When I say local, I mean those who had moved into the area as well as those who had been born and raised there.

ERM: So there was no hard feeling on the part of the local people against the CCCs for taking jobs away from them?

FWG: There wasn't at the time I was there. There was stimulation of the business, too, because the boys had some money and they spent it at the local stores and in nearby towns. There was a certain amount of goods purchased from the stores for the program. I don't recall any real resentment against them. Once in awhile the boys might step out of line or one would break the law, and there would be some reaction. In the general atmosphere of that time and in the Trinity forest area, which had been lacking an economic basis of support except limited local agriculture, the attitude was very friendly toward the Forest

Service, towards the government program, towards the CCCs. These introduced a lot of money into the area and did a lot of work that the local authorities felt needed to be done. That was particularly true of additional access roads.

ERM: Did the congressman from the district have any impact on all this?

FWG: Well, I'm sure that at the time they must have, but it didn't come down to the level at which I was working.

ERM: I wonder whether congressmen were responsive to their constituents, especially when constituents were in a state of unemployment. I wonder to what extent congressmen sought to create opportunities for employment of their constituents in the Trinity.

FWG: I am sure that they--although I have no personal knowledge of it--saw that adequate shares of CWA and ECW and those types of funds were allocated there. My recollection is that the congressman for that area at the time was Harry Englebright, from my hometown of Nevada City, who was a Republican. Of course, the national administration was Democratic. In the employment of some of the local people in these programs, there had to be a clearing of local committees, presumably a local Democratic hierarchy. But that was done pretty much on a basis of need. I can't recall, in my personal experience, any introduction of partisan politics into these programs.

ERM: What was the political complexion of the community in the Trinity in the years that you were there? Was it conservative, liberal, Democratic, Republican?

FWG: I think it probably followed the national picture of support of the Roosevelt administration because these programs were of pretty direct value to them. I can't recall any strong political bias in any of the things that I was concerned with at the time.

STAFF ASSISTANT, KLAMATH NATIONAL FOREST, 1935 to 1936

The Staff

ERM: In 1934 you became staff assistant for forestry and lands on the Klamath National Forest in northern California.

FWG: No. In April, 1934, I moved to Weaverville as ranger on the Upper Trinity District of the Trinity National Forest. I was there only a year. I reported April 1, 1935, to the supervisor of the Klamath at Yreka. My job there was staff assistant for timber and lands work. The assistant supervisor, Tom Bigelow, who was one of the real old-timers in the Forest Service and had grown up with the Klamath forest; a staff assistant for fire protection, Ernest Baxter, who has since died; myself; and an administrative assistant—business manager comprised the staff of the forest supervisor at the time. That forest, of course, had an extensive system of CCC camps that were busily engaged in road work and various other improvements and protection.

Land Exchange Examinations

We didn't have much timber business. You may recall--I'm sure you do--that during the thirties, the emphasis on use of timber was not on the national forest timber. It was on private timber, which was economically distressed. Much of it was undergoing either tax delinquency or tax forfeiture. It is my recollection that the Forest Service more or less bowed out, except in those particular situations where national forest timber was necessary to help mills in operation. At any rate, we didn't have very much in the way of timber sales on the Klamath during the year I was there. I did considerable lands work, including examination of a large tract of land for land exchange in the vicinity of Hilt. This land was owned by the Fruit Growers Supply Company. I cooperated on surveys of some of that land with the local people in the Hilt operation. And I did some reforestation work with the CCCs.

ERM: Can you tell us what this exchange of land involved?

FWG: The Fruit Growers Supply Company had a mill at Hilt, California, and a larger mill at Susanville. Hilt is about ten miles north of Yreka, near the Oregon line. The Fruit Growers Supply Company is a subsidiary of the association that markets Sunkist citrus fruit. It was organized back in the mid teens primarily to assure the association of a dependable supply of box shook for shipment of oranges, lemons, and grapefruit. It also engaged in the general lumber business because only part of the lumber it made was required for box material; the higher grades were sold on the market. This company had cut over, I suppose, twenty-five thousand acres in its Hilt operation over a period of twenty years.

ERM: This was privately owned land?

FWG: It was privately owned. It was land which the company owned. I'm not familiar with how it became private land, but I think it originally was outside the national forest and later was brought in. But in any event, it was private land. It had been railroad and donkey logged, and it had been pretty well denuded but was reforesting in good shape to young timber.

ERM: Natural regeneration?

FWG: Yes. And the proposition at the time was that perhaps the company would trade this land to the United States for an equal value of timber to be cut from adjoining national forest lands. Actually, that never came to fruition, despite the fact that we spent some months making a field examination and computing values on it. But the general proposition was that, under the Act of March 20, 1922, which authorized the government to take title to privately owned lands within the national forests and to grant in exchange an equal value of national forest lands or national forest timber, the company would convey the lands to the government, and the government in turn would give the company a permit to cut not to exceed an equal value of timber.* That was the general proposition. I spent considerable time on that.

---

*Exchange of Land in Consolidating National Forests Act of 20 March 1922, ch. 105, 42 Stat. 465, 16 U.S.C. sec. 485 (1964). Also known as the General Exchange Act.

The CCCs

I also spent time working with the CCCs on reforestation projects in the high country along the Oregon line and, to some extent, on campground site withdrawals, a type of what we used to call lands work, which embraced everything from examining forest homestead entries, finding section corners, and running land lines, to withdrawal of administrative and recreation sites and land exchanges. That's about the gamut of it. I didn't do the actual planning of campgrounds because the CCC organization had people to do that. Even at that time, through the CCCs, the Forest Service had landscape architects and professional people to work with campgrounds and ranger stations.

ERM: Were these years the real beginning of recreational concern in the Forest Service?

FWG: No, I really don't believe so. Of course, it was a time of concern for me because the CCC provided the wherewithal to do substantial recreation improvement work. But I find out from going back to some writings that the Forest Service first started keeping an annual estimate of recreation visitors in 1917. The Forest Service manual--the old, hard-covered, five-by-eight manual, which was the bible from 1925 to 1934--has quite a section on recreation use and management in the national forests. It was written, I'm sure, by Lee [Leon F.] Kneipp, who was an assistant chief of the Forest Service. In fact, that section really sets forth the concept of multiple use in considerable detail. In some paragraphs it points out that the reconciliation of recreation to other land uses was essential. So I don't think by any means that the CCC program was the genesis of recreational concern by the Forest Service.

ERM: Would you say that it was a major stimulus?

FWG: I'm sure it was, for the reason that, for the first time, the Forest Service could really do something about developing recreational opportunities in the national forests through improvements such as trails, lakes, campgrounds, and picnic areas, and the opening up of access to areas that were recreationally desirable. Of course, the primitive areas go back to 1925 or 1926. I've seen some of the CCC and ECW works in the eastern part of the country where they really did a more sophisticated recreation-development job than in the West. Through these various programs the Forest Service, as well as state forestry and park agencies, built lakes and put on them structures of

various kinds besides the usual accoutrements of tables, fireplaces, sanitation, and so forth. ECW appropriations, that financed the CCC and other programs, provided many millions of dollars for land purchase in national forests, including much land later found suitable for recreation use. A considerable part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area is an example of this. So you might say that these programs really marked the beginning of active development and encouragement of recreation but not concern with recreation use and potential.

Multiple Use in the 1930s

ERM: You recognized, I'm sure, at the time that there were more than just one or two uses of the national forests that you were on. Did these uses come into conflict from time to time?

FWG: Well, as I mentioned, the national forests of northern California at that time were largely in what we liked to call custodial status, so I can't say from my experience in the field at that time that there was really too much conflict because there wasn't the intensity of uses. The conflict was in the protection field, to get on top of the fire losses. We had competition for range. I'd say at that time that was the chief competition for a resource, except in local lumber mill situations. There wasn't competition between range and wildlife the way we have it now, nor the disputes about timber harvest versus recreation or wilderness.

I might point out, though, that the Forest Service and I were not entirely uninterested in the wildlife features of the forest at the time. We all had appointments as deputy game wardens, for example, and functioned along with the local state game warden in that respect. I had the sad duty on several occasions to haul people into the justice of the peace for shooting deer out of season. That again was, I suppose, what they called custodial. The real competition for resources postdated World War II. I think that was probably historically true throughout California. The thirties were not a period of pressures on the resources of the national forests except in localized circumstances.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF NATIONAL FORESTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, CALIFORNIA FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION, 1936

Contributions to Local Economy

ERM: In 1936 you worked on a special study project at the California Forest and Range Experiment Station at Berkeley on the contributions of national forests to local governments.

FWG: That was a detail of several months from the Klamath National Forest to the experiment station. The Forest Service was engaged in what might be called a periodic assessment of the impact of the national forests on the finances of local government. I believe the first one was done in the twenties by Fairchild at Yale.*

The matter became pressing again because of the impact of the depression on finances of rural counties, particularly, and the fact that the national forests do not pay a real estate tax as private property does. My function in that study, along with H. R. Josephson, who now heads up the forest economics division [Division of Forest Economics and Marketing Research] in the chief's office, and an economist named Wade DeVries, was to gather information at selected county offices and selected Forest Service offices as to tax rates on private property; methods of assessments; county budgets; county expenditures for roads and other services as against social expenditures; the input of the national forests to the counties, not only in the 25 percent fund, but also in contributions in kind; the construction of roads that the county otherwise probably would have to do; the provision of recreation facilities, which if not a county responsibility, at least contributed to the county economy; the expenditures for fire protection, which otherwise would have to have been taken care of by the county and private owners; things like that.

ERM: Was watershed management and protection involved, too?

---

*U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, "Forest Taxation in the United States, by Fred Rogers Fairchild, Miscellaneous Publication No. 218 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1935).

FWG: As I remember, we didn't involve it at the time because it wasn't a county function or even a state function, other than the suppression of fires. I didn't work in the southern California forests so I can't recall whether that entered into the picture there or not. It may well have, where the local governments were actually spending money for watershed--flood control and soil stabilization.

In any event, we worked for several months accumulating these data and working them into a report for California, which was one of the sample states covered in this study, showing the impact of national forests on county financing and the various contributions which they made to it. Actually, as far as I know, other than that being incorporated and summarized in the national recommendations, no real action ensued from it. The 25 percent fund continued. There were no supplementary payments made that I know of.

I think that the general conclusion was that, on balance, the benefits from the national forests at least equaled the costs they might impose and the diminution of local revenue. Of course, that was a time when land didn't have the value that it has now. A real question was how much it would actually yield in tax revenue, particularly the watershed and mountain areas. Much similar land was actually tax delinquent at the time. So I think the study was probably correct, particularly as the government was expending large sums in most counties where there were substantial national forests through the ECW and CCC and regular programs.

I might say, as a sidenote, that the question is still current. It has popped up many times over the intervening years. It is still acute, particularly in relation to new acquisitions of lands for federal purposes, leading to many proposals for supplementary payments of one kind or another, even for the taxing of public lands, which, of course, is constitutionally not permitted.

ERM: In bad times the policy works definitely to the benefit of the county. In times of high prosperity would it be possible for the counties to derive a larger income?

FWG: Some more recent studies, which are not so comprehensive, were made of sample counties by Ellis Williams of the forest economics division [Division of Forest Economics and Marketing Research] that I mentioned earlier. They generally showed that the 25 percent fund did not equal the revenue that might reasonably be expected were all the lands subject to local taxation at then current rates. But if you added in the so-called contributions in kind, things that the Forest Service

did that the county or state would otherwise have to do, then the balance still favored national forest ownership.

This may not necessarily be true where the government acquires, in a rather poor county, a large tract of land that has been paying taxes. For example, when the Forest Service acquired the Sylvania tract in the Ottawa forest in northern Michigan, it reduced the tax income of the local county and township rather materially. Until economic benefits from recreation, timber, and so forth build back, that county and especially the township are going to suffer some decrease in revenue. Eventually they will probably gain but in the short term will suffer.

ERM: This study, then, did consider the impact of the multiple uses of the national forests upon the local counties?

FWG: This 1936 study attempted to equate the positive side of national forest ownership and management, including its support of local industries through timber and other resources--timber at that time was the main one because it was depression time--with the negative impact on the counties. I haven't thought over the years that this question of income to the counties really has an impact on the problems of multiple use. But it no doubt is a factor in questions of timber harvest versus no-cut and of transfers of national forest areas to park status. Those counties which are enjoying a substantial income from the national forests are reluctant to have those lands from which this income originates put into some other status. This income is a relatively sure thing; it comes to them without any cost for collection or any delinquencies, and in recent times in many areas it has been quite substantial.

I mentioned the Texas national forests. Even in the early fifties the income to counties from them was from fifty cents to a dollar per acre, which was in excess of what private timberlands were paying at the time. The Douglas-fir counties of Oregon, between the national forests and the O & C [Oregon and California Railroad] revested lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, derive many millions of dollars of annual income--a relatively high per-acre return--which simply comes to them in the form of a check with no effort on their part at all.

ERM: Did your study make any analysis of how recreation contributes to the local community?

FWG: I can't recall any specific relating of recreation use to the local economy in the way that it has been done in recent years; that is, the

estimate of visitor use and the placing of a dollar value on this business to the local enonomy.

County Pressures to Increase Cut

ERM: Did you find that the percentage of timber receipts from the national forests returned to the county brought pressures from the counties to increase the allowable cut?

FWG: I don't recall that we found that at the time. That is an apprehension that has been voiced many times since, particularly since the increase in land values, timber stumpage values, and so forth of the last fifteen or twenty years. I personally don't know of any overt attempts by counties to, in effect, force more timber on the market than the Forest Service was willing to offer or to advocate higher prices. I do know that many of them are not agreeable to diminution of timber-sale income through diversion of timber to other uses if they can avoid it.

Counties aren't always influential in achieving this. But I think an example of that is the acquisition by the Forest Service, around 1957 or 1958, of over half a million acres of former Klamath Indian Reservation lands in southeastern Oregon. Practically all of the timbered lands of that reservation, except some one hundred forty thousand acres kept for the nonwithdrawing members of the tribe--you may recall that reservation was largely liquidated at the request of the benefiting Indians--were put up for sale. The first legislation authorized such sale only to private ownership; at least it had no provision in it for other than that. The secretary of interior was directed to break the reservation into units of timberland; have them appraised by presumably noninterested, objective appraisers; and expose them to sale.

Both the timber-using industry there and the local county and chambers of commerce and so forth, when they got to studying the possible impact of such action, became much opposed to it for several reasons. One was that there was already an overbuilding of manufacturing capacity in the area. They were apprehensive that if the timber lands were purchased by mills outside the area, the buyers might bring in additional milling capacity that, once the reservation timber was liquidated, would have to draw on the national forest timber to the probable detriment of the established mills.

Another was that they foresaw that if these people bought that timber at the current market value, the buyers would probably liquidate it as fast as they could, and after a short time the counties would have just cutover land to tax. Then from that there developed a theory that if it was put in the national forest and administered under sustained yield, there would be a steady flow of timber for the local industries and of 25 percent funds to the local government. That was influential in having the legislation amended so as to provide for segregation of the property between the nonwithdrawing Indians and a directed purchase of the remainder by the secretary of agriculture for incorporation into the national forests with the directive that the timber be managed under the sustained-yield principles.

There were some preliminary steps such as advertising it for purchase by private industry with a commitment written into the conveyance that it would be handled under plans for sustained-yield management approved by the Forest Service. That was done as to several units. Only one, a predominantly lodgepole pine tract, was purchased privately. As to the others, no one cared to pay the current value of the timber and then agree to handle it under sustained yield.

ERM: That was enough of a hooker to scare the bears away.

FWG: Well, it was an economic matter. You buy it at today's prices, and you could cut, under sustained yield in that area, only 1 1/2 to 2 percent of the inventory purchased, as it would have to be liquidated over a fifty- or sixty-year period. And you'd have your money tied up all that time, and the annual growth of 2 to 2 1/2 percent of the growing stock wasn't enough to offset that. But the important thing, I think, is that the local people saw in national forest ownership and management of that tract some very positive advantages. They made that known to Senator [Richard L.] Neuberger and others in the delegation, and the act was passed. It's the largest single purchase, I guess, the Forest Service ever made. I think it was roughly around sixty-eight million dollars for five hundred twenty-five thousand acres.

ERM: In your 1936 studies at Berkeley, did you find that at this time local governments were concerned at all with the Forest Service's watershed control measures?

FWG: No, I can't say that I did. My assignments were mainly in the northern California forests, but that was not a factor at the time in these places.

Federal Aid to States

ERM: Do you see federal aid, in forestry, to states as holding any potential danger?

FWG: I have always thought that the provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act, particularly those relative to forest fires, were equitable and desirable because, after all, fire is no respecter of land ownership or boundary lines.* Traditionally when there has been a common problem, all people who could pitched in and helped. The subsidy program, if you want to call it that, the contributions of the federal government to build up state forestry organizations for fire control, has been good, I think.

I would approve also of the same programs for trying to get better forest management on small properties because, after all, it's a national problem as well as a state or local problem--the assurance of adequate supplies of timber. However, I also think a more effective and cheaper way of solving the small ownership problem, at least in many areas, is to buy them for national or state forests.

ERM: It is a particularly hard nut for forestry to crack, isn't it?

FWG: Well, it's never been cracked. It probably won't be because people own lands for diverse and varied reasons, particularly small tracts. In regard to these contributions to local governments, I advocated and did quite a lot of work along with Ellis Williams, whom I previously mentioned, and others, on supplements to the 25 percent fund where lands are taken off the tax role. Obviously there has to be a transition period before the benefits of public ownership begi n to equalize the tax loss. None of these proposals for cushioning tax losses w as ever adopted, except in very restricted circumstances like the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, where there is a supplementary payment paid to the counties.

In broad general support for forestry, it seems to me that most states can roll their own hoop. I remember the Fulmer Act.** I don't

---

*Clarke-McNary Act of 7 June 1924, ch. 348, 43 Stat. 653, 16 U.S.C. sec. 471 (1964).

**Forest Land Management Act of 29 August 1935, ch. 808, 49 Stat. 963, 16 U.S.C. sec. 567a-567c (1964). Also known as the Fulmer Act.

know whether you remember that. It's on the books. It authorized the federal government to buy forest lands and convey them to the states, to be paid by the states with receipts from them. It was never activated. Apparently the states weren't anxious for it; neither was the federal government.

Some eight hundred thousand acres of these former land utilization projects had been placed under a long-term lease to various state or educational agencies—some to universities and some to state forest or park organizations. The proposal was made in the early fifties that these be quitclaimed to the states or to the organizations, whatever they might be, that had the leases. This was authorized by Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and was eventually done.*

My feeling at the time and since has been, in regard to these and to other types of federal land such as surplus property, that it is inequitable to the taxpayers generally, whose money bought these lands, to grant them free to particular states or particular institutions--to endow some state or local agency with a free gift of valuable properties which was bought with the funds of all the people.

I subscribe to former Senator Wayne Morse's formula that there should be at least a sharing of the costs. The "Morse formula" that he advocated for years in relation to surplus federal lands was that any recipient would have to pay at least 50 percent of the then market value. That principle hasn't prevailed. It does, however, reflect my attitude toward your question about federal support to state forestry activities.

---

*Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 22 July 1937, ch. 517, 50 Stat. 525, 7 U.S.C. secs. 1010-1012, 1013a (1964).

STAFF ASSISTANT, DIVISION OF RECREATION AND LANDS, CALIFORNIA, 1937 to 1944

S. B. Show, Regional Forester

ERM: From 1937 to 1944 you were on the staff of the assistant regional forester for the Division of Recreation and Lands in Region 5. You must have known S. B. Show. I wonder if you could comment upon incidents you recall that might help to clarify his personality or philosophy.

FWG: I worked under Show from 1930 to 1944 or 1945. I had little contact with him when I was on the national forests, except as he might come through on an inspection trip or other visit. He personally welcomed me into the Forest Service; I remember that when I first joined. He was, as far as I was concerned, an amiable person and a good boss to work for.

I became better acquainted with him after I moved to the regional office in 1936 in the Division of Recreation and Lands. That was a period, of course, of high activity by the F orest Service, in the middle of the depression era, you might say, and the Forest Service had the CCCs and all the other programs going and was really a strong influence in the rural areas of the state. Show believed in a dynamic Forest Service policy.

My assessment is that Show also was essentially a believer that the federal government in the field of land and resource conservation could do a better and more comprehensive job than state or local agencies. And that was not entirely a personal or bureaucratic prejudice. The state forestry division at that time was primarily a fire-fighting outfit; still is. The federal government had most of the money for resource conservation and development. Show believed in the expansion of the national forest system in California and strongly supported programs of land and timber exchange and land acquisition.

Many of the so-called land-use studies that were made at that time by J. K. Brandeberry either were proposed by Show or had his endorsement. Two of the most prominent of those were studies made of the redwood areas in the 1935 to 1938 period. Incidentally, I reviewed one of them, and it outlines a very fine program of multiple use for the redwood areas.

Show was aggressive within the Forest Service in getting his full share of anything that was going around in the way of funds, influence, and personnel. I think he occupied a very strong position in the state with the state legislature and state leaders. Show, also, was strongly interested in technical aspects of land management.

He had authored the bulletins on timber and logging practices in California earlier in his career along with [Ed I.] Kotok. He was very interested in fire protection, which, of course, was a major problem at the time. He stimulated the preparation of fire control and fire prevention and public relations types of manuals on fire control. He was influential in the chief's office because he was one of the strong regional foresters of the time.

ERM: He was a strong critic of industry, wasn't he?

FWG: Well, I really don't believe he was critical overall. I think he was critical in the sense that he felt that industry wasn't doing the forestry job that should be done. If you read these logging bulletins, you can see why. I don't think he had any personal animosity toward the lumber industry because I know that in some of our contracts on land exchanges and so forth, he was quite cordial to company people, such as Jude White, who headed up the Long Bell Lumber Company at Weed; and Ben Johnson, who was the president of Pickering Lumber Company at Sonora; Swift Berry of the Michigan-California Lumber Company; and Ken Walker, who was one of the representatives of the Red River Lumber Company. If there was one outfit that exemplified the typical lumber company of the late 1920s and early 1930s, with all the destruction of forest stands and forest land, it was the Red River Lumber Company. As far as I know, Show and Ken Walker got along fine, at least on a business basis.

But I'm sure that Show influenced the thinking on proposals for public regulation of private forest land cutting current through the 1940s up until, well, as long as Lyle Watts was chief and in attempts to get legislative prescriptions governing the use of private forest lands. He was involved in the battle which preceded the establishment of the Kings River Park [Kings Canyon National Park]. He had close relations with the California State Chamber of Commerce conservation people and others on that question. But I think that was because Show didn't agree that the Park Service could do a better job on the Kings Canyon lands than he was doing. It was pride in his organization, as well as opposition to converting these lands to limited use.

Show liked dynamic people in his organization. He favored those supervisors who were aggressive. He favored his staff people

who were aggressive. He had no hesitancy of overriding some of his supervisors, but he was able to do it in ways that didn't alienate them, I'm sure.

I met him a time or so later after he retired. He then had joined the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. In his later years in the Forest Service, I think he lost his interest in administration, and in the last years of his career there, he concentrated more on public policy and politically oriented matters, such as regulation of use of private lands.

Legislation of the 1930s

ERM: Do you recall how you felt about the Copeland Report of 1933 when it came out?*

FWG: No, I sure don't because at the time I was absorbed in other things.

ERM: In other words, it was not a matter of discussion among you and other foresters.

FWG: Not on the forest level. At that time I was at Big Bar trying to get a CCC camp organized and programs laid out, fires suppressed, and the rest of it. The Copeland Report made no impact on me.

ERM: I gather that you have a feeling that the legislation of the thirties generally advanced the cause of developing a sense of multiple use on the national forests--the CCCs and various other things.

FWG: I would say so. I think you have to distinguish a little between the concept of multiple use and the application of it or programs involving multiple resources on the ground. Across the board, I think, the CCC and the other programs put multiple use into action. They may not have known they were putting multiple use into action, but across the board they did all the things that we talk about when we talk about multiple use.

---

*U.S., Congress, Senate, A National Plan for American Forestry, S. Doc. 12, 73d Cong., 1st sess., 1933. Also known as "The Copeland Report."

ERM: What about the TVA?

FWG: I don't have much familiarity with it. I have had some small contacts with them. Basically, TVA concentrated on the educational forestry programs, those aimed at persuading private landowners to do a better job of land use. They changed over the years, like others. One example is "The Land Between the Lakes" National Recreation Area in Kentucky. TVA is trying to develop a classical national recreation area that will include multiple use of all types of wildlife and forestry conservation, timber utilization, recreation, and conservation education. Further northeast in Kentucky, TVA is letting contracts for coal that cause strip mining of substantial forested areas. So they are a little bit schizophrenic in their activities, too.

ERM: Aren't they beginning to catch a little heat on that score, too?

FWG: Yes. One interesting situation may be coming up. The Forest Service recently bought in the Redbird River country of Kentucky sixty or seventy thousand acres of land that was owned by the Ford Motor Company. It is hardwood timberland that Ford acquired when it used oak and other hardwoods for body parts in its cars. This land had been thoroughly logged. The minerals had been separated from the surface ownership. The service bought it subject to coal rights outstanding in TVA. It will be interesting when the time comes that TVA wants to mine that coal, to see how they are going to get by Forest Service prescriptions on surface damage and land protection.

Multiple Use in Land Planning

ERM: Do you recall an awareness of multiple use while you were in Region 5?

FWG: If someone had come in and said, "Have you a multiple-use plan?" the answer would have been, "No!" If they reviewed the activities of the Forest Service in any given area, I think they would say, "Well, they may not know it, but they are practicing multiple use." I mentioned the multiple-use management proposals written into the land-use studies of the proposed redwood area purchase units.

Talking about the resources the national forests offer, the first ones mentioned by Secretary [James] Wilson were timber, forage, and water of the national forests. These were to be managed for the

greatest good of the greatest number in the long run, and so forth. The real additions to those resources have been the public recreation programs and deliberate and planned wildlife propagation programs. The recreation development program was started by the Forest Service early because by 1917 it was actually keeping track of recreation visitors. The wildlife program came later.

When I first went to the regional office in 1936, Millard Barnum had a large number of young foresters out making an inventory of suitable recreation sites. This was one of the first surveys of national forest lands particularly suitable for recreation use and development that I know of. It preceded the servicewide one in the sixties by thirty years. [J. K.] Brandeberry was making land-use studies, as he called them, chiefly, but not exclusively, of areas outside the national forests, including the redwoods.

The study of the northern redwood unit laid out a program of multiple use with recommendations as to the way it should be acquired and the way it should be managed. The recommendations encompassed all of the elements of multiple use as we know them now. If the recommended program had been followed through, there would be a viable redwood national forest today.

One of my first jobs after moving to San Francisco was to go to Lake Tahoe to help examine this large area of land I mentioned before, the primary value of which was recognized as outdoor recreation and scenic preservation. It was strongly felt at the time, at least by me and the people in the regional office and Tahoe forest headquarters, that it would be a crying shame for that land to be devoted to the type of developments that even then were occurring around the lake--the subdivisions and exclusive recreation homes and businesses. On our survey we assessed the timber values. We paid a lot of attention to watershed values because the east side land drained into either Lake Tahoe or the Carson River, and we noted the wildlife values. But primarily we thought that this land should come into public ownership because of aesthetic and recreation values.

That concern followed through the activities I was involved in there, which went to land exchange and a certain degree of overall planning. We actually tried to evaluate the recreation, aesthetics, and watershed resources--the intangibles--in any proposal for acquiring lands and to keep some balance in our program. We acquired, for example, most of the Truckee River for several miles north of Tahoe. The Truckee River tract happened to be owned by the Westside Lumber Company located at Tuolumne near the Stanislaus National Forest;

I believe they'd taken it in on a mortgage. The Truckee River from Lake Tahoe some twenty miles north had few timber values, and it had no range values. We went to considerable effort to acquire that land, trying to exercise a little foresight toward future demand for public recreation.

I helped work up an exchange with the Red River Lumber Company. We went to a lot of work to include in it some of the lands around Lake Almanor. They weren't worth much for timber, in particular; they were cutover. There was residual white fir on them; that was about all. But we tried to foresee that come thirty years from then, Lake Almanor would be valuable, and it is. You can proliferate that concern. I went through some of the old exchanges to see some of the older land management thinking. I believe we were thinking multiple use, although we may not have been very conscious of the terminology.

Kings Canyon

ERM: You recall, of course, the Gearhart Bill of 1940.*

FWG: That was the Kings Canyon National Park.

ERM: It created the Kings Canyon National Park. This involved taking national forest land, did it not?

FWG: Except for General Grant Grove, I think this park was established out of the national forest.

ERM: Did you have any active part in that transfer?

FWG: No, I didn't at the time.

ERM: What is your own personal evaluation of it?

FWG: I had never seen the Kings Canyon at the time, so I really didn't have any personal feeling for it one way or the other. My feeling probably

---

*Kings Canyon National Park Act of 4 March 1940, ch. 40, 54 Stat. 41, 16 U.S.C. sec. 80-80d (1964).

paralleled that of most of the Forest Service people, which was that the lands could be equally well managed under the Forest Service, and some of the things the Park Service wouldn't do, the Forest Service could do. You may know better than I that the chief controversy there was over some dam sites on the Kings River. There wasn't too much timber. I don't think anybody was really fretting about timber. There wasn't too much grazing. The resources were water and water power, recreation, and wilderness.

ERM: Water power had advantage.

FWG: The water storage potential stirred the opposition to the proposal both from public water and power districts and the commercial power people. A Department of Interior memo of January 31, 1939, gives some data on a proposed John Muir national park, which I think later became Kings Canyon, as near as I can tie the two areas together. Perhaps this is not the exact area, but it included about four hundred fifty thousand acres. The secretary of the Interior Department apparently had asked about the then current uses of the lands, and the memo enumerated grazing of cattle and horses 687 plus 298, or about 1,000 cattle and horses grazed, also, some 300 sheep. It said the Forest Service advised that no timber survey records were available for the commercial timber.

They further stated there were substantial quantities of marketable timber in the Lewis Creek and Sugar Loaf areas, which could be accessible when the highway up the South Fork of the Kings River was completed. So there really wasn't too much concern about timber or grazing there; it was the water. I may note there was a bitter fight on it in which [Charles G.] Dunwoody of the California State Chamber of Commerce took an active part and finally lost out to the superior influence of Secretary [Harold] Ickes.

The original act omitted from the park the Cedar Grove and Tehipiti Valley areas because of potential water storage possibilities. Three or four years ago, the Forest Service and the Park Service, which managed Cedar Grove campground under a special use permit, agreed to legislation incorporating these lands into the park. This was enacted with little or no opposition.

Redwood National Forest

ERM: During the 1930s, the Redwood National Forest Purchase Units were established. Was the establishment of these units in any way the result of lobbying on the part of the landowners? Was this type of lobbying common in the thirties or forties?

FWG: There is no simplistic answer. When I think of the term "lobbying" in its invidious sense, the answer is, no. The Forest Service's interest in the redwood forests began in 1934. Actually, under the Blue Eagle of the NRA [National Recovery Act], there were provisions for set-asides of government timber to keep it from competing with industry, and there was a lot of ferment there with which I'm not too familiar. But there was participation by the Forest Service in the Blue Eagle programs of forest utilization and conservation.

I know one of the early questions was whether redwood could be selectively cut, indicating to me that there was concern at that time about some of the impacts of then current logging practices. There was established on some private lands south of Eureka, called the Henry Creek area, an experimental plot of one hundred sixty acres in which the owning company and the Forest Service collaborated in trying out methods of selective logging. Probably that stimulated the interest of the Forest Service in the redwood area.

The national forest system included no redwoods at the time, aside from a few in the Santa Cruz mountains. The national forests were expanding at that time. There were many new purchase units in the East. There was money made available from ECW funds for land purchase. Forty to fifty million dollars in all were allocated to the Forest Service for expenditure under the Weeks Law, as amended. So I think really the interest generated from the fact that there were no national forests there; that there was a forest conservation problem; that S. B. Show, Jay Price, and others became interested; and there was a crisis in local government financing due to tax delinquencies.

Those lands, like many others, were feeling the pinch of the tax burden. That was especially true of the nonoperating properties. In Del Norte County, by 1936 or 1937, practically all of several major holdings had become tax forfeited, or at least owed large sums in unpaid taxes. They were owned by absentee owners, and most of them were not paying their taxes. Several of them, I guess, previously had defaulted on bonds that they had issued using the timber as security.

The same was true further south, in Mendocino County. They may not have defaulted, but they were feeling the pressure. The Southern Pacific Company had a big tract in there, and some others. I don't know it personally, but I have little doubt that between the counties and the owners there was a community of interest in what the Forest Service could do to help them out of this situation.

One of the main tracts on the Klamath River, part of which was eventually bought for the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit, was owned by the Ward interests from Bay City, Michigan. A gentleman named Harold Ward was one of the chief stockholders and, I believe, president of the company. The Ward interests owned three or four different companies, but he was the person we dealt with. The Ward people, along with Requa Timber Company, which was controlled by some San Francisco people, in some way had become acquainted with Colonel Ed Fletcher.

Colonel Ed was a San Diego businessman, a member of the State Board of Forestry for several years, a state senator, and had dealt in real estate all his life. He made money in San Diego real estate. He was designated as agent for the Ward Redwood Company, and he pushed the purchase of its lands to get the company out of its tax troubles. He did succeed in arousing some interest in making funds available through contracts with the then administration. Del Norte County was very receptive to a purchase program because at the time it was issuing tax anticipation warrants and all sorts of things in order to help pay county expenses.

But aside from some such relatively minor influence such as Colonel Ed might have had, I don't know of any organized lobby. I think there was a general community of interest there rising out of the depressed conditions, tax delinquencies, and acknowledged lack of any forestry practices in the redwood area.

San Jacinto Tramway

ERM: Were you involved in the San Jacinto tramway dispute in the forties?

FWG: It involved the question of a tramway across a national forest primitive area. I was involved very peripherally. I remember there was a dispute.

As I recall, it was finally solved by taking forty acres out of the primitive area. That was one of those situations, again, where the accident of this primitive area extending over this particular forty or one hundred sixty acres was made a reason to deny thousands of people the pleasure of going up on the tramway to San Jacinto peak for skiing and recreating. I guess the answer at that time was that this was not right because of the action taken. It was another one of those controversies that was rather hot at the time, though relatively localized.

Recreation in the National Forests

ERM: Do you recall what the general feeling was at the ranger level of the Forest Service during the thirties and forties toward recreation on the national forests? What generally do you recall about rangers' attitudes toward hikers and campers who ventured into their domain? Lee Kneipp in an interview with Amelia Fry stated that the first recreational campgrounds constructed in a national forest were not to accommodate or foster recreation, but rather to keep campers from interfering with "the regular business of the Forest Service," in other words, to keep the people away from the watering holes and the animals and the area of logging and, therefore, to avoid conflicts between grazers and recreationists, sawmen and recreationists, and so forth.*

FWG: Actually, that wasn't the rationale that I understood at the time or since for the development of public campgrounds and picnic grounds in the national forests. I suppose I might defer to Lee Kneipp on that since he helped institute the early programs. But that wasn't the official line as I understood it. The reason for spending funds on camping and picnic grounds was to concentrate people as a fire prevention measure, so they weren't all camping out in the brush, and to provide some sanitation facilities so they weren't polluting the streams, and to provide some amenities to encourage family use. And, also, perhaps to some extent along his statement, to keep them

---

*Leon Kneipp, tape-recorded interview in 1964 by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley. In process.

relatively concentrated so the Forest Service knew where they were, for safety as well as other reasons.

The reason I don't think that the statement attributed to Kneipp represented the essential rationale is that, in my experience, there has been no attempt by the Forest Service to prevent people from going out and camping where they wanted to. They have to go to the ranger and get a fire permit. Of course, in the southern California forests large sections are closed to all forms of access for fire prevention reasons. But when I was a ranger, people went out and camped where they pleased.

Car-borne people who came through from outside usually hit a campground because there they had a camp stove, table, a faucet that gave them water, and fuel wood around. They had a pit toilet and that type of amenity, and prepared parking places. It was common for others to go off into the backcountry. This was particularly true in hunting season; people went up all over the forests then.

ERM: I haven't myself encountered many rangers, old or new, from whom I got an expression of antagonism toward the public use of forests for recreational purposes. Indeed, I have found more than just a few who admitted to having gone out on their own initiative and built things for the benefit of the people, this long before there was a recreational plan for their district.

FWG: I'm sure that's right. Part of the rationale of keeping the trails up was for people to get into and around the country. Of course, our rangers and their people from the early days on put in thousands of man-hours of extra time on their own packing out the garbage and cleaning up the messes and so forth. I had no resentment, certainly, when I was a ranger, and I did quite a lot of work on campgrounds and that type of improvement. I never knew anyone else that did.

On the other hand, my contacts may not have been that extensive. But the only resentment that I've encountered on the part of Forest Service personnel is against the so-called recreationists that break up things or rowdy around the public areas. They have little patience for that because it is pretty darn hard to get money for recreation improvements, even now.

ERM: That's an irritation that can be felt by any group toward any other group. How does the Forest Service measure the value of land for recreation use? Has the measurement changed over the years? Is there more use of mathematical formulae or statistical analyses now?

FWG: There is much better accountability of that use, of course, in terms of man-days or visitor-days and better correlation of use and improvement and maintenance expenditures. There have been attempts to put a dollar value on recreational use through use of some conversion factors, or an attempt to put economic values on it in terms of average expenditures of recreationists in a given area. That's a device used frequently in promoting either sophisticated recreation developments or parks. It is used, also, by the Corps of Engineers in developing cost-benefit ratios for dams and reservoirs. They commonly use some rather low dollar values, such as a dollar a day for each visitor-day, or a dollar for each recreation visit, or two dollars for a day's use. I think it's generally accepted that there is no way of accurately putting a tangible value on recreation. You have to evaluate it in terms of people use and people enjoyment. The only true measure of the national forests recreation resource is the way the people have increased their use of it.

ERM: Is this a tactic on the part of preservationist groups to countervail the statistical or the dollar values that are put on timber?

FWG: I can only answer that from my experience with the Forest Service. I have struggled with them, with the problem in a good many instances. I've worked with these in regard to national recreation areas in later years of my career. I've worked with reservoir projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, which generate lots of recreational use. The last project I worked on was the study of the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee. It was a congressionally directed study to determine what alternate programs there are to a high-level dam there, proposed over the years by the Corps of Engineers.

In all of those the question comes up, "You can measure the value of a thousand board feet of timber or a ton of coal or forage for so many livestock. If a calf puts on seventy-five pounds in three months, that means so much to the landowner. But how do you get at what it's worth to a family to sit on an overlook and view the Blue Ridge Mountains in all their beauty or to take a canoe down a stretch of white water? How does the value to the user of a canoe trip on the white water compare to that of a fisherman on a reservoir who's catching a six-pound bass?"

My experience is that it's awfully hard to put a cash or monetary or numerical value on recreational experiences. One can postulate possible economic benefits to an area from recreationists or tourists. This is done in support of parks, reservoirs, or highways. In my

view these are indicative only and have a large potential for deceiving the public. As to using computed recreation values to offset the impact of monetary receipts from national forest timber and range, I don't think the computed values have much effect that way until they become cash in the till.

ERM: Did you ever personally have contact with Aldo Leopold?

FWG: No, I never did.

ERM: How much impact do you feel Leopold had on the Forest Service's development of recreation and game management programs?

FWG: I can't answer that because I don't really know. I would say this. I am sure that in the game management field he had a very material impact because in the late thirties and forties the Forest Service really started on planned game management more in the East than in the West, I'm sure. Dr. [H. L.] Schantz was in the chief's office at the time, and Lloyd Swift was his assistant.* My familiarity stems mostly from my acquaintanceship with Swift over the years. Swift was a protege of Dr. Schantz, and I'm sure that Schantz wrapped into his thinking the things that Leopold was interested in.

ERM: Did you know Arthur Carhart?

FWG: No, I didn't know Carhart.

ERM: What about Robert Marshall, did you know him?

FWG: I knew him to a small extent. I met him on one or two of his field trips. I know what he stood for. I remember what he looked like. I'm generally familiar with some of his philosophies.

ERM: He was an ardent preservationist, right?

FWG: He was an advocate of wilderness to the extent that it didn't really reduce contributions of national forests to employment and community stabilization. He wasn't an advocate of placing everything in wilderness, but no doubt he wanted more wilderness than existed at the time that he was in the Forest Service. I forget when he died. In the early forties?

---

*Lloyd Swift, "Wildlife Policy and Administration in the U.S. Forest Service," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office (Berkeley, 1968).

ERM: 1940.

FWG: Yes. So his influence on the Forest Service was for five or six years. He was a contemporary of John Shanklin, I know, and of John Edwards, who worked with me in the San Francisco office. I had some acquaintanceship with his philosophy, particularly from John Edwards. I have, among some papers, a memo apparently written in the late thirties, because Marshall went out of the Forest Service about that time, about the qualifications that should apply if a national forest area were to be changed to park status. It sheds a little light, I think, on his thoughts about putting land aside strictly for wilderness or for parks. I might read some of it. It is an undated memorandum signed by Robert Marshall, apparently written sometime in the mid or late thirties, after he headed the Division of Recreation and Lands in the Forest Service, and, of course, before he died.

He first says that to justify transfer to park status an area should offer "superlative scenery or be part of the logical administrative unit of superlative scenery." Then he goes on to say, and this I think is significant, "It should not contain timber, grass, or water, on the development of which a large number of families are dependent for their livelihood, unless either a method can be first worked out for caring for those families or the commodity development of the area would cause such major damage to extraordinary scenic values that it would seem worth sacrificing the livelihood of an important number of people in order to preserve the superlative."*

And he analyzes the Forest Service versus the Park Service as to their recreation administration. He comes out with the view that the Forest Service then was doing a better job in some aspects and the Park Service in others, and that there should be no notion that the Park Service was in any way a better agency to administer forest recreation than the Forest Service. I thought that these expressions might be interesting in relation to Marshall. I didn't know him personally.

ERM: That is a memorandum or a piece of writing by Robert Marshall that I have never seen quoted in any of the usual quotes of Marshall.

---

*Robert Marshall, "Qualifications which any National Forest Area Should Possess If It Is to Be Changed to Park Status," typed memorandum dated late 1930s. For a copy, see Appendix A, p. 151.

FWG: Well, he was a wilderness enthusiast, no question about it. But in the context of the times, I think Marshall also recognized that there were a lot of people who were dependent on forest-based industry for their livelihood, and so he tempered his feelings to take this reality into account. This is what I would gather from his memorandum.

ERM: He himself was a person of inherited wealth, wasn't he?

FWG: He was wealthy, yes.

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF LANDS, U.S. FOREST SERVICE, 1945 to 1958

National Forest Reservation Commission

ERM: You became director of the Division of Lands between 1945 and 1958, right?

FWG: That's right. I moved to Washington in the late fall of 1944 to work for Lee [Leon F.] Kneipp, who was assistant chief of the Forest Service, in charge of lands activities, and also handling recreation in the Forest Service during the war because [Robert] Marshall had died and [John H.] Sieker was in the army.* Lee Kneipp was an old recreation proponent, and he was handling that job. I transferred to the position of secretary of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which was set up by the Weeks Law to pass on purchases of lands under the Weeks Law for national forest purposes. A member of the Forest Service long had been designated to do the so-called secretarial work--to prepare programs, review proposals that were being presented to the commission, organize them, advise the commission on anything it should look particularly at, and handle reports and correspondence.

At that time there wasn't much land being purchased because of the war. But the commission was still alive with quite a few land and timber exchanges and odds and ends of business. I didn't have too much work on commission business, but part of the job was to act as head of the Division of Land Acquisition, which was concerned with land purchases and exchanges, land records and status, national forest boundaries, and like matters. So I had a staff administrative job as well as this job as secretary of the commission.

The job as secretary of the commission did bring me into

---

*Leon F. Kneipp, tape-recorded interview in 1964 by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office, Berkeley. In process. John H. Sieker, "Recreation Policy and Administration in the U.S. Forest Service," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California Bancroft Library Regional Oral History Office (Berkeley, 1968).

personal contact with some of the members, such as Congressman Roy Woodruff of Michigan, a long-term member of the commission; Senator [Walter F.] George of Georgia, they're both dead now; Senator [Henry] Styles Bridges of New Hampshire; and Congressman William Colmer of Mississippi. This didn't relate to multiple use, but rather to the problems of the commission. Anyway, that was my assignment there.

While we had little money for land purchase in the first year or so, we did have an active land-exchange program in the Lake States and in the western regions. Part of my job was to review exchange or purchase proposals, correspond with the regions as to discrepancies or questions, inconsistencies or poor policies, be sure that if they were to be approved by the chief and secretary they were in the public interest as the law required, and recommend approval or disapproval. There were many substantial exchanges in the late 1940s and early 1950s, including those through which the Forest Service acquired the lands on Lake Tahoe known as the Pope-Baldwin properties.

ERM: Did this involve you in a great deal of travel?

FWG: After the war ended, when people had liberty to travel, yes, I made several field trips a year throughout the country.

ERM: This involved all kinds of land acquisitions: assignment of heretofore unreserved public lands, outright purchase of lands, accepting donated lands, and exchanging lands.

FWG: Right. And the peripheral problems of keeping track of purchases, maintaining land status records, and becoming an expert on land values.

ERM: To go into all the different processes, the various kinds of land acquisitions that you were involved in, would be almost an interview in itself, I'm sure.

FWG: We could discuss particular examples of it. There was at that time two or three basic statutes plus some subsidiary ones. The Weeks Law was one. It originated in 1911, and its purpose was to authorize the purchase of lands in the eastern United States, where there were very few reserved national forest lands. This was supplemented by the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924. Then there are two exchange acts, one applicable to the national forests' lands reserved from Public Domain and one applicable to acquired Weeks Law lands. And there are some acts of local application in California and Nevada and Utah

using receipts of particular national forests for acquiring lands for flood control and soil conservation purposes. There are eight such receipts acts authorizing land purchases through congressional appropriations from the receipts from the sale of timber and other resources of the named national forests.* There are also a number of special acts that are strictly for local application. Also, there are two acts authorizing acceptance of donations, one a section of the Clarke-McNary Act. The two exchange acts and the Weeks Law as amended at that time were the major acts; they have been supplemented later by other acts.

The purchases of lands under the Weeks Law and exchanges involved under the Weeks Law had to go before this commission that I mentioned. The exchanges of national forest land or timber reserved from the Public Domain at that time were finally passed upon by the secretary of the interior after they were recommended by letters from the secretary of agriculture to the secretary of interior. This was changed to lodge final approval in the secretary of agriculture by legislation in 1960. Some of those transactions were quite complicated.

This may be of some interest. Going back again to the thirties, both California and Oregon Forest Service people had originated so-called precutting exchanges whereby lands were to be conveyed to the United States with a certain selected reserve of timber left upon them. Under the agreements, either the timber to be left would be marked or designated by the Forest Service or the timber to be cut would be marked and designated by the Forest Service. These agreements brought into play questions of relative values of timber left and timber taken and things like that. They were quite advantageous in those timber types adapted to selective logging practices, particularly in forestalling clear cutting or denudation of pine-type forest lands. They were sound accomplishments in my opinion, but they were technically rather tricky and hard to present to people who were not knowledgeable.

We had a diverse program. In the fiscal year of 1947, appropriations were made for purchase of lands in the eastern national forests under the Weeks Law. Our prosperity didn't last long, though, because by 1950 the country was getting into trouble in Korea, and the appropriations dried up again. Also, a resistance was developing to government purchase of lands, although in the Appalachians, the Ozarks, and the northern Lake States there was lots of land available at reasonable rates.

---

*Examples of receipts acts include: Act to authorize land purchases in the San Bernardino and Cleveland national forests, Act of 15 June 1938, 52 Stat. 699; act to authorize land purchases in Angeles National Forest, Act of 11 June 1940, 54 Stat. 299; act to authorize land purchases in Cleveland National Forest, Act of 11 June 1940, 54 Stat. 297.

Lake Tahoe Acquisitions

One of the transactions I take a little pride in, because I helped originate it before I left the San Francisco office, was a series of transactions by which the Forest Service acquired the so-called Baldwin estate and Pope estate lands on Lake Tahoe. You may know that the Lake Tahoe shore lands practically all were patented before the national forests were established. There was very little public ownership around the lake.

Lucky [Elias Jackson] Baldwin, who made some of his money, at least, in the Klondike, had accumulated several thousands acres of land there, including some two or three miles of the lakefront and extending west to include most of Fallen Leaf Lake. The Pope family, of the Pope and Talbot Lumber Company, had considerable lakefront acreage adjoining the Baldwin property. This was on the California side, going north along the lake from the old settlement of Meyers. Actually, Camp Richardson was carved, I think, out of the Pope property. Well, those lands became available through liquidation of the estates of these two families--all of the Baldwin estate, which went back to Fallen Leaf Lake and took in most of it to the south in the higher lands, and a good part of the Pope estate.

The Forest Service had no money so it had to deal through the exchange acts. Millard Barnum, who was then in charge of the land exchange business in the San Francisco office, and others, with the cooperation of the Winton Lumber Company and some other lumber companies that desired national forest stumpage, negotiated exchange transactions whereby the companies bought the Pope and Baldwin properties and took them off the market. Then these companies exchanged them for equal values of cutting rights to national forest timber tributary to their mills.

Quite a lot of it was around the Winton operations north and east of Jackson in El Dorado and Calaveras counties. One of the interesting things was that this was done with the concurrence and support of the El Dorado County commissioners because they foresaw the benefits of public ownership both touristwise and from the standpoint of solving some of their problems of overdevelopment that they, even at that time, were interested in.

These were large exchanges, running into the millions of dollars, which was big money for the late forties and early fifties to the Forest Service. They took quite a lot of selling on the chief's

level because of the complications of timber companies buying lands and then exchanging to the government. They were susceptible to questions as to whether the companies were getting more for the lands than warranted by their investments in them. So the values had to be carefully worked out and the transactions carefully assessed to be sure they would stand up before hostile criticism.

Then they had to be approved by the Department of Interior, which as it turned out, as I recall it, was largely procedural. Interior didn't really raise any questions about the desirability of acquiring this property as some of us had thought it might because it is primarily recreation property. Those exchanges were finally completed, and they really formed the basis of the public presence on the south end of Lake Tahoe, highly valuable at this time and of great public benefit from the standpoint of public access to and use of the lake.

ERM: Did you do any of the negotiating with the Wintons on this?

FWG: I think most of the negotiating was done by Barnum.

ERM: Out of the San Francisco office.

FWG: Out of the San Francisco office. And by Ed Smith, who was then supervisor of the El Dorado National Forest. Ed was an old-time supervisor.

ERM: I wonder whether you had any contact with either Dave or Charlie Winton or with Jack Kerns or any of their people at Martell.

FWG: Some with Dave Winton. Dave was the leader in negotiating these. The Wintons were concerned about assuring that this timber would go to their operation against the possibility of it going to other mills, particularly the Blagen mill further south. So that was their motivation. Of course, the Forest Service's motivation was a chance to acquire--probably the last chance--a really utilizable and highly valuable public property on Lake Tahoe because we had flunked out on the other shore at that time.

I note in glancing through your recorded interview with Ham Pyles a reference to use of lands in the Allegheny National Forest known as the Biddle estate donation.* I was involved in closing the donation phases

*Hamilton K. Pyles, "Multiple Use of the National Forests," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview by Susan Schrepfer, Forest History Society (Santa Cruz, California, 1971), pp. 78-79.

of this case, and it had some features that caused me to remember it much more than most. Donations were not frequent enough to be common, but they were part of the lands business.

This one was unusual. Lydia S. Biddle in 1929 willed to the federal government, "as a park, reservation of forest lands, or game preserves, my homestead and all included in the 600 acres surrounding it, and everything in the place with the exception of the furniture and belongings of the house. . . ." The will states, "I feel that this is the only way to insure preserving the forests and making a refuge for the wild animals and birds...."

There was no mention of the national forest. Further, the bequest was subject to two life estates granted to relatives. An item that intrigued me was that this section of her will, apparently written by her and quite vague as to future custody of the property, was witnessed by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. That is, the will was witnessed by the justice.

The life tenancies terminated in 1955 and questions then arose whether the Forest Service could appropriately accept the bequest on behalf of the government and, if so, if it desired to do so. Among other improvements, the property included a very large wooden house or mansion and several outbuildings. An additional complication was the fact that some thirty-seven hundred dollars was due the state in inheritance taxes.

The attorney general ruled that the devise properly could be accepted by the secretary under Section 7 of the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924. Decision was made to do this for the potential uses mentioned by Pyles. To pay the inheritance tax from appropriated funds for Weeks Law purchases it was necessary to obtain the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission. This also was finally accomplished and the devise accepted in 1957, twenty-eight years after the will was made.

Attitudes Toward Public Acquisition

ERM: Can you see over the years any changing attitude on the part of the public and the forest industries toward acquiring additions to the

national forests?

FWG: Very definitely in general; there are exceptions at particular times and places, of course.

ERM: How would you characterize it?

FWG: It follows their particular current interests. In the depression years, forest land, especially cutover land, was a drug on the market and a tax liability. The Forest Service administers about four hundred thousand acres in north Idaho that the timber companies let go tax delinquent. The counties donated it to the Forest Service, at the behest, I'm sure, of the timber companies to assure fire protection and management. Acquisition of lands in Mississippi and probably Louisiana and Texas was actively pushed by some landowners, particularly the Long Bell Corporation, and many of the others were very happy to dispose of their white elephants at the time.

ERM: But were very sad about having done so about ten or fifteen years later.

FWG: Those lands responded very well to fire protection and silvicultural treatment.

ERM: Nobody really foresaw the tremendous boom in pulp and paper.

FWG: I think that was part of the key in the South. The development of a process for making kraft paper out of southern pine permitted them to use relatively young growth. The other thing was that many of those lands had been horribly burned. They had been clear cut and probably burned over several times, so if you looked at them you couldn't see any potential in them, which was deceiving. Given protection and some reforestation, they became productive in an amazingly short time. By the time the fifties came around the timber companies were reluctant to have further public purchase of forest lands, at least on any substantial scale.

I think there was an ideological factor there, too, with a period of hostility to any further involvement of government in business matters. Also, there was the aspect of competition for land, previously discussed. Weyerhaeuser started in its program of building up its timber holdings. Outfits like Boise-Cascade did the same. Paper companies, of course, started acquiring some of these larger lumber companies and otherwise building up their holdings, due to the factor you mentioned. So it all jelled, and by the fifties they were quite hostile to any substantial acquisitions of land by public agencies, and

that, I think, has continued. Local governments, too, became increasingly reluctant to have land removed from tax rolls.

We made a study in West Virginia in the early sixties, at the request of Senator [Robert Carlyle] Byrd, outlining two or three possible national forest units there. One of them, which we called the Mountaineer Unit, west of the present Monongahela National Forest, had a great deal of potential, we thought, for a national forest. It bore good stands of young growth, mostly below commercial size, all hardwood. There were lots of problems in the area with depressed communities for coal mining was terminating and the forests had been cut but hadn't regenerated to economic size. The lands, however, had high recreation values and high watershed values, being in the headwaters of the Ohio River, and there was potential for developing both timber and recreation use industries.

That proposal was publicized and met strong opposition from some of the local timber companies there. This was not overt opposition from the companies, but opposition from local employees and so forth talking to the local county commissioners. No doubt this attitude was conveyed to the senator for the matter was never pushed. This situation reflected the typical temper of the time toward increased public ownership.

National Forest Reservation Commission

ERM: You were secretary of this National Forest Reservation Commission for how long?

FWG: I assumed the directorship of the Division of Land Classification in 1958. So I was secretary to the commission from September, 1944, to December, 1957, or thereabouts.

ERM: How did the commission aid in the acquisition program?

FWG: The commission didn't take a real active part. Some of the members of the commission were helpful. From this angle, Senator [John Cornelius] Stennis comes to mind, not only in the acquisition program, but in the Forest Service programs generally.

ERM: He has been one of the strong allies of the Forest Service.

FWG: Yes, particularly in forest research and that sort of thing in later years.

ERM: The McIntire and Stennis Act.*

FWG: Right. He has been a good friend of the service, and so has Bill [William Meyers] Colmer of Mississippi, who is the oldest member of the commission. I think probably the commission's influence has been more passive than active. I think some of the members have kept detrimental things from happening, both to the acquisition program and, perhaps, to the Forest Service. They haven't actually gone to bat for a stronger land program.

I recall one instance in the fiscal year of 1947 after the first meeting of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which approved purchase of several thousand acres. Some publicity was given to it. Then Congressman [Robert Fleming] Rich of Pennsylvania, who, I think, was connected with the Woolrich industries there that make wool clothing, rose up and said, in effect, "This is a hell of a situation. The government is spending money to take lands off the tax roll. I demand it be stopped." There was quite a furor at the time. Finally, the Forest Service decided to put the question to the commission, What do we do?

The secretary of the army is the head of the commission officially. At that time, with Korea brewing and World War II terminating and so forth, he seldom put in an appearance. We asked him to come over and chair this meeting and he did. Robert Patterson, at the time, was secretary of war. The commission discussed the situation, and Patterson settled the matter promptly and decisively.

He said, in effect, Congress has appropriated this money knowing what it was for and apparently with approval of this expenditure for these purposes. It is not the function of the commission to override the will of Congress in this matter just because some people don't like it. I forget all the details, but the commission supported him in that statement. They said, "No, it isn't. Go ahead and spend it. If Congress doesn't want to appropriate any more, that is Congress's business, but they appropriated this knowing what they were doing."

---

*McIntire-Stennis Act of 10 October 1962, 76 Stat. 806, 16 U.S.C. secs. 582a-7 (1964).

I can recall, also in 1947 or 1948, Congress passed the bill for acquisition of lands in the part of the Quetico-Superior Area, which then was the Superior Roadless Area. Now it's the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. This act was stimulated by abuses of air access to this otherwise remote and scenic land, with detrimental impact on fishing and the general primeval aspect and also by proliferation of resorts. Resorts were being built with access by boat or by plane, with many flying in the guests. A lot of people who valued this lake country as kind of a natural area didn't like it.

ERM: Frank Hubachek was one of them.

FWG: Frank Hubachek was a leader in the move, as was his partner, Charles Kelly. But, anyway, Lee Kneipp drew up and Congress enacted a bill to authorize the acquisition of lands within a certain described part of this roadless area and the appropriation of funds for it. This is called the Thye-Blatnik Act, after the congressional sponsors.* This act was later amended to include all of what is now the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. The Forest Service had obtained some appropriations for land purchase there. Then in the early part of the [Ezra Taft] Benson regime there weren't any appropriations, and there was a lot of discussion as to whether the department would recommend appropriations to buy land there.

At one of the meetings of the commission, this came up for discussion, and I can remember Senator [John Cornelius] Stennis participating in that. He at the time was a member of the Armed Services Committee, and the army or the air force had flown him out to some of the Alaska military bases. They also had flown him to some of the interior lakes of Alaska that, apparently, were strictly primeval. He recounted his experiences there and his pleasure at being able to see this land in its original state. He said in regard to the Superior proposal, "I think it important that this commission endorse a program which will preserve a little of this country as it used to be." I think that was influential in the resumption of interest by the administration and by the Congress in the program to further consolidate the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, which has been largely done by now.

ERM: That's a point in favor of VIP trips for senators and congressmen.

---

*Thye-Blatnik Act of 22 June 1948, ch. 593, 62 Stat. 568, 16 U.S.C. sec. 577c-h (1964).

FWG: If they get a reaction like that, as he did. He is a very fine gentleman and a broad-gauged legislator.

ERM: Was the commission a good liaison with the general public? Do you think it was subject to any undue pressures that were sometimes in conflict with the purposes of your land policy?

FWG: On your first question, I don't think that it was a particularly good liaison with the general public. I think it had value as a liaison organ with Congress because of the stature of the congressional people that were and are on it.

ERM: But more in keeping things out of trouble.

FWG: Yes. They were people you could go to with problems who had some understanding of Forest Service operations because several of them at least made a point of going out in the forests from time to time.

On the second question, it depended upon the member. Of course, the secretary of the army didn't take much active part and finally recommended legislation that made the chief of engineers his alternate. The chief of engineers assumed his position. And in run-of-the-mill type programs, the Department of the Interior was quite supportive. During the pre-World War II years, when the Forest Service attempted to get approval of land purchases around San Diego or San Bernardino under the receipts acts that I mentioned [see page 43], Secretary [Harold] Ickes was quite obstructive.

His position was that these lands never grew a tree, and they never will grow a tree, and they aren't forests, and he was not going to approve purchase of them. He was neglecting or overlooking the fact that the bills didn't say anything about trees, but were in aid of flood control and soil conservation. He finally got mad at Lee Kneipp and wrote a letter to President [Franklin D.] Roosevelt saying, "I'm tired of being insulted by Dr. Kneipp. I hereby resign from the National Forest Reservation Commission." But he couldn't do it because he was a member by statute. He never participated after that. So I never really had the pleasure of meeting the gentleman. I used to trot over there with the programs, but I never got to see Ickes.

There were some vacancies in the early fifties on the commission. Roy Woodruff died about 1950. And the then organized lumber industry, if you want to call it that, decided it would try to get some members on the commission that would reflect its views, particularly from the standpoint of restricting or inhibiting further national forest land purchases.

They used their influence to get Wesley D'Ewart from Montana appointed. D'Ewart at the time introduced--I think against his natural inclination because I got to know him fairly well while I was secretary of the commission--some of the so-called range disposal bills providing for the sale or disposal of the Public Domain lands to states, ranchers, and so forth. So he was on the commission passing on proposals to buy land to upgrade timber and water resources of the national forests, and at the same time he was handling bills to dispose of the public range. I don't think D'Ewart really did the job for them.

He was followed by Representative Sam Coon from eastern Oregon. He was aggressive, objecting and combating land acquisition proposals that came before the commission. As far as I recall, other than causing some difficulties with the presentation and arguments within the commission, he really didn't obstruct the programs much. The other members of the commission just overrode him. He was replaced later by Hamer Budge of Idaho.

There is kind of a sequence of events in this situation that is rather interesting. D'Ewart got on through the agency of the timber people, and he got beat after two terms. Coon got on, and he was defeated for reelection. Budge got on, and he got beat. Budge was followed by Jack [Alfred John] Westland of Washington, and he got beat. I think these people would have liked to have used their position on the commission to, in effect, reduce or negate the land acquisition program of the Forest Service. They weren't very successful on the commission. What influence they had on appropriations committees and in places like that, I can't measure. Budge was quite influential politically at the time he was one, as was D'Ewart.

ERM: How often did the commission meet?

FWG: They met at the call of the secretary, which was when there was business to be transacted. When funds were at a low ebb, why, they met about twice a year for exchanges and routine business. Since the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided funds, I understand they meet about four times a year on a regular schedule.

ERM: Were regular minutes kept on file?

FWG: Yes.

ERM: Would these be available for study?

FWG: The Forest Service has them, plus a sheet record of every transaction

ever approved by the commission and summaries of all programs. Those were available when I left there. I presume they still are kept up.

ERM: How does the Forest Service administration generally feel about the commission?

FWG: There have been a number of suggestions made that it be legislatively abolished. The first was by Mr. Ickes who said that it was unconstitutional anyway because it allocates to Congress--because a majority of the commission are members of Congress--powers vested in the executive branch. In later years, practically every time there is a change of administration, they cast about for commissions, boards, and so forth, started by their predecessors but which aren't politically profitable to them. So periodically the department is asked for its recommendation as to the National Forest Reservation Commission.

Incidentally, it is paralleled by the National Migratory Bird Refuge Commission, of somewhat different membership, but with the same functions in regard to purchase of lands for migratory bird refuges. That question comes up, too, with the fish and wildlife service [Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife]. The response of the Forest Service generally has been to recommend that the commission be maintained on the grounds that it provides an impartial review of land transactions, which are sensitive and not subject to public bid or public auction; that the congressional commission members are informed on how the Forest Service is handling land-purchase funds Congress appropriates and can keep their colleagues informed if they desire to do so; that it provides these commission members with an opportunity to know what the Forest Service is doing, not only in lands, but in other functions. I think those are probably the main reasons for it.

ERM: What is your own evaluation?

FWG: I think it is a useful device, but it caused extra work, no question about it. We had to make up these huge dockets; one sheet for each transaction whether it involved one acre or ten thousand acres. We had to overcome indifference or the fact that many times members were busy. Having to subject the proposals to the scrutiny of these members causes delay; I don't mean that any member goes over every transaction closely. They have people to do that.

Practically every one of them has an administrative assistant somewhere in their organization that takes these dockets and thumbs through them and says, first, "Is there anything here that directly

involves my area or constituents?" If so, they want all details. Secondly, they ask, "Are they good public business and are the values right?" Some, such as John Saylor, the present Republican member from the House, have people that go over programs with a fine-tooth comb.

I think the fact that these transactions are subject to high-level inspection has been good for the Forest Service. For one thing, it forces them to face up to the question, Is this a valid proposition? I think, also, it is a protection to the Forest Service because in the sixty years of Weeks Law programs there has been no real questioning of its operation or scandal or accusation of surrendering to the landowners or paying exorbitant prices or anything like that. I also think the fact that some prominent members of Congress are acquainted with Forest Service activities who wouldn't otherwise be acquainted with them is beneficial to the agency.

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF LAND CLASSIFICATION, 1958 to 1970

Creation of Division

ERM: You headed the Division of Land Classification from 1959 to 1970.

FWG: Actually, the Classification Division was established, I think, the first of January, 1958.

ERM: Why was the Division of Land Classification created?

FWG: I mentioned that briefly in the discussion of the origin of multiple-use planning. In the mid-1950s it became increasingly evident that there was need for more intensive staff work and leadership on questions of national forest boundaries; new national forest areas; national forest land planning; the growing pressures for lands for private uses; and relationships with other agencies, predominantly the National Park Service but also the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and various other agencies. The staff worked to try and get ahead of these pressures on the national forests for lands. This is the point that you were making at lunch, that we should try to get ahead of them, rather than to just react.

Howard Hopkins had taken over from Lee Kneipp in 1948 when Kneipp retired, and Hopkins and I had, with a limited, nontechnical staff, largely handled all the land acquisition work, and we'd attempted to handle some of these other things, including the land utilization projects that I mentioned. These involved problems of lands to be transferred, pressures for disposal, and the footwork that had to be taken to keep the key ones in public ownership. We had handled a comprehensive boundary examination, which was another one of the measures to offset some of the demands for drastic reductions in the national forests. We had a service-wide program for examining national forest boundaries from the standpoint of lack of public ownership or consolidation and changes of land uses since the forests were set up. There was a substantial amount of work on legislation.

It was realized, I'm sure, by the chief and by Hopkins that we simply didn't have enough time and personnel to give those the attention they deserved and do all the other work that I was doing and

he was doing at the same time. So really that was the genesis of it, this matter of pressures on land. It wasn't only pressure for recreation purposes, although that was strongest, I guess.

Take the western edge of the national forests across the Sierras in California, Sonora north to Redding. People were moving into that area, particularly retirees. They weren't actually moving onto national forests, but a lot of them were moving to lands within the national forests or just outside, areas where the government owned maybe 10 to 40 percent. The rest was privately owned. These were developing into farmsteads and retirement homes or communities.

It was felt there should be some real attention given as to what should be Forest Service policy there. Should it attempt to stay in there, attempt to consolidate into nuclei or units of national forest, and free other lands for other uses? What would be the impact on watersheds and on the local government of these alternatives? There still are those problems as to many areas in national forests. They are especially acute with regard to recreation communities.

Then, also, interagency land matters became pressing. We have discussed proposals for parks from national forests. Other agencies also became increasingly involved. In 1956 Congress had passed a law authorizing interchanges of land between the military agencies and the national forests.* The Corps of Engineers was building more dams and reservoirs that involved national forest lands and buying lands within the national forests for these projects. They had large areas in military reservations, some of which they were surplusing, while in other places they wanted more land. The interchange law was designed to provide authority to move lands from military to national forest status or vice versa without time-consuming legislation. There were other similar matters.

All those things dictated a much more intensive staff work, and that was the reason for the new division. Why I moved there instead of staying with land acquisition, I don't know, except that I'd had about twenty years of very demanding work on the land acquisition functions, and I thought I needed a change of pace and respite from it. It was a pretty high-pressure job with a very heavy work load and very little technical help. This other turned out to be pretty high pressured, too, but on a more restricted basis.

---

*Act of 26 July 1956, ch. 763, 70 Stat. 656, 16 U.S.C. sec. 505a-505b (1964).

ERM: Your discussion indicates that the function of the Division of Land Classification relates to multiple use in important ways.

FWG: I think it is definitely related to it for the reason that we couldn't consider these other things without really analyzing the multiple-use factors.

I might mention here that from July, 1958, to February, 1959, I also served as acting assistant chief, after [Howard] Hopkins retired and until [Arthur W.] Greeley took over that job on an expanded basis. I mention that only because it did get me into some of the deliberations that went on in that particular period of late 1958 and 1959.

But any of the work I did--if you again distinguish between multiple-use planning, or the preparation of plans, and the concept of multiple use as management of all resources of a unit and programs to harmonize use of them so as to get optimum benefit rather than maximum benefit--definitely involved analysis of multiple-use concepts and potentials. Any consideration of forested lands for retention in, addition to, or elimination from the national forest system, or of national forest versus park status or private ownership had to be analyzed for multiple-use potential and the public benefits from such use as against alternatives. We did this constantly in area studies. The studies of the Sawtooth Mountains area of Idaho or the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River in Tennessee and Kentucky are examples.

Zoning: A Management Technique?

ERM: Does the Forest Service divide the national forests into zones and subdivisions of zones, units or management areas? If so, does this facilitate multiple-use administration?

FWG: Well, as I told you, I'm not an expert on the technical multiple-use planning techniques. But first as to administrative areas, the answer, of course, is yes. These go from ranger districts to national forests to regions, the ranger district being the basic unit. The ranger district, I believe, also is the basic unit for multiple-use planning.

The early work on multiple-use planning--I believe this system still persists--did identify with various ecological subdivisions of the planning unit. Some of these are ecologic and geographic both; some of them are more resource-oriented than others. For example, the planners would identify what they would call the alpine zone, the climatic, ecological, and resources complex characteristic of high elevations. Some people don't like the term zone, so they use other phraseology, sectors or subunits, for example. Other examples would be water-influence zones or sectors--areas of land around lakes and streams, the use of which is directly influenced by the presence of the water--travel zones along highways and roads, and recreation-use zones where the major resource is the environment and improvements heavily used for outdoor recreation. In southern California the early studies identified the canyon bottom areas as special zones because they are heavily used for recreation but are hazardous from the fire protection and flood control standpoint. They warranted special consideration in multiple-use planning.

Management isn't physically divided along those zones. The management direction is geared to the resources and character of the zones, recognizing that they are planning devices and not natural barriers. There is no line on the ground that says this is the alpine zone, this is the general forest zone.

That was a California concept originally because the lands do divide or stratify in terms of management problems and the possibility of conflicts. The so-called alpine zone has high importance for water, public recreation, primitive areas, and that sort of thing. There is not too much possibility for conflict with timber use, but there are conflict potentials in grazing use. And in the general forest zone there can be problems of watershed versus timber cutting, and of aesthetics or the protection of the views and so forth, but not too much conflict with wildlife, for example, because pratically any treatment of a virgin forest benefits wildlife in one way or another.

To the extent that the Forest Service multiple-use planning recognizes these various ecological and use zones, the answer is yes. In regard to the question, Does it administer by those zones? the answer is no. National forests are administered by ranger districts.

ERM: There are no precise criteria, then, for zoning within the national forests?

FWG: I think each region has specifications for the identification of various types of planning areas in subregions, zones or sectors, subunits ,

or potential conflict areas, or what have you, so as to get uniformity within the planning area. Those are not uniform throughout the service, if that's what you mean.

Criteria for Establishing National Forests

ERM: What criteria do you use for the establishment of national forests?

FWG: There is a whole list of them. We had a twelve-page outline listing the factors that are being taken into consideration. I don't know if I can dredge it up here or not.*

ERM: It could be noted in the interview as an addendum.

FWG: It goes into all the physical resources, including soil and water, vegetative cover, land condition, and land use and management practices current and past. It goes into the economics of the area, the recent impact of such things as industries, employment, subsistence farming, relief loads, and other social, economic, and local governmental factors. It goes, of course, into acceptability under the common criteria of meeting national and local needs for timber and aiding in watershed rehabilitation. It goes into the attitudes of local people and state people. It treats the common resources--timber, water, soil, forage, recreation opportunities, and wildlife--separately. It includes analyses of community dependency, of public values, and of alternatives. So it covers all those things. And if the area is considered as a purchase unit, it includes cost estimates. No one of them is the predominant one.

Basically, we don't establish a national forest unless there is a need for accelerated and intensified forest land management practices of some kind or a public advantage in combining public lands into a more manageable unit to preserve and enhance public values. You might acquire lands within a national forest specifically for a campground or a large recreation area, or to facilitate management, but

---

*This list could not be located. F.W. Grover recalls that it was entitled "Land Classification Outline and Study Checklist," that it was in use when he retired in 1970, and that it had at that time not yet been published.

establishment of a national forest usually involves a variety of conditions on the ground, a variety of resources, and a variety of justifications.

It also depends on the social and economic environment of the time. In times or areas of economic distress where there may be large unemployment locally, the economic and social factors may be decisive if the national forest programs can be financed to go in there and help. Distressed areas in Appalachia might be an example.

ERM: Do interest groups of one kind of another have influence on the selection or expansion of national forests?

FWG: Yes. And not in the invidious sense either because a national forest is a public property. The Redbird unit in Kentucky was the last substantial national forest unit to be established; it was approved in 1964 or 1965. This includes somewhat in excess of half a million acres, 60 to 70 percent to be acquired over a period of years under the Weeks Law. Many things influenced the establishment of this new area. It is in the headwaters of the Kentucky River; a couple of forks of this stream had a history of disastrous floods. Part of the cause no doubt was denudation of the watershed and accelerated runoff because the uplands had been heavily cut and burned. Strip mining was resulting in accelerated erosion and land damage. The state hadn't gotten on top of the fire problems; there were a lot of fires in there. The local people favored a national forest as a means of flood control.

This was an economically depressed area; there were lots of people out of work. Many of the mountain folks had moved out from the hollows to the hard-surfaced roads and weren't finding much work so there was a very heavy relief load there. The potential was there for salvaging timber and so forth for some small local industries that would give some of them employment; also, there was a large reservoir of useful improvement work. It was an area of increasing strip mining. Whether or not the national forests can do much about that or not is problematical, but at least to the extent that the Forest Service can acquire lands under some type of regulation, it can minimize the damage. The land had excellent potential for restoring productive forests for timber production.

I and other people that worked on it believed that even though the land is beat up and battered, it has high potentials for accommodating outdoor recreation, particularly the room-to-roam type. It is beautiful in the fall when the leaves color, and includes interesting

hiking chances and interesting features such as typical hollows of the Kentucky highlands. Game and fish are badly depleted through poaching and pollution of streams from mining. The unit has, however, a very high potential for wildlife because it's basically hardwood timber and can support wildlife in quantity if it can be reestablished under affirmative management. And, as I say, the local people felt it would be beneficial. The governor recommended it. And all those things enter into it.

National versus Local Welfare

ERM: From what standpoint are we to judge the best combination of uses to which land may be put--local welfare, regional welfare, or national welfare? On what basis has this been determined? Some say on the basis of the needs of the local unit.

FWG: That's one of those have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife type of questions. I will try to answer as best I can. Obviously, national forest management must serve the national welfare.

ERM: And the regional welfare and the local welfare.

FWG: And the local welfare. They are usually synonymous. I would say that in situations where serving the local welfare would be demonstrably adverse to the national welfare, the Forest Service wouldn't do it. And I think if the reverse was true, why, there would be a lot of temporizing before it happened. Basically, the policy would be to try to bring the two together. This is not entirely an idle question, however, because it goes into, as we discussed before, how much resources should be segregated for purely passive types of uses as against producing commodities.

Taking the local welfare in its broadest concept, such as the building of houses with heavy use of lumber now occurring here in San Diego, how much timber should be segregated in wilderness areas and national parks in pursuit of national programs and so removed from utilization, reducing the supply of lumber for these houses? And to the extent that this is done, how much is the average house purchaser required to pay additional for the pleasure of people that like to look at a wilderness area and recreate in it? How much

is the shortage of timber on the stump going to influence the price people pay for houses ten years from now when the new baby crop is maturing and buying houses? So there is a serious problem no longer confined to small towns in and about national forests.

ERM: Whose ox is being gored?

FWG: Yes. And then what's local welfare and what's national welfare? You mentioned the export of timber to Japan. Obviously, it is considered in the national welfare to export that--the Department of Commerce, Department of the Treasury, and so forth all support it. There is the balance-of-payment question. The Department of State supports it from that standpoint. Yet some of the lumbering people and others in areas where it's being taken from very definitely question it because of impact on employment and competition with local small mills for timber.

Actually, of course, Congress put a quota on the national forest timber that can be exported, which probably doesn't affect the total amount. So there is no specific answer to your question. Secretary [James] Wilson's admonition was to develop the national forests for the benefit of the homeowner first of all. But since his time, the homeowner or would-be homeowner might be in San Diego or New Orleans instead of in or adjacent to the Coconino or Willamette or Bitterroot national forests.

Land Transfers to Park Service

ERM: I think you have expressed your feelings on the transfer issue proposed for the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Great Basin National Forest, North Cascades, and the Ice Age national park. Do you have opinions on these tranfers?

FWG: The North Cascades was settled, at least for awhile, by the legislation of 1969, which set up the North Cascades National Park and adjacent national recreation areas. I happen to think, personally, that that legislation is largely a fraud upon the American people because it leads them to believe they are getting something they didn't have before, which isn't true. It's going to cost them extra money, perhaps a half million or a million dollars a year for duplicating protection and administrating services and facilities and so forth.

The North Cascades National Park really didn't take any land of consequence out of intensive lumbering. The land was publicly owned, with small exceptions, managed and available for public use. The park hasn't so far done anything about the mining patents that are dispersed through it. And the Park Service can't do anything more than go to Congress for money to buy them out the same as the Forest Service might have done. It may have a little more money for developing amenities and amusement devices, and my feeling is that it will develop some things sponsors of the legislation aren't going to like in the way of opening up areas and tramways and other tourist attractions. I don't think the Park Service is immune to pressures; the main local interest in that area was as a tourist trap, so to speak. It's going to have to show some results, I think.

I never could understand why the National Park Service worked for the Great Basin proposal. Wheeler Peak is the second highest peak in Nevada. In fact, if you take Nevada in it's entirety, it is its highest peak. But it is not extraordinary as compared with the Rockies or Sierras. There is a little snowfield under Wheeler Peak that most people like to think is a glacier, but apparently geologically it isn't a glacier. And there is a limited area of nice high country at the higher elevations of the ridges that ascend from the sagebrush high desert to Wheeler Peak.

Basically, it is very limited in area, a rather commonplace piece of country. The park proposal was stimulated mostly by the Ely Chamber of Commerce and a former employee of the Park Service, who, I believe, ran a newspaper in Ely. Certainly, if it had gone through, it would have amounted to serious degradation of national park standards, in my judgment.

ERM: You mean it doesn't qualify as the unusual.

FWG: It certainly is not an area of scenic grandeur, exceptional in the nation, and only one of a kind. The Oregon Dunes are in the same category. They occupy fourteen or fifteen thousand acres, practically all in the national forest. People like to recreate in them and on the adjoining beach. The Forest Service has set aside part as a scenic area and developed recreation facilities in other parts. The Park Service wanted originally to include a large area of private land outside the national forest and the dunes, taking in some natural lakes. These are not in the dunes, but adjoin them and include many summer homes owned mostly by residents of central Oregon--Eugene, Portland, and so forth. This proposal got knocked down locally. If the Forest Service proposal for a national recreation area goes through, such

land will continue in private ownership but the dunes will be protected.

Some people didn't like the fact that the Forest Service has allowed the taking of fresh water from under the dunes. These are underlain by a fresh-water aquifer of almost unlimited extent, and this water can be pumped and taken to places like Coos Bay and put to industrial or domestic use. It is being done. Such a development has a minor impact on the dunes, in my judgment, and I have been there several times.

So this is another case of a push for a park title and increased tourism at public expense. The district ranger of the Forest Service is located within half a dozen miles of the area, with a large organization, including recreation specialists and landscape specialists and engineers, all competent to deal fully with the resource. There is no evident public benefit in transferring the lands to the National Park Service so it can go in there and build a duplicating setup to do practically the same management job as the Forest Service is doing. That is my view.

ERM: I suppose that the preservationists' response to your answer would be, "Well, we feel that the Park Service is less likely to do anything bad in the long run." Isn't that their general feeling?

FWG: They feel that the national park system provides greater assurance against timber cutting, road building, mining, and, of course, lumbering, if you view that as being undesirable, which, of course, most of them do. This so because the national park system traditionally excludes commodity uses. Again my view was and is that, instead of trying to take land out of one federal pocket and put it in another to obtain debatable benefits--debatable from the standpoint of the general public--they should be out acquiring more public beaches, stretches of rivers, and other key recreation lands that are going to be fouled up by other types of development if they aren't brought into public ownership soon.

ERM: To what extent have you found the have-you-stopped-beating-your-wife-lately type of questions have been part of the attack on the Forest Service from groups that have come into issue with you on land status and management?

FWG: I think that is particularly true of the controversies that involve the cutting of timber. To some people any cutting of timber is not acceptable, and the Forest Service can proclaim to its last breath that it is going to do it under good systems of silviculture, and it's

going to protect the streams and roads and the recreation areas, but they simply don't believe it. I don't know, frankly, how you make them believe it because they go back and recite other horrible examples--some of which are horrible and some of which are not so horrible--like this clear cutting in the Bitterroot National Forest controversy.

ERM: I suppose there can always be pictured grim bits of evidence that would tend to cast doubt on the integrity of the Forest Service plans.

FWG: One of my gripes against the Sierra Club--to which I don't belong, but probably should because I approve of some of their objectives--is that in the past, in my judgment, their publicity has been intellectually dishonest. I recall a film made and exhibited early in the advocacy of parks in the Washington Cascades depicting the beauties of this area, all of which was within the national forests as far as I know. In that film there was not a single acknowledgment of the fact that these lands were in a national forest, that they were reserved from appropriation or disposal, except occasionally under the mining laws, and that they were under comprehensive management for public use and benefit. Pictures were taken so that any national forest signs were left out of the picture. They distributed this widely. They conveyed the impression that here was this beautiful vast area that was completely unprotected, unadministered, and at the mercy of predatory industrial interests who were about ready to desecrate it, which was, of course, completely false.

They have taken pictures of clear-cut areas with scenery in the background--they have done that in the redwoods to some extent--creating impressions that was the commonplace thing, rather than, perhaps, the exception. So my view is that they haven't been completely honest with the American people. They've talked of Mineral King as a wilderness area. Mineral King, of course, is not wilderness. There is a road into it, and there are eighty or ninety summer homes there. There was a mining town there at one time, the source of the name, I guess.

Multiple-use management, you see, is a rather prosaic concept. The Forest Service takes a hundred thousand acres of land and says, "This has some areas that are real nice for people to camp and picnic in; there is a nice stream here. We will protect those, and they will be used by the public for recreation. There are fifty thousand acres of highly productive timberland, and that should be utilized, so we will plan to harvest that timber and grow a new crop. Up on the ridges there is some good grazing; if the local livestock can use it, fine.

Certainly, in anything we are going to do we are going to protect the watersheds because that's where San Francisco or Portland or some other community gets their water or if the water provides irrigation, that's where we get our food. So in everything we do we're going to be sure we don't foul up the soil." That makes a sensible program to people who understand it, but as compared to extolling the beauty of the North Cascades and deploring the threats of ravaging lumbermen conjured up or the implication that the Forest Service is conspiring to make a Disneyland out of Mineral King, it doesn't have much appeal. I guess maybe that's one of the problems.

ERM: Problems of the mass media, the situation we have today, too, isn't it?

FWG: I'm sure it is. I get the California Log, the Region 5 newsletter, and recently I dropped by to see Doug Leisz, who is the regional forester now; he's a native Californian who assumed the job when Jack Deinema went to Washington. Doug had been engaged in a running battle with CBS news media. A news team had visited in and about the Six Rivers National Forest around Eureka and taken some pictures of a clear-cut area, which turned out to be mostly private land, and produced a very critical piece in the Walter Cronkite news accusing the Forest Service of clear cutting and denuding the hillsides there. Leisz took exception to that with letters to the CBS editors and so forth.

He finally got the fellow who had written the piece and some others to come out and take another look at it. He gave them a tour of some of the national forests and showed them what the Forest Service was doing. First he showed them that the land they used as a horrible example wasn't national forest. Then they counted the trees that were coming back in the clear-cut area and found out there were a thousand trees to the acre starting back, which is good stockage, one every six feet on an average. As far as these people were concerned, they were wrong in large part, most likely on the basis "My mind is made up; don't confuse me with the facts."

ERM: Did CBS do any kind of a follow-up?

FWG: So far they haven't done a follow-up. I hope they will, but the follow-up will never catch up with the initial impression created.

National Grasslands and Recreation Areas

I would like to mention two or three things that happened during the time I was in this Division of Land Classification; they are related to multiple use even though it may be a tenuous relationship. I mentioned our efforts to have the national grasslands established out of the old L.U. areas [land-utilization projects]. This was done by secretarial order, which also made them part of the national forest system. We carefully wrote into such orders that the national grasslands are to be administered for sustained yield of all the resources that they can produce and under programs of multiple-use management.

So following up on the Multiple Use Act and the others, we attempted to the full extent of the authority we had to write multiple use into the management policies for national grasslands. This would mean that if the Forest Service follows through on the ground, the game, fish, range, watersheds, and outdoor recreation are all going to have coordinated consideration, development, and use. And, hopefully, the Forest Service will go ahead and really develop some of the assets other than forage for livestock.

The other of these developments is the establishment of Forest Service administered national recreation areas. The first of these was the Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity N.R.A. [National Recreation Area], which encompasses three lakes in northern California in or near the Shasta and Trinity national forests. These are reservoirs created by the Bureau of Reclamation as part of the Central Valley Project. There were proposals to set them up as a national park or a national monument. An interdepartmental study team, including the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation after Ed Crafts moved over there, the Forest Service, and Park Service, studied the areas and came up with a concept of a national recreation area. This was approved by Congress. Later three others also were established. We have written into the establishing legislation the concept that, although recreation is the most important use of these lands, all other resources are to be utilized, also.

The chief and secretary, in presenting these proposals to Congress--one in West Virginia, one in southern Virginia called the Mount Rogers N.R.A., and one surrounding the Bureau of Reclamation's reservoir on the Green River at Flaming Gorge in Utah and Wyoming--emphasized to Congress that recreation area status didn't mean that the other resources of timber and forage and game and so forth were to be abondoned, rather that they would be utilized to the full extent

possible without eroding the primary recreation quality of the area, not necessarily its recreation use, but its quality.

I think those two new management concepts within the national forest system--the national grasslands and national recreation areas--are significant because the first involved the adoption by the department of the principle of multiple use on these range lands as well as on the national forests; the second involved the endorsement by Congress of the system of multiple use in national recreation areas managed by the Forest Service. It might be somewhat inhibited multiple use, but the directive is there. As far as I know, the people are doing it on the ground. Coincidentally, the establishment of national recreation areas in national forests by Congress is a recognition of the ability of the Forest Service to manage outdoor recreation on a par with the National Park Service.

European Forestry

ERM: Have you observed in Europe any of the forests that are managed over there, usually surrounding a city like Zurich or Frankfurt or any of the cities that have city forests, on a multiple-use basis? They have recreation, and they have grazing, and they have picnicking, and they have logging, all going on at the same time, a lot of it, and seemingly without any unhappy feelings on the part of any one interest group. They all seem to accept this.

FWG: I haven't observed them. I haven't been lucky enough to go to Europe to study them. I understand that is true, though, from things that I have read. I suppose part of the explanation is that they grew up gradually with that concept. And, of course, landwise and resource-wise, at least, they are a lot less affluent than we are. The Japanese have the same system, I understand. Much of that land that you mentioned in Europe, in my understanding, is privately owned. Private owners utilize the timber and so forth, but they also permit public use for recreation.

ERM: I think in these cases the land is owned by the city. Then whatever logging is done, is done on a lease basis; logs are cut and sold. As you walk through the forest on trails, you'll find these stacks of logs along the trail. I never found anyone there who was offended

by this. This was a natural thing for them. It was an essential thing in their whole way of life. They were not aesthetically offended by this to the same extent that I think people in this country sometimes are by something of that kind.

FWG: In this country, as far as the timber use is concerned, we have a lot more varied conditions, I think. Some of those conditions in themselves arouse these conflicts and resistance. In forests that have been cultured for centuries, and especially where utilization is intensive, the results of timber harvest may be substantially unnoticeable after a short time. Hardwoods, particularly, reestablish quickly. The same thing is true in ponderosa pine types that are subject to tree selection; individual trees can be removed without too much visual impact.

Some years back, the San Bernardino National Forest cut considerable insect-infested and diseased trees and insect-susceptible trees out of the Barton Flats Recreation Area. They made a special project of it with very low stumps and complete cleanup. Some of the stumpage value necessarily had to be diverted to that with lower prices, but the action was well accepted by the people of the area, who traditionally have used Barton Flats. This is a residual stand of ponderosa pine in the upper reaches of the San Bernardino forest close to the southern end of its natural range, so it wasn't too vigorous or beautiful in the first place. People enjoyed it and they endorsed this logging because they recognized it as a move to perpetuate the forest. But you can't go into a virgin redwood stand and successfully take out a few trees, nor from a virgin Douglas-fir stand. Logging in these necessarily must be heavy and characteristically leaves a visual mess that persists for fifteen to twenty years. Therein is part of the dilemma of the professional forester in this country.

Shawnee National Forest Extension

ERM: While you were director of the Division of Land Classification, you participated in a study regarding possible extension of the boundaries of the national forest in the Shawnee Hills of southern

Illinois.* This report was prepared by local and regional people in accord with agreed upon concepts. What were these concepts? Did they relate to multiple use? Why was this prepared by regional people? Is this common? Do local people tend to reach conclusions different than national people? Did you agree with the conclusion of this report?

FWG: [Laughter.] That's quite a question. The Shawnee National Forest is in the southern tip of Illinois, bounded by the Ohio River on one side and the Mississippi River on the other side. Generally speaking, the economy is not good there. In part it was dependent on coal mining in earlier years. There still is some in the general area. A lot of the land was farmed. The farms were not especially good, and that largely has dropped out of the picture. People there were searching for ways of raising their economic status by the bootstraps. They even welcomed the maximum security prison at Marion, Illinois, in lieu of Alcatraz, because it would bring some business into the area.

One of the things that they did agree on was that the Shawnee forest would be much more attractive to people coming in and also more productive of timber and other resources if the government acquired more land within it. Because it was a Weeks Law forest--started in the thirties and aborted somewhat by the war--the Forest Service never did flesh out its land holdings to the extent needed for optimum production. This was not entirely a study of boundary extension. That was one phase of it, to consider inclusion of some lands that were eroding--abondoned farms, that type of land--that were susceptible of forestation and public use. It also analyzed and projected programs for additional development.

It really was initiated by the local people. Of course, we have a forest supervisor there, and it is his job to do the basic work on any of these things that affects his forest. So it was agreed, with the chief's office participating, by the regional office at Milwaukee and the forest supervisor, that we needed to get down on paper just what the Forest Service thought it could and should do in the area, including lands to be acquired and additional resources to be developed.

---

*U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, National Forest Program for the Shawnee Hills of Southern Illinois (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, [1963]). For the introduction to this study, see Appendix B, p.152. A copy of this study is held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.

People were very interested in a road across that neck of Illinois between the two rivers, which they would call the River-to-River Road; they could see that as kind of a parkway. I might mention that this national forest is not too far from Chicago as distances go, and lots of people already were coming in there, particularly in the fall, for recreation use and to enjoy the scenery. For example, large groups of horsemen had come down to ride in the national forest because they are public properties. So local communities were getting some of the recreational benefits, and they wanted more.

I haven't reviewed the program. I have it someplace. It proposed filling out the public land pattern and accelerated recreation developments and accelerated timber planting. I think it included some small lakes for both flood control and recreation. Those wouldn't necessarily be built by the Forest Service. They might be included in the small watersheds program of the Soil Conservation Service or in-state programs. I don't know whether the Forest Service ever endorsed the concept of a River-to-River Road or not. They certainly studied it a lot. Any such project would have had to be undertaken under forest highway authorization for the Forest Service to have participated. But that study was the genesis of the idea and of expanded programs of resource restoration. This is an example of local and national interests coinciding.

The mechanics of it were that the three levels of Forest Service administration got together and decided it was germane and desirable to cooperate with these local people and that we would develop a program and make it available to them and their congressional delegates, which we did. Nothing too much ever came of it, as I recall, but the Forest Service is still plugging along there, for it is a worthwhile program.

ERM: I have a feeling that there is some question here as to whether the Forest Service's policy in the establishment of a national forest like this really has any national purpose or is only a response to local demands.

FWG: That could be charged as to this particular program, depending on how broadly or narrowly you view the national interests. The Shawnee area is quite productive timberland. A large part of it was poorly farmed; it had a lot of soil loss and so forth. From the standpoint of adding to the timber supplies of the nation, it has great potential. As I said, it was an area of rather drastic unemployment, in which the federal government was carrying an inordinate relief load as compared to the average for the country.

It is in watersheds of the Ohio and the Mississippi wherein a lot of federal money is going into flood control, not only on the main stems, but on the creeks and rivers that drain down through the Shawnee, and into maintenance of navigation--dredging of silt, for example. So while these programs would benefit the local people, the consensus was that they would also benefit the nation. I don't know where you draw the line there.

ERM: I think you've answered that question very well.

Sawtooth Mountain Area Study

In 1965 the Sawtooth Mountain Area Study for Idaho was done.* You participated in this study. What were your recommendations for the Sawtooth Mountain-Salmon River country--national park or national forest status? Did you prefer multiple use or preservation for this area and why?

FWG: I think this question and this situation illustrates the complexity of this multiple-use picture. The Sawtooth Range on the west side of the Salmon River in Idaho is a very beautiful area of jagged peaks, not so striking as the Grand Tetons, but still, viewed from a distance, of that general character. It is already in the Sawtooth Primitive Area, which will no doubt be recommended for a wilderness area. Adjoining it on the east side are the Sawtooth Valley and the Stanley Basin, traversed by the upper reaches of the Salmon. Those largely are privately owned. Further east is the White Cloud Mountains area. To the north are a series of mountains extending to the Idaho Primitive Area and Canada.

The National Park Service has proposed a park to encompass the Sawtooths for many years. Such proposal is on lists back to 1939--

---

*U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and U.S., Department of Interior, National Park Service, Sawtooth Mountain Area Study, Idaho: History, by Victor O. Goodwin and John A. Hussey, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of the Interior, 1965). For the Forward from this study, see Appendix C, p. 153. A copy of this study is held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.

in fact the record of park advocacy goes back to 1914. One reason advanced is that Idaho had no national parks at the time of the study; therefore, it should have one. The Sawtooths were the best bet. Mainly, though, some people thought a park would draw tourists into the country. And the Park Service was of the opinion the area is of national park caliber, a rather elastic concept over the years. All of it is within national forests except these two valleys, which originally were in agriculture and now are used for grazing. They are very beautiful valleys rimmed by mountains on the east and west.

The event that really stirred the situation up was the invasion of the Sawtooth Valley, in particular, by second-home subdivisions and the threat that these would multiply. Some of the land was being cut up into quarter-acre lots, and some were sold, and a few houses built practically in the center of this lovely mountain valley. The main highway north and south runs through the valley, and travelers look across meadows and forests at the beautiful Sawtooth Mountains. Increasingly, they are looking across a bunch of A-frame dwellings and outhouses.

So there were proposals by the Greater Sawtooth Area Preservation Council and various others to make a national park of the area. This was proposed to Senator [Frank F.] Church and Senator [Leonard Beck] Jordan. The Forest Service thought there were alternatives with less restrictive impact on resource uses and on the county than a full-fledged national park. So it was agreed that there would be a joint interagency study.

Early in the Kennedy administration the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture agreed on the Treaty of the Potomac, which was a letter signed by the two secretaries that said, in effect, that neither department would attempt any raids on the other's lands without due notification and participation of the administering agency. It provided for some other things like the North Cascades study. So this joint study of the Sawtooths was agreed upon with the National Park Service, and I headed up the staff work for it in the chief's office. Of course, it again was conducted for the Forest Service by people in the region, and the Park Service assigned people from some of its regional offices.

We had a planning team of two principals, one each from the Park Service and the Forest Service. We had a Washington coordination group in which I participated. The team in the field was backstopped by technical or specialist types of personnel as needed. Forest Service members were authorized to draw upon the region for

help. It was a comprehensive study that went into all the resources--water, timber, range, scenery, recreation, history of the area, archaeological factors, land ownership, and local dependency.

The report of this joint study team made no recommendations. It outlined two alternative programs the federal government could undertake in this area, recognizing that the problem was to halt and reverse the trend toward subdivisions and other incompatible developments in these beautiful mountain valleys.

An additional alternative was to put the primitive area into wilderness and continue the Forest Service programs. Obviously, this would not settle the question. One alternative was a national park. The advantages and disadvantages of that were laid out in the report. Advantages included preservation of the resources in their present state, eventual public acquisition of the private lands, and elimination of commodity uses, hunting, and probably winter sports, and a high impact on the local tax base from acquisition of this land--transfer to nontaxable status--because it is in poor counties.

The other alternative was a Forest Service national recreation area, where administration would be merged with administration of surrounding areas, eliminating separate headquarters and administrative organization. Range and timber resources would be used to the extent feasible without degrading recreation. Timber is not important in this area; grazing is. Hunting and winter sports would be permitted. Devices would be used to ease the impact of land acquisition on the local people and counties.

A national recreation area would preserve the western ranch environment and atmosphere of the valleys as a typical historical scene of the early West, rather than eliminate livestock use or put buffalo on the meadows as the Park Service might do, and keep the valleys and adjacent land in commercial cattle and sheep with controls against obtrusive development. One device recommended was purchase of scenic easements rather than fee title to these valuable lands, an easement enabling the government to control development but leave the lands on the tax role as agricultural lands. Such a partial interest would cut out their speculative value as subdivision properties but leave them in use as privately owned agriculture and grazing lands. The matter hasn't been decided.

The Forest Service obviously favors the national recreation approach; so did the local people, according to hearings held by Senator [Frank F.] Church in the area. There is still a local movement to make a national park out of it with some local sponsors and

some support by the Sierra Club, which again raises the question of local interest versus what some people think are national interests and others don't. In this case, the national recreation area approach would, in my view, satisfactorily meet the national need and adequately protect local interests--a reasonable compromise.

We could not make such a study without digging into all the potentials for multiple-use management of the lands involved. And this was done subsequent to the Multiple Use Act, so we knew what we were talking about in terms of formal or applied multiple use. We couldn't make this study without an analysis of that and all the factors that involved car-access recreation versus primitive types. A scenic-route road around the valley would help on the economic side, as it would attract people from outside and add to their enjoyment. But it would bring in more people. The timber is eventually going to become decadent, and some logging will be necessary to preserve the scenery. The Forest Service felt that there would have to be timber utilization, otherwise the now attractive lakes would be surrounded by an unsightly background of dead and dying trees. The Forest Service also contemplated a continuance of range use and believed that carside recreation and primitive recreation would be feasible side by side.

One of the things that lots of attention was given to was the control of the Salmon River and particularly any activities that might silt it, like mining. Also, there are remnants of some old historical towns dating back to the mining period. In fact, Atlanta, on the west side, is one that is quite historic. These could be made of interest to recreationists as well as local historians. So all the multiple-use potential was analyzed and went into Forest Service presentations of the issues.

ERM: You mentioned that timber there is becoming decadent and needs to be cut to preserve scenic values.

FWG: I said this study had to look forward to the fact that this lodgepole pine and fir would become decadent in due course and vulnerable to insect and disease damage and that a certain amount of regulated harvesting of the susceptible trees was probably the best way of maintaining the scenic character of this area. Adjoining the valley and below the high peaks is this rim of this type of timber, speckled through with lakes of various sizes. Redfish Lake is a very beautiful lake a couple of miles long and a half-mile wide. Alturas Lake is another extremely beautiful one. There are probably half a dozen nice lakes in there, beautiful because they are surrounded by this forest.

That scenic backdrop could very easily become ugly if cultural operations are not permitted. There may be places for letting nature take its course, but beauty spots such as these are not among them, in my opinion. It offers the same question as weeding your garden or letting the weeds take over. But, anyway, that question was given consideration along with the rest of the resource problems.

ERM: Don't you encounter a response from the wilderness quarters saying, "There is nothing really wrong with a forest that's dead and dying; let it be the way nature wants it to be"?

FWG: I suppose it would. I don't remember comments on that particular phase of it. They have probably been made in the interim.

ERM: I know I've heard that mentioned often.

FWG: I understand it is Park Service policy to let nature take its course, for better or worse. In an area of intensive human use, though, such as this would be, where people come for a natural environment that's both pleasing and relaxing, I think that preservation of the aesthetics is as important as some of the other things. At least that was the theory.

Monongahela National Forest Addition

ERM: Would you comment on the study relating to the proposed Mountaineer Unit addition to the Monongahela National Forest?* What was the conclusion of the regional office? Do you agree with it? What was the rationale for the proposed addition?

FWG: The conclusion of the regional office was that a national forest there would be a local, regional, and national benefit. I had been through the area and saw the little, depressed towns where the coal mines had

---

*U.S., Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, The Mountaineer Unit, a Proposed Addition to the Monongahela National Forest (Upper Darby, Pennsylvania: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962). For the summary from this study, see Appendix D, pp. 154-156. A copy of this study is held by the Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, California.

moved out; some of the ugliest towns that exist are in the coal mining country. The potential of this land was great if it were protected and the forests reestablished and positive programs of game management and recreation put in. I concurred with the concept of a national forest there. As I mentioned earlier, nothing came of it. There was some opposition from the timber industry people, and, anyway, there wasn't that kind of money around by the time we got the study done. It would have been a purchase proposition, buying lands from the owners, a large part of whom, I guess, were either coal or inactive timber companies.

Big South Fork of the Cumberland River

ERM: Did you speak earlier on the interagency, interdepartmental study relating to the Big South Fork of the Cumberland?*

FWG: I mentioned it briefly. It was finished in late 1969. Copies came out not too long before I retired. The situation there is that the Big South Fork of the Cumberland River, above the present Lake Cumberland flowage, is, I suppose you could call it, a splendid example of a free-flowing, southern Appalachian stream. I forget the statistics, but there is probably forty or fifty miles between the reservoir and the headwaters of the several forks, with rather deep gorges, limestone-walled hollows, rocky bluffs, and scenic hardwood forest country. There no longer are many free-flowing streams in the southern Appalachians. It is part of the Cumberland River system, which has been heavily dammed for flood control purposes.

The Corps of Engineers had proposed a high dam at a place called Devils Jumps, maybe four or five miles above the end of flowage of Lake Cumberland. That dam had been approved by the Congress prior to this study, in part because of the conflicts between

---

*U.S., Army Corps of Engineers; U.S., Department of the Interior; and U.S., Department of Agriculture, Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Kentucky-Tennessee: Interagency Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of the Interior, and U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1969). For the Forward from this study, see Appendix E , p.157.

public power advocates and private power interests. If the Corps of Engineers were to build the federal dam, the power would be developed and presumably marketed by the Corps, largely through rural electrification coops. There had been resistance to that possibility by the private power people in the area. That may not have been the only reason, but apparently it was one of the controlling reasons why the dam had not been authorized.

Senator [John Sherman] Cooper had introduced legislation in the Senate, but he could never get it through the House because of this opposition. So he got a provision through Congress in the 1968 Flood Control Act directing the chief of engineers, the secretary of agriculture, and the secretary of interior to make a study and prepare alternate plans for use of the Big South Fork and contiguous lands for recreation, conservation, and preservation uses, and other aspects of this area, as possible alternatives to the dam.* He was thinking that if he could not get a dam for his people, maybe he could get something else. I assume that was the motivation. I might mention that a portion of this area is in the Daniel Boone National Forest. Part of it had been logged. There was some coal mining in there--some old dumps--quite a lot of seepage into some of the streams that resulted in a degree of acid pollution of some streams and considerable stripping in some headwaters areas. Taken altogether, though, it is an attractive and relatively undeveloped piece of Appalachian highlands.

In the interim, while this question of the high dam was going on, some of the conservation organizations got interested in preserving this stretch of river and its main tributary, the Clear Fork, as a free-flowing stream, perhaps adding it to the wild rivers system. It wasn't in the wild rivers original or basic system, but they had gotten interested in it and some other Kentucky streams, including the Red River, which was also proposed to be dammed. So there was a lot of ferment, both locally and at their regional and national organizations, about keeping the South Fork of the Cumberland as a free-flowing stream and doing something about getting it under public control.

We made this study, which was directed by Senator Cooper's resolution. The Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service jointly represented the Department of Agriculture--the Soil Conservation Service because of its responsibilities in the small watersheds

---

*Flood Control Act of 1968, Title II, 82 Stat. 739.

flood control programs, the Forest Service because this was practically entirely a forested basin and part of it was in the national forest. And there were the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army, the Park Service and Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for the Department of Interior, and some cooperation from the Bureau of Mines on mineral resources. The Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture also participated on some of the economic analyses.

It was agreed that again this would be a study without a recommendation from the study team. We organized to form a local study team to be drawn from regional or local people of all the services involved, and a Washington steering group of people from the participating agencies to give general guidance and resolve questions or conflicts. The report was to be written and submitted to the secretaries without recommendation for transmittal to the Congress as was required. That was done.

Again we laid out several alternatives. One was the continuation or acceleration of existing programs, which could involve upland agricultural conservation practices under the Farmers Home Administration or the Agriculture Conservation Service; additional flood control and watershed projects through the Soil Conservation Service; expansion of the Cumberland National Forest; additional cooperative forestry programs; and things like that; perhaps a state park or so. Another alternative was a national recreation area. That was presented as two options, within or without a national forest. The third alternative was to create a national forest there with attendant land purchase, land rehabilitation, and multiple-use programs. Another alternative was to create a national park.

So each of those was explored, and the particular people who were supposedly expert in these areas undertook the preparation of that section of the report. The engineers, of course, did the water and stream-flow analyses and analyses of a high dam versus a low dam, of upstream dams complementing a low dam, and various possibilities of that sort, too. Each of the alternatives had to take account of the others. Oh, another possibility was a scenic or wild river, with attendant land purchase by federal or state agencies. Each of these alternatives was explored.

Of course, the national forest alternative was put forward on the basis of a complete job on multiple use. We also structured out the possibility of a national forest there that would involve buying large acreages of land with a national recreation area superimposed on national forest land within the national forest, following the precedents of the others mentioned before.

The National Park Service developed what it thought would be an appropriate national park and what the pros and cons were. Then the impacts on the local economy and the costs and benefits were worked up for the alternative programs. That's one place where we came right up against the questions, "How do you put a value on the intangibles, on recreation use and recreation visits; and what is the most important type of recreation, for example, trolling from a boat on a lake, shooting the rapids in a canoe, or just sitting on the roadside looking at the scenery?" A large lake, such as would be impounded by the proposed high dam, would offer much lake-oriented recreation.

One of the factors that we never quite got on top of was that parts of the watershed are heavily underlain with coal. There is some strip mining going on in one of the forks of the river with quite a lot of siltation at times of heavy rains. This material would work its way down the river and destroy the clarity of it and its capacity for fish propagation. Whatever course of action that might be taken there would have to deal with the problem of privately owned coal. This, of course, could be quite expensive if it's there in economic quantities in large beds. A five-foot bed of high-quality coal can have a royalty value of five thousand dollars or more per acre.

ERM: Do you know the name of the operator that is working that?

FWG: I really don't know. I think they were Tennessee people. The likelihood is--I think there is a discussion of it in this report--that there is more than one because there is seldom just one operator in that type of country.

ERM: That report has been rendered, I presume.

FWG: That has been rendered and printed as a Senate document out of the last Congress.

ERM: No action has as yet been taken?

FWG: No, as far as I know.

ERM: How do these interagency and interdepartmental studies actually work out in practice?

FWG: They work out according to the willingness of the participants to see the other guy's viewpoint. My experience with them has been acceptable. I haven't always liked the results, and there have been

quite acrimonious contentions in the process, but I found these other people generally fair-minded. I worked on a professional basis with them, and they, being professional, also, were willing to see all the sides of the picture. They may not have agreed, but they were willing to at least consider the alternatives. The Sawtooth study involved a very long-standing and deep-seated desire of the Park Service as an organization to get a national park in there. But the working people had to admit that some of the impacts on the local people, land base, tax base, and so forth might well be unacceptable as an alternative.

On this Big South Fork study I think we all recognized that here was a problem that wasn't going to be solved tomorrow because we were dealing in terms of a hundred million dollars or something like that to just buy the land and resources. But we factored out practical programs for the unit if Congress wanted to meet the costs. There are five different alternative cases that it can consider, or it can let the problem take care of itself. Considering the condition of the resources and the character of the country, I am convinced that a viable national forest there would be the best program, both locally and nationally.

ERM: The prospects are not very great that that is going to be done very soon.

FWG: No. I think it would be an excellent project. I agree with the position of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that there is already an abundance of lake-oriented recreation in the Southeast. The need for flood control through dams in this river apparently isn't really as vital as it was first claimed to be. But merely making a wild river of the stream and a narrow strip of land won't do the job either because the need is to deal with the whole drainage and the coal and timber in it. If the coal is strip-mined and the timber is cut off, the wild river will be destroyed, for the water, scenery, and the aesthetic qualities for which the people might use it would be completely destroyed.

There is a problem of maintaining a vanishing resource, the free-flowing streams in the Allegheny Mountains. The Allegheny Mountains and plateau include a large area I would class as moderately productive forest land. It can be made to yield substantial amounts of desirable timber and can be highly developed for wildlife propagation, wildlife management, and for recreation. It has excellent possibilities for hiking trails, where you hike in for ten miles and make a loop or hike out again, or for longer trails with lay-out shelters. Some of the streams are quite well blocked off in so-called hollows and are very attractive. So it has excellent potential.

One of my regrets is that the people of this nation don't move foresightedly to secure some of these lands and potential resources for the public, rather than some of the other things they are doing. After all, a hundred million dollars distributed over ten years as compared to a two-hundred-billion-dollar budget each of those years isn't very much. But it is not possible to get that kind of action.

ERM: I marvel at your powers of recall for details, particularly the place names, that you seem to have right on the tip of your tongue. That is a rare quality.

FWG: My memory is beginning to fade.

ERM: I can see that you have prepared for this interview, too.

FWG: I did go back and refresh my memory, as far as I could, from the records we had. As I told you, I didn't bring with me very much in the way of records when I retired.

Land Transfers between Forest and Park Services

ERM: How much contact have you had over this latter period of your Forest Service career with Conrad Wirth and the National Park Service?

FWG: Well, I didn't know Wirth very well. I knew him and attended hearings with him and various meetings and so forth. Wirth, of course, was a dedicated advocate of an expanded national park system. I find that goes down to many of the Park Service people I worked with. It's hard for them to understand why anybody should object to creation of a national park because, in their opinion, that's the ultimate of beneficial land management for the public. Wirth had a long career. He somewhat paralleled Lee [Leon F.] Kneipp in the Forest Service, although he was younger. He started out in the land acquisition and other lands programs in the Park Service and worked his way up to become director. So he was involved in establishment of the Olympic and Kings Canyon, as well as in later efforts.

It was rather remarkable to me that at the time President Eisenhower was elected and inaugurated and Secretary [Ezra Taft] Benson was imposing very tight restrictions on Forest Service activities

and particularly prohibiting expansion of the national forests, Wirth apparently sold to both Secretary [Douglas] McKay and Secretary [Frederick A.] Seaton the desirability of an expanded national park system. So he must have had capabilities in that line. Of course, I think I know his rationale, "We can get these from the national forests, and it won't cost any money." In other words, by transfer. And that was largely the thrust of his actions, because it wasn't until George Hartzog succeeded Wirth and Ed Crafts took over the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation that the Interior Department really got into a program of buying back private lands for inclusion in the park system.

ERM: Almost all proposals made in recent years have sought to add Forest Service land to the national park system. Has there been any move in the other direction? Are our national parks inviolate from their creation?

FWG: Generally speaking, they are inviolate. The historical record going back to the early parks--Mount Rainier, I think, was one of the earlier ones--shows about five and a half million acres of lands transferred from the national forest system to the national park system. And about a half a million acres were transferred from the National Park Service to the national forest system, a ratio of somewhat over ten to one.

A good part of the transfer to the national forest system was in the early days when the sizable chunk of Yosemite, including the Ritter Range and the Minarets area, was eliminated from the park and placed in the forest. In more recent years, some proposals have been made for small transfers from park to national forest status; some of them that have gone through were primarily for administrative convenience. Others, even though they involved only a few thousand acres, have been opposed by either the Park Service or park protectors--the organizations that fancy themselves the park protectors.

One, on the Sequoia National Forest some years ago, that would have reformed a section of boundary to conform to topographic lines was bitterly opposed by the National Parks Association and others because it would involve taking out of the park and putting into the national forest some giant sequoias. Congress didn't enact it over the opposition. We also considered with the Park Service some other transfers. An area north of the Grand Canyon--primarily a timbered plateau above the breakoff--we thought would be better administered as part of the adjoining national forest. They were not agreeable to this, and nothing has been done.

ERM: It's a buffer zone.

FWG: Yes. A road goes through it. It has little use as part of the park and bears deteriorating timber stands. It needs affirmative management. On the other hand, there have been a few small transfers, particularly out of national monuments. They were generally adjustments where some land went to the monument and some came out.

ERM: But there have never been any major transfers.

FWG: Not that I know of. At least certainly not in the last forty years.

ERM: I wonder if the precedent of transfer in large ordered lots, set by the movement of lands out of the national forest system into the park system, doesn't open the way for movement in the other direction if national needs or the inclination of the public change. How does this set with the people who are the most concerned about building national parks and wilderness areas?

FWG: I think the most appropriate example of that is the Olympic National Park in the state of Washington. Many years before that park was created, the Forest Service had recommended and obtained the establishment of a national monument surrounding Mount Olympus there in the high country of the Olympic National Forest. In the late 1930s the park advocates and the Department of Interior obtained the creation of the Olympic National Park, which took in the monument and large areas of the Olympic National Forest surrounding that national monument. They used the national monument as a nucleus.

That national park, with some later additions to it, includes some thirty billion board feet of timber, all old growth and highly valuable timber that we now sell on the stump for fifty or sixty or seventy dollars a thousand. One of the rationales advanced is that the country must preserve a representative example of the rain forests of the Pacific Northwest. But from time to time proposals have been made to modify the boundaries of Olympic National Park to exclude some of this timber, principally around the edges, but in substantial quantity.

These proposals have never gotten to first base. If they are advocated by the dependent timber industry, they become a raid on the national parks by the timber industry. Were they to be advocated by the Forest Service, they would be a reopening of a bureaucratic quarrel because the Forest Service wasn't happy about the creation of the park in the first place. So there has not been real pressures for that to be done, notwithstanding the fact that people and towns up

there could derive considerable employment from utilization of a part of that timber and still leave a large chunk of rain forest inviolate. It isn't growing, and it isn't, I guess, dying in large measure, so it's sort of in a status quo. As a form of reserve, I suppose it could be restored to the nation's commercial timber inventory, but I'm confident that any use of it other than for a few people to look at would be over the dead bodies of all the park protectors.

ERM: How much real loss to the nation would there be in your estimation if these lands were returned to the Forest Service?

FWG: I think the concept of preserving a goodly sample of magnificent timber is sound. The thing is, in this large quantity and that rough country, any public enjoyment of it is very limited. People walk up the trail for half a mile or some hike up to the high country, but the use is light and the sample excessive. I think the amount that is in the park is inordinate for that purpose. The loss to the people, of course, would be that instead of having thirty billion board feet to look at and enjoy and marvel at, they would have ten billion board feet or fifteen. The rest of it would be converted into lumber, paper, pulp, and the other things people use, and a new forest started there.

I can't assess the impact of reducing the park; it depends on your viewpoint. Like the redwood park, How much redwood do we need to preserve to ensure that people have what they need to look at and marvel at? Most people enjoying the redwoods seldom get more than a few hundred feet from the roads. Personally, I think more areas large enough to include small watersheds or other moderate-size ecosystems and better distributed would better meet the objectives of preserving for public enjoyment botanical types or communities with less detriment to other uses of natural resources.

Future of the Redwoods

ERM: Do you see that there is any truth in the claim that the redwoods are a dying breed, and the last redwoods, indeed, are a prospective disaster area?

FWG: I think the time will come when most of the so-called virgin redwoods will be--outside of the parks and preserves, of course--cut. You say the last; that never happens, of course, because there are always

places where people don't cut.

ERM: Are such statements then, in your view, hyperbole and rhetoric?

FWG: I think the thing is that we can raise as much redwood as we want. I take with a grain of salt the claim of the redwood industry that they are doing that because I think they are replacing quite a lot of it with Douglas-fir, which is easier to cultivate. Redwood as a species, coast redwood, sprouts from the stump and, if the forest is given reasonable care and husbandry, there will always be a heavy component of redwood in those forests in which it is indigenous.

ERM: Does this happen in areas that are clear cut, especially clear cuts on an exposed western slope? Isn't it true that in many situations it will not regenerate?

FWG: I'm not a redwood silviculturist. All I know is what I've gained around the edges and from talking about it. My understanding of it is that, generally speaking, sprouts will persist unless they are subject to repeated burning or some mechanical injury. It apparently doesn't come back through seeding to the extent that the so-called white woods do in a mixed stand. I haven't seen them for years, but at the time we were working on those redwood purchase units in the Mendocino County area, which was the old logging country--logged with horses or bull teams and, of course, later with machinery--there were splendid stands of second-growth redwood.

If you want redwood you can grow redwood. There are very productive sites in the redwood areas. Whether it will be grown by private timber industry, is anybody's guess, and how much of the land will be taken for other types of uses, of course, again is anybody's guess. Much of it is pretty rough for settlement and that type of thing. I would expect that there will always be redwood timber, but not in the amounts or of the quality of the past.

MULTIPLE USE-SUSTAINED YIELD ACT OF 1960

Impact of the Act

ERM: In 1960 came the passage of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, which was a piece of legislation created, in a sense, within the Forest Service and put through Congress.* To what extent do you feel that legislation, since it was achieved, was really applied in the national forests. How well do you think the Forest Service has actually grappled with this complex business of applying the multiple-use principle since the passage of the act?

FWG: Well, of course, multiple use means many things to many people. Its definition has been somewhat perverted in some places. I really don't have the overview of all of the national forests that other people might have. I also would say that the degree to which it can be applied totally is not always controllable by the Forest Service because there are various other things that enter in. Take, for example, the Douglas-fir region of Oregon and Washington, where you have communities, industries, and thousands of wage earners dependent upon an adequate supply of timber to their industries. Much of this must come from national forests because private timberlands were severely depleted during the 1940s.

I'm sure there are places where the Forest Service would prefer to devote its time and funds to some of the other resources, rather than the heavy emphasis on timber that it has to put in some of these areas. But on the other hand, are you going to create a depression in a local area for lack of processing timber sales and putting them out for bid and giving these mills the timber supply they need? There is a dilemma there that has to be recognized, I think, and it isn't recognized by many of the critics of the Forest Service, particularly those whose way of life is so far removed from that of laboring people that they have little understanding and no empathy with the people who earn their livelihood in the woods and mills.

---

*Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 12 June 1960, 74 Stat. 215, 16 U.S.C. sec. 528-531 (1964). For a copy of this act see Appendix F, p. 158.

I think the Multiple Use Act has really been beneficial in the actual on-the-ground administration of national forests across the board. I don't think its application is uniform nor uniformly intensive. I don't think it has solved all of our problems. I don't think it would solve all the problems if it were strictly applied across the board for the reason, among others, that a desirable use today may not be desirable tomorrow. People's ideas of what uses the national forests should yield to them change.

One benefit of the act has been that the Forest Service personnel across the board are under a directive and an obligation and are also imbued with the need for multiple-use management. This wasn't true before 1955. It has become increasingly so since the act was passed. Practically every ranger now has a multiple-use plan for his district. Some are good; some aren't so good. The rangers are under a directive to use those plans in all their management activities, and they are doing so.

The law hasn't eliminated the controversies over preservation versus multiple use or parks versus working forests. It hasn't solved some of the problems of what types of recreation should properly be furnished because the Multiple Use Act only mentions recreation; it doesn't distinguish between types of recreational use. It gives little guidance as to the importance of developing recreational resources for general people-use versus setting areas aside strictly to look at, for people to enjoy the scenery. It doesn't state what proportion of the national forests should be kept free of roads for use only by those people who have the physical stamina to hike into them or the money to hire horses and guides or how much should be roaded so the guy with the Chevrolet and four kids can get into them for a weekend of camping. It hasn't solved those problems by any means. It hasn't solved the problem of how much wilderness is enough or that of convincing people that good silviculture and utilization is compatible with recreational use. These conflicts of ideas, needs, and uses within major-use categories must still be resolved.

1950s: Competition for Land

ERM: Why do you suppose the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 was considered necessary? Multiple Use had been practiced by the

Forest Service, and you had established public approval of your policies in various ways before 1960. Why do you suppose [Richard E.] McArdle and others in the Forest Service pushed this legislation?

FWG: Do you want a speech on that?

ERM: Just give me your frank opinion of it.

FWG: If you are looking for a simplistic answer, there isn't any, in my opinion.

ERM: No, I realize that.

FWG: I'd have to go back to the period just following the end of World War II to start on this. At that time I was in charge of land acquisition [Division of Land Acquisition] in the Forest Service, along with all the other lands activities under Lee Kneipp. About 1948 we reactivated the Weeks Law program of land purchase in the eastern United States for the first time since 1941 or 1942. With that first appropriation of $3 to $3.5 million, we were able to buy lands practically at the prewar rate of $5 to $7 an acre for good, restocked cutover land in the eastern national forests. By 1950 those rates had almost doubled. By 1960 we were talking in terms of $25 an acre for ordinary cutover lands, up to $100 or $150 an acre for lands having special value for recreational purposes.

Beginning about 1950 the affluent society began to be felt. There was a building boom, an automobile boom, housing boom, and, with all the rest of it, the population boom. I think that between 1950 and 1956 recreation visits to the national forests a little more than doubled from twenty-seven million to fifty-six or fifty-eight million. The cut of national forest timber--which reflects demand because the Forest Service really doesn't push it on the market, but it puts it there in response to demand--practically doubled. Receipts from the national forests almost quadrupled in that six-year period. To me that was the beginning of the pressures on the land.

ERM: A collision course between two major uses.

FWG: A collision course between a static land area--an almost static, you might say, resource base at least in terms of land area--and a very dynamic and demanding economy. As far back as 1934, Lee Kneipp in his contribution to The Western Range called attention to the fact that the land area of the United States is somewhat less than two billion acres--that was the forty-eight contiguous states--and

it was obvious that if each of the demands for resources was to be placed upon a separate segment of that land area, the total land area needed would far exceed the two billion acres available.* So there had to be a program whereby acres yielded multiple benefits. He was particularly concerned with recreation at that time, and he was pointing out that large areas of the national forests could yield water and timber and recreation all from the same administrative unit.

Anyway, in the early fifties, to my mind, that prediction became an actuality. The demands on the land began to press upon it, and that created a situation of competition for resources, not only in the national forests, but from all lands. That fact was, of course, shown by the increase in the market prices of lands. The foresters noticed it in the increased prices for timber and increasing demands for timber from the national forests, which had to be depended upon for more and more of the yearly timber cut.

That competition for land evidenced itself along about 1954 or 1955 in the form of intragovernmental and intergovernmental competition for land as well as in competition for public land from segments of the private sector. Ezra Taft Benson became secretary of agriculture in 1953, under Eisenhower. Benson brought with him, as his assistant secretary in charge of resource or conservation activities of the department, [James] Earl Coke, who had been the head of the cooperative extension service in California. After a year or so there he resigned and became a high official in the Bank of America. But anyway, the initial policy of the Benson group was to minimize federal land ownership and to, in fact, dispose of federal lands where possible. I'm convinced in my own mind that Coke would like to have tackled the national forest system, but there was enough evidence of resistance to that that he instead levied down on the so-called land-utilization projects.

This is a side issue, but there were a lot of pressures to dispose of the land-utilization projects that were bought in the Plains States and the Dust Bowl and the drought areas during the thirties. There was also pressure to dispose of isolated, unattached parcels of national forest land of which, of course, there are many. When you looked at some of the Weeks Law purchase areas, why, they were all isolated and detached parcels of national forest. But this was part of the competition for land that emerged at that time. The commodity interests,

---

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

in my opinion, said, "Now we've got our boys in office. Now is our time to move, to fortify our position in regard to these lands."

This may seem somewhat a detour from the question, but to me it's tied into the reasons for, not only the Multiple Use Act, but the emphasis that the Forest Service placed on multiple use during the latter part of the fifties and from then on. The first few years of the Eisenhower administration, the time when Benson and particularly when Mr. [James Earl] Coke was assistant secretary, I'm sure in my own mind and relating it to events, were considered by some of the private timber, livestock, and mining people as providing an opportunity to move in on the Forest Service, including the disposal of forest lands and the public range and stopping all further increases in government ownership. They revived the program for transfer of the public range lands to either state or private ownership, considering these, I think, to be synonymous. There were a number of bills introduced in the Congress for the sale of portions of the national forests designated as isolated and detached parcels and of the land-utilization project lands.

There was a definite move by the East Texas Chamber of Commerce to force, legislatively, the sale of the national forests in Texas to private ownership, these being quite productive and very desirable lands. This move, incidentally, fell flat in part because the people in the area favored the multiple-use policies of the Forest Service, which gave them hunting areas, recreation areas, as well as timber for local plants, and in part because the Texas national forests, even at that time, were paying substantial amounts to the local counties through the 25 percent fund. They had a good timber-sale program, and prices were going up, so the counties were benefiting.

There was a rather impressive study made by a group in New Mexico of the federal range lands of New Mexico and, I guess, Arizona, which advocated the disposal of all of those lands to state and private ownership except what they termed timber and watershed lands in the national forests. They didn't define the watershed land, but it was obvious that large areas of national forests as well as the Public Domain were included in the disposal idea.

Nothing came of these, but they were symbolic of what [Richard E.] McArdle later called the single-use pressures. There is no question that the livestock people wanted the range lands for grazing purposes and to be rid of federal regulations and federal management. Timber users wanted as much timberland as they could get for their own uses, where they would be free of the other uses and Forest

Service supervision. Both lumber and stock-raising interests felt there was too much government ownership, and they wanted to halt any further additions and reverse that trend. NLMA's [National Lumber Manufacturers Association] policies of the period were strongly against further public forest land ownership and in favor of disposal of federal forest lands to private ownership.

I should say here that when Erwin Peterson, from Oregon, took over as assistant secretary in place of Earl Coke the attitude of the department toward the national forests and Forest Service programs improved greatly and continued to do so as long as he occupied that position. Peterson was a broad-gauged, middle-of-the-road administrator who contributed substantially to conservation programs of the time.

About 1954 the National Park Service approached the Forest Service with proposals to transfer several Forest Service areas to the national park system. They formalized that in 1955. They requested transfer to national park status of, I believe, eleven separate areas of national forest lands, somewhat less than two hundred thousand acres, including the Minarets area, which is adjacent to Yosemite National Park in the high Sierras and the Bristlecone pine area in the Inyo National Forest, which had come into prominence because of the discovery of the oldest living tree there. Some additions to the Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona were included. There were a number of others I haven't documented. I believe, though, probably the proposed Great Basin national park area in the Humboldt National Forest in Nevada was one of them. It later became a controversial proposal. Oregon Dunes may or may not have been in it, but at least it was in the thinking at the time. That was the beginning of the main competition for land between government agencies.

There also were other types of competition, including programs of the Corps of Engineers for building reservoirs--but those were largely determined by Congress--and super-highway programs and so forth. There wasn't too much argument there. These proposals by the National Park Service did raise the question of what the Forest Service considered limited use--recreation and preservation, an outdoor museum setup--as against multiple use.

There were other factors. The timber industry moved very strongly for legislation that would require that where private timberlands were taken for federal projects, such as reservoirs or highways, owners be compensated with federal forest lands, most of which would have to come from the national forests. One such effort was known

as the Cordon-Ellsworth Bill, after the two Oregon congressmen, a senator and a representative, who sponsored it.* That was an attempt to get payment in kind rather than in dollars and reflected, again, this desire of influential forest industry segments for federal lands for single use. I think that was around 1955, 1956, or 1957. It was defeated after a rather stiff fight in Congress. About that time, also, the National Park Service advanced its requests for lands. The national park system had lots of supporters in various types of organizations.

ERM: The National Park Association, the Sierra Club.

FWG: The Sierra Club, the Western Federation of Outdoors Club, and many others. And, of course, many local communities consider national parks as an economic asset. In many cases they joined in. It brought about the demand of the Sierra Club that the Glacier Peak [Limited] Area in Washington state be added to the national park system, supported to some extent by the local people. The efforts of the Ely, Nevada, Chamber of Commerce to get the Wheeler Peak area of the Humboldt National Forest created as a Great Basin national park stemmed from the idea that it would bring tourists and tourist money to Ely.

By 1959 or 1960 we had a list of thirty to forty proposals for parks or monuments or recreation areas that would take land from the national forests, including, by 1959, two or three million acres in the North Cascades that Congressman [Thomas M.] Pelly wanted studied as a national park by the Park Service. By 1961 there were fifty-six or fifty-seven items on that list, most of which were proposed outside of the National Park Service, but some of which it had endorsed and some of which it later endorsed.

So that was the phase for competition for land within the federal government, which was one of the very disturbing things, I know, to McArdle because it did pose the question: What is the benefit to the users and the taxpayers of taking recreation land from the Forest Service, which is set up to do a recreation management job, and moving it over to the Park Service for a more limited use but the same type of recreation? Such transfers do not make any more areas available for the public to recreate on. Contrarywise it

---

*Cordon-Ellsworth Bill, S.B. 2069, 83d Cong., 1st sess., 1953.

would stop certain uses such as mining, lumbering, grazing, hunting, skiing, and such management activities as type or stand conversion for water-yield control or game management. But it didn't make any more lands available to the public.

I know that my view and that of [Edward C.] Crafts and others was that the real problem was to bring into public ownership some of the prime recreation areas which were privately owned and which were going to go down the drain if they were left in private ownership. And, of course, the Department of the Interior later went that way rather strongly with the national seashores, such as Cape Cod, and national recreation areas. But it also pressed for national forest lands.

The Forest Service saw these many pressures for transfer of multiple-use lands to park status as proposals for limited use of large segments of the national estate, for recreation and preservation as against development for the whole spectrum of uses the resources could provide. Also, it seemed to be a revival of the idea--promoted by some in the 1930s--that recreation of federal lands should be exclusive of other uses and administered by the Park Service.

About that time, too, the Forest Service, in order to buttress its programs, started Operation Outdoors, a proposal for more money for recreational developments on the national forests. Also, it formulated the Program for the National Forests, which was a comprehensive program of financial support for multiple uses of the national forests. In that, recreation was quite a prominent feature, as were functions like wildlife habitat improvement and soil and management. The Program for the National Forests, which was sent up to Congress by Secretary Benson, I think in 1959, and later revised and sent up by President Kennedy, was never financed at anywhere near the amounts proposed.

It proposed substantial increases for national forest recreation, wildlife, soil conservation, flood control, and those types of activities, as well as for reforestation and research. In the process of working out these things--and I have rather vague recollections of this; I can't pinpoint it, but I know it is so--it was brought out, Well, just what is our statutory basis for asking for forty, fifty, up to a hundred million dollars a year to develop recreation or wildlife on the national forests?

Of course, there was no clear-cut statutory recognition of recreation. It's recognition was in appropriation acts and administrative policy. I know from experience, it is a heck of a lot easier to

go up to Congress and ask for money for programs the Congress itself has specifically approved than it is to go up on the basis of, "Well, we have been doing it for forty years and we need this much more money." So that is one thing I am sure that led to the Multiple Use Act. The same is true for wildlife management, if the Forest Service were to go into it on a really organized, technical basis.

Then there were the pressures on the timber uses, which again I wasn't intimately involved in, but I remember they were there. There were pressures in certain areas to decrease the rotation and cutting cycles and so increase the allowable cut. There were pressures for roads to get into undeveloped areas, and so forth. Those caused concern and indicated that legislative approval of the sustained-yield principle might be most useful. The basic act specified that the purposes of national forests are to furnish continuous supplies of timber to the people of the United States and to promote favorable conditions of water flow; but it didn't say, "You manage the timberlands on the basis of sustained yield."*

Another factor that, I think, was influential was the fact that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission had been organized, and it was trying to evolve federal recreation policies and programs of support and so forth; and it did. The Forest Service was furnishing inputs as to the needs and opportunities in the national forests recreation picture. The commission was considering various things, among which was the concept of national recreation areas, purely recreation rather than preservation areas.

I think all of these things led to a decision by McArdle and his staff that it was desirable to get some more affirmative direction on the uses of the national forests other than for timber and water. If the Forest Service was to go up to Congress and request greatly accelerated appropriations for recreation, it would have to have the endorsement of Congress for the use so that any question of authority would be eliminated. If it were to buy into the programs that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was working up, then it ought to have clear-cut authority to do recreation work, to participate on a par with the agencies which have that authority. From where I sat I thought that one of the strongest influences on the chief and staff was the push for transfer of large areas of national

---

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

forest lands to the limited uses of the national park system.

Opposition to the 1960 Bill

ERM: What opposition did the legislation run into from those other sources? How, for example, did the Park Service react to the bill?

FWG: By the time the bill was approaching enactment, the Park Service reacted rather violently, but not so much to the bill itself, I guess, because I don't recall that the Interior Department testified before congressional committees. My recollection is that the Interior Department deprecated the need for it, but I can't recall that the department actually opposed it. I may be wrong in that; Crafts and others handled the legislation. Interior people certainly took a dim view of it from the standpoint, Why do you need it? and so forth. They didn't think it was necessary.

But the multiple-use emphasis was accompanied by quite a lot of publicity by the Forest Service advocating the principle of multiple use for wild lands, and multiple use versus single use was a strong point in some of the discussions of these national park proposals both on the ground and in official letters to the Park Service. I have someplace here remarks by Connie [Conrad] Wirth. [Pause.] I think McArdle's concern with pressures for transfer of lands to the national parks was not based entirely on the more recent transfer requests and advocacies, although those, of course, brought the matter into prominence and probably firmed up his views, but related as much to the long background, that went back to the thirties, of proposals to place several million acres of national forest land in parks. Some of these, as the Olympic and Kings Canyon areas, were made national parks, and consideration apparently was given to transfer of all recreation and wilderness administration to the Interior Department. I don't find that now, maybe later on. But in a meeting of Park Service people in Williamsburg, Virginia, in the spring of 1960, Wirth--here it is--took issue in rather bitter personal words.

ERM: Is this a speech or a letter or what?

FWG: First it is in a speech that he made to assembled Park Service people at this Visitor Services Conference in Williamsburg, Virginia, and

later apparently in a paper that he prepared to send out to various people that supported the parks.*

Here in his opening remarks on November 30, 1959, he says that, "It is hard to believe that there are those who would misrepresent basic planning principles and, by doing so, defeat the establishment of a much needed and well-rounded-out National Park System. I only wish they had the courage to face up to the real issue which is a study and survey that will not hide under 'multiple-use,' 'single-use,' 'non-use,' or 'locked up resources,' but which will determine the case on the basic issue which is 'primary use.' The real question is, to what 'primary use' should any given logical unit of land be put to, to best serve our country. You can preach all kinds of uses, but the only intelligent approach to any problem of land management is to survey and study the matter, determine the primary use, and then take the proper steps to see that its administration is placed in the agency designated by law to do that particular job."

Then in his statement, which I believe was sent out to supporters of the Park Service, he says, "The campaign which gives us so much concern has been indirect. Largely it is cloaked under advocacy of the 'multiple-use' cure-all for all land management problems. It stigmatizes 'single-use' with particular emphasis. The old and completely discredited catch-phrase of 'locked up resources' is again appearing in print and further disparagement is being added by stating 'the key is being thrown away.' No person or agency , so far as I can determine, is actually named. However, the examples which are given establish identity beyond any reasonable doubt that the targets in this campaign are all those including private citizens and organizations, who feel that there are important parts of our scenic and scientific heritage still remaining whose preservation is vital and necessary.

I have seen nothing which derides any other type of land use,

---

*U.S., Department of Interior, National Park Service, speech delivered by Conrad L. Wirth at Visitor Services Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, 30 November 1959. For a copy of this speech, see Appendix G, pp. 159-162. U.S., Department of Interior, National Park Service, 11 December 1959, statement by Conrad L. Wirth. For copy of this statement, see Appendix H, pp. 163-164. Also, see "Wirth Strikes Back," Ye Dailye Ranger, 1 December 1959." For a copy of this, see Appendix I , p. 165 .

such as logging, grazing, mining, etc., as 'single-use,' and therefore undesirable. The term seems to be reserved exclusively for those situations in which assured preservation of all scenic and scientific areas which may be judged to be of national significance is needed. For these reasons, I spoke frankly about the matter to the Park Service officials and furnished them with an analysis of 'multiple-use' as the National Park Service views the matter." So that was in the nature of a countercampaign to the Forest Service promulgation of the multiple-use doctrine as a national policy for wild land management.

ERM: What response developed in the last stages of legislation from other groups that Wirth was appealing to for support? Was there any determined effort up on the Hill to squash the bill?

FWG: [Edward C.] Crafts, of course, has talked about that in his articles in American Forests.* I wasn't really that close to it to know what the under-table efforts were to quash it. I do recall making one or two congressional contacts simply to explain why the Forest Service felt the act was desirable. I can't recall that any of those revealed any counterpressures by these particular people.

ERM: How did the industries stand in regard to the legislation?

FWG: They made a strong effort, the timber industry particularly, to modify it so as to introduce the principle of primary use plus concomitant uses that didn't interfere with the primary use. I guess that industry by that time was quite apprehensive of these pressures by the Sierra Club and other organizations for large set-asides for national parks and wilderness areas. So I suspect that that sort of dulled what otherwise might have been a stronger opposition to it, a stronger attempt to establish timber as a primary use.

They did, as you know, succeed in getting a provision in the bill that the multiple-use principles enunciated were in support of and not in contradiction with the basic purposes of the national forests as set out in the 1897 act.** That act said that no national

---

*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.

**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 Act of 4 June 1897.

forests shall be established except to provide a continuous supply of timber or to protect the watersheds. The Weeks Law, as amended by the Clarke-McNary Act, also established the regulation of stream-flows, reforestation, and furnishing of timber supplies as its basic purposes.* The industry had a point there, and they did succeed in getting that in.

As far as I know, they were content to rest on that, mainly, I think, because they were and subsequently have been concerned over proposals to transfer lands from the national forests to the national parks. As I remember the North Cascades study area--most of which was not put in the national parks but which was studied for possible park purposes--had fifty or sixty billion board feet of commercial timber. And, of course, they were still looking back at the Olympic National Park, which sequestered some twenty-five or thirty billion board feet of old-growth timber. So I don't think their efforts were really all out by the time this act became an issue in the Congress. That's personal opinion.

Need for the Legislative Mandate

ERM: Were there internal reasons for pushing for a multiple use act on the part of the Forest Service?

FWG: If you could bear with me, I would like to go back again to around the period immediately following the end of World War II. As you mentioned, multiple use on the ground was no stranger to the field organization of the Forest Service. They may not have consciously thought in that term, but they were making use of the various resources and planning their uses and management, including transportation and fire protection. About that time, about the end of 1946, some Forest Service personnel in the field became quite concerned about the lack of a coordinating device for tying together into a master plan the various, specific resource plans.

The Forest Service had timber management plans by working

---

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

circles, which dealt with the allowable cut and the road system to be used, the marking principles, and all the rest of it. The range management people had allotment plans for stocking and range improvements. There were recreation plans for development of specific, designated recreation areas, not necessarily single campgrounds, but recreation complexes. And there were other types of plans, such as transportation and other improvement plans.

But there was nothing that tied these together, no overriding document that said that timber management plans have to be coordinated with the range management and the recreation plans and so forth. That intrigued Millard Barnum in the regional office in San Francisco, who was then in charge of land planning and land exchange activities, and Everett Jensen, who was his staff assistant. Jensen has an analytical mind and liked to project himself into the future. He started working on the concept of what he called area planning or management direction.

That idea was given some impetus by some events that happened during the early fifties. I recall one of them where there was a timber sale in the Inyo National Forest which denuded roadside strips along a highway used by recreationists. It created a real furor. The chief sent a special investigator out to see what had happended. What had happened apparently was that, while the Forest Service had a strong roadside protection policy, it wasn't clearly set out in the timber management plan. And the timber management people either didn't know about it, or forgot about it, or decided to forget about it.

There was an incident in north Idaho where a road system was built into a drainage that furnished water to a town there. The road system wasn't well planned and wasn't well executed and caused a lot of erosion. Probably the soil was pretty unstable. That brought a deluge of congressional and other protests down on McArdle's head. Also, in California pressures for timber were building up; the rush to the forests for recreation started; and the second-home problem was beginning. The conflicts were predictable.

In the prewar days in the Washington office there had been a Division of Land Planning, which had dealt with overall planning of the national forest system. It cooperated with the National Resources Planning Board on forestry matters and was headed by Ellery Foster and John Camp under Lee Kneipp. It had been discontinued during the war.

When Howard Hopkins succeeded Lee Kneipp in 1948, he thought that it was timely for that function to be reconstituted. Hopkins had been in Region 5. He had become intrigued with the idea the Forest Service needed a better resource planning mechanism than these individual functional plans, to keep it out of trouble for one thing, and to really make good on its policy to get the optimum amount of public benefits from any given area of land. He proposed a new division to undertake that type of planning in substitution of this old one.

That proposal received very little enthusiastic support either from the regional foresters, who foresaw another planning mechanism in the making, or from Assistant Chief Chris [Christopher M.] Granger, who then headed up national forest resources management activities. Granger, in effect, felt, "Well, here he's proposing a division under the assistant chief for lands, which is going to do the planning for the national forest resources that I'm supposed to manage." So he would have no part of it.

Most of the regional foresters took the position they had plenty of planning going on now--transportation plans, timber plans, recreation plans--and besides that this was a period of austerity. Funds and personnel weren't very plentiful at the time, and they felt that every person diverted to additional planning would mean that much less work done on the ground, where the Forest Service would have to make its mark.

But there continued to be field interest in multiple-use plans due in part, I think, to the personal interest and work of people like [Millard] Barnum and [Everett] Jensen in the San Francisco office; Neal Rahm, who later became the first multiple-use coordinator in the chief's office; Lee Thomas, who succeeded Rahm in that job; and Bob Gardner, who headed watershed management activities in the Denver office.

Also, I think there was support for more intensive multiple-use planning by what you might call the have-nots in the Forest Service structure in the regions and on the ground. Pressure for timber resulted finally in a system of timber-sale and timber-cut quotas by forests. These were proposed by the regions, and represented what they thought they should cut to support dependent towns or industries--certain goals of that sort. They were perfectly legitimate. If you've got the responsibility of providing raw materials for industries, then you should plan what you need to do that.

To retrogress a little further, the Forest Service had sort of

trapped itself before the appropriations committees, because in the times when it was real hard to get money from the appropriations committees, in the early fifties when the Korean War was going on, Forest Service testimony had laid a great deal of emphasis on the receipts of the national forests and the contributions to the treasury. And congressional committees got around to relating the appropriations for timber sales and timber sales administration. Hence, that activity was well financed in the regions, but not well enough financed to carry the whole load.

So when a supervisor or a ranger got a timber quota, if he couldn't do it within his timber sale and allotment, he did it with ranger or staff personnel or otherwise, which meant that in many instances activities like wildlife and soil and recreation and lands took a backseat. This was of concern to many Forest Service people, and this was not just a personal concern that their particular area of responsibility was not being financed the way they thought it should be. People on the ground saw that we were getting into an imbalance of management direction, that mistakes were likely that would be written on the ground for a long time or in the public mind, and that gave aid and support to the effort to get at this multiple-use planning.

The upshot of this was concern for multiple use that started about 1955, with the chief determined to make it a living thing on the ground and also to use it as a Forest Service policy as against the more limited use of the national parks and use it to buttress the Forest Service against all the pressures that were so evidently developing.

With that came the question of, How do you go about this? How do you get rapidly changing personnel at the forest level and the regional level to actually know what the plans are for multiple use and what they should be doing in this regard? How do you prevent these unfortunate occurrences where tourists find sheep grazing in campgrounds in mid-July; or the roadside zone policy is violated; or you go out into a perfectly nice scenic area and find a big clear-cut patch in the foreground of a beautiful view of Glacier Peak--a picture the Sierra Club used effectively in promoting their North Cascades program. How do we drag out and analyze conflicts between or among uses and provide for solution? The answer to that was, well, we have a system whereby these things are all brought together into a multiple-use plan, and that plan is made mandatory on the ranger; a system whereby, when he does something, he has to go to that multiple-use plan and say, "Now am I in accord with it or am I not?"

The upshot of that was that in 1958 it was agreed by Ed Cliff

and Hopkins that there would be established a formal system of multiple-use resource planning to govern the renewable resources. In fact, I think they also wanted to govern, as much as possible, the minerals, which they could do for mineral leasing but not for so-called hard rock minerals. Direction would be through a special staff job in the regions and the chief's office under the regional forester or the chief.

Out of that came this multiple-use coordinating position and the establishment of a Division of Land Classification, which would deal with the land phases of national forest planning and with the impacts on the national forests from outside agencies or organizations, public or private. It wouldn't do the internal resource planning. It would do the internal land-pattern problem planning and all the staff work associated with these external pressures for transfers of lands to or from the national forest system. That was the division I transferred to. The Division of Lands that I had headed at that time was split. One division concentrated on the acquisition and disposal phases--purchase and exchange, rights-of-way, and that sort of thing--and the other, the planning division, concentrated on planning the national forest system.

As a result, the Forest Service did go to a comprehensive system of multiple-use planning, which has worked well or not so well depending upon the circumstances and the people, but nevertheless it is something that the local Forest Service people can take to the local interested citizens, agencies, organizations, and to state agencies, and say, "Here is our plan for the Downieville Ranger District," and so forth. That started, as I said, with the preliminary work by [Everett] Jensen in Region 5. Back in 1947 he made one for the Downieville Ranger District, which he called an area planning guide. The Downieville Ranger District is in the Tahoe National Forest.

In 1952 the California Region became very much concerned with the pressures on lands in the southern California forests--Los Padres, Angeles, San Bernardino, and Cleveland--because the southern California population was growing far more rapidly than the national one. These were lands of high fire hazard, flood hazards, and all the rest and were being inundated by recreationists to boot. So the first formal program of this kind that I know of was a two-year program that started with a committee of which Ham Pyles, whom you interviewed, was one. He was then supervisor of the Cleveland National Forest. This highlighted the problems of flammable brush on steep slopes; higher mountain zones, which were suitable for recreation and which were also water yielders; and the canyon land

areas, which were flood hazards but also were greatly desired by people for residences and recreation.

This effort resulted in 1953 in a document outlining management direction for the southern California forests.* That report established the techniques of outlining broad policy objectives; then breaking the area down into ecological and/or geographic zones and stepping down policies and management objectives for those; and then promulgating coordinating requirements to assure that each resource was given its full place in the picture whether that be small or large. If there were conflicts foreseen, the policies for resolving them one way or the other would be established. That general system, I think, followed through to the detailed, overall servicewide type of planning.

ERM: Was there flexibility built into it?

FWG: These plans or directions were set up to be, theoretically at least, revised periodically--every two or three years--as conditions changed.

ERM: Is this now, in your view, being widely used throughout the national forests?

FWG: I think it is. The system has the defects of people, of course. Some accept it and are enthusiastic; some are not. There are areas where the resources aren't there to make full-fledged multiple-use planning practical. But I believe that our people on the forest and lower levels accept it as a necessary working tool and use it. Many of the deficiencies from the standpoint of our critics often are in concepts of what a resource is, rather than in the application of plans and programs on the ground.

For example, a ranger district may have a multiple-use plan that says that in general forested areas which are timber-bearing lands, the policy will be to produce optimum crops of timber of the

---

*Clare Hendee and Stephen N. Wyckoff, "Plan for Management of the Southern California National Forests," typed (United States Forest Service, 1953). The original study is held in the office of the forest supervisor, Cleveland National Forest, San Diego, California. For a discussion of and excerpts from this study, see Hamilton K. Pyles, "Multiple Use of the National Forests," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview in 1971 by Susan R. Schrepfer, Forest History Society (Santa Cruz, California, 1972), pp. 10-12 and Appendix A, pp. 161-168.

kind needed by the local economy, let us say, first, and then by the national economy, coordinating other resource uses to obtain the optimum mix of products and benefits. Then you have coordinating requirements--we'll do this for wildlife; we'll have protective zones where we won't cut for recreation; this area will be kept inviolate because it has a beautiful lake--that all enter into the plans.

But when they come to put into effect the part of the plan that says we'll make the timber areas most productive of the types of forest products for the economy--that means timber cutting and roads--there are objections from all those that want to maintain a pristine environment. For example, there are in many old lodgepole forested tracts--and I have seen them--stands one hundred fifty years old of trees as thick as hair on a dog's back and none of them over six or eight inches in diameter. They have been stunted and aren't good for recreation or for wildlife because they are too dense. They aren't producing any growth of timber. So a logical thing to a land manager is to try and get some timber sales and get this land back in production. The only way you can remove that old stand is to clear cut it, salvage out of it the part that's usable, and get a new crop started.

I know when I was on the Helena National Forest in Montana, just before I retired, the estimates there were that you might get ten thousand board feet per acre of usable material from the old stand. If that were removed and the land reforested and managed, it could grow forty or fifty thousand board feet per acre on a sixty-year rotation. So if the local land manager takes seriously this policy of rehabilitating timberlands, he gets square in the middle of a clear-cut controversy because people don't like the way it looks. I don't blame them. I have seen lots of them; they're messy for fifteen or twenty years, until new growth covers the land again. But they are necessary if the public wants productive forests.

I think the same thing is true in recreation. We have an area laid out where recreation is one of the major purposes to be served, along with perhaps some livestock grazing, some watershed betterment in most cases, and perhaps some timber removal to keep the forest growing and healthy. But recreation may be the resource use with which the other things are going to be coordinated. To some people recreation means being able to drive up in the car and picnic. To some of the other people who have been so critical of the Forest Service, it means keeping a perfectly natural area without any alterations or changes that alter the aesthetics or encourage people use.

So it is in those kinds of situations that, I think, the controversies

about the application of multiple use have arisen, rather than whether the Forest Service is really trying to do multiple use. It is trying to do it, but who determines whether the Lincoln backcountry area in Montana, for example, should be kept inviolate as a wilderness area, or whether it should be what we more recently designated as back-country areas, hike-in areas, or what have you--free of roads but not free of campgrounds, sanitary facilities, well-engineered trails, and some of those kinds of amenities--places where people can recreate in an essentially natural environment but still with some of the amenities? Or perhaps it should be roaded to a degree so that the ordinary guy and his family can get in there with his car and enjoy the beauties and some of the recreation resource.

The extreme preservationists want it a wilderness or a park. There are some people who enjoy the backcountry type, that want to be able to drive to the periphery of it and be able to hike into a campground in a couple of hours with their small kids and have a stove and a toilet and clean water and garbage collection and so forth. There are others who aren't equipped for that, that prefer to be able to drive to it. Decisions on this detailed planning will have to be hammered out by the public and the Forest Service. This, too, is multiple-use planning. And the work that has gone into this and hundreds of other situations of conflicting ideas and philosophies demonstrates the Forest Service's desire to make multiple use work and the complexities of doing so.

Multiple Use Act Helps Forest Service

ERM: Are we into a situation in the early seventies that is a repetition of the crisis that was developing in the middle and late fifties? Do you think the Multiple Use Act for a time stemmed the tide of criticism and helped solve some of the problems, but now these problems have come around again in a new form?

FWG: I think the Multiple Use Act has helped the Forest Service on many of its problems. I think it gets more money for recreation. I think the Forest Service gets more appropriations for recreation, inadequate as they are, than they would have had it not been for the Multiple Use Act. One of my endeavors in the Division of Land Classification was to deal with proposals for national recreation areas.

The Forest Service has four national recreation areas established by Congress, and there currently is legislation in progress for the Oregon Dunes. These are not parks and they are not monuments. They are areas which have some particularly outstanding attributes for outdoor recreation, and they are organized for broad public use. I don't think those would have been placed under Forest Service jurisdiction and management had it not been for the recreation and the wildlife stipulations in the Multiple Use Act.

I think the Forest Service gets a much greater share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund appropriations for buying recreational areas in national forests than it would if recreation and wildlife had not been a congressionally approved activity of the Forest Service. Incidentally, I just read recently where it completed the purchase of some seventy-five hundred acres of land around Lake Tahoe on the Nevada side for quite a number of millions of dollars, which would have been impossible without the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I think there are many places where local and state people have bought the program of multiple use and by that have, in effect, forestalled or defeated efforts to move lands into a more restrictive-use category. The Great Basin national park proposal in Nevada was one of them. The local people weren't willing to buy the concept of just setting that area up to look at and for people to hike around; they favored the broader uses sponsored by the national forest.

Public Attacks on the Forest Service

ERM: Now the tactic seems to be to destroy the credibility of the multiple-use idea, doesn't it?

FWG: And they seize upon the places where the applications of it haven't been the way they want it to be. One complaint is that clear cutting is not multiple use, that it is a betrayal of the multiple-use principle. Well, replenishing the timber supply is one of the multiple uses. Clear cutting is so-called area management; the principle of cutting all the timber on a limited area and starting anew is as old as professional forestry. It came over from Europe.

ERM: Isn't the claim made that the clear cutting in certain instances, such

as on the Bitterroot and in West Virginia, has exceeded what is really good practice even under clear-cutting management principles?

FWG: I haven't seen the Bitterroot National Forest. It seems to have involved an awful lot of controversy. I have no doubt that there are errors in execution, particularly if your view of the national forest resource is that it should be devoted to the maximum extent to aesthetics, the green spaces, things that people enjoy rather than production of what they use. I mentioned the incident in the early fifties when the timber-sale people were overcutting the roadside strip. It was purely a poor performance. I have no doubt that some of the others are that way.

Possibly they did make too large clear cuts in West Virginia, maybe they didn't know what they were doing. Maybe they didn't pay enough attention to the aesthetics. People like to look at the forests as well as use boards. I don't think that such errors in judgment negate the multiple-use principle or Forest Service management accomplishments, but I agree that they are being used as an attack on the Forest Service.

The Bitterroot Valley area I have never seen. My understanding is that it started out on the basis of replacing an old, overmature, diseased stand of trees with new growth, and in the process removing those and doing some terracing and planting.

ERM: How do you account for the attack on the Forest Service's clear-cutting policies by this forestry school in Montana?

FWG: I really can't account for it because I don't know the people in the forestry school. We mentioned earlier this propensity of outside agencies to try to take over the planning of national forest activities, but to shy away from the responsibility of executing those plans and the public accountability that goes with it. I think that has always been a tendency of forestry school people to sit behind the desk and say, "Those stupid guys in the Forest Service don't know what they're doing. They should do it this way or that way." I also think there is a little professional jealousy there. Of course, I also think that probably where there is smoke, there is some fire below the smoke. The Forest Service by no means is perfect.

I had occasion to review, of course, most of the rationale of the preservationists in their push for the parks, particularly, not so much for wilderness, when I was working. I have tried to keep up with some of it, including some of the bitter letters in American Forests saying

that the Forest Service is selling out to the timber industry or this or that special interest. The latest, I believe, is selling out to the mining interests in the Appalachians. These to me are completely silly and more than a little libelous of the people who are in there sweating to do a job.

The timber purchasers and the Forest Service have always been antagonists back as far as I can remember on business matters. The timber industry certainly tried to cut the Forest Service down to size in the Eisenhower administration. It would like to control the Forest Service, but it never has. But these people who accuse the Forest Service of serving special interests simply won't or can't understand its obligations to the public generally.

But, anyway, I've tried to keep up some familiarity with the current situation, and I really can't account for it except I think in many ways it's a result of the affluent society, if I may be a little philosophical, of the urbanization of people and their detachment from the land and their almost complete isolation from the sources of the good things that they use and enjoy. They don't know where their good life comes from. They don't stop and think about it.

So you have an increasing number of people, some of them who get really fanatical, who see only one aspect of this situation, and that aspect is that they like to look at wild lands and forests or to be alone with nature. A fixation on, "We enjoy going among the trees, and we like to go to the wilderness to recreate our souls and get rid of the pressures of business and so forth." They don't stop to realize that the real wealth of this country is created by the application of labor and capital to natural resources. Natural resources are agricultural lands; they are our water, our forests, and our minerals.

Going along that line a little more, we have created a large class of people, who, in my opinion, are not cannibalistic, but they are kind of parasites on the economic body because they exist and become affluent basically on the labors of others. There are lawyers who make their living representing people in the courts. They are prominently represented in the academic community. They don't create any more lumber; they don't produce any food; they don't make any steel or sweat in the coal mines. Those people owe their livelihood to taxpayers, many of whom, in the West, work in the lumber mills and derive their sustenance from converting forests into lumber. Practically all of them use lumber, or they use paper. If they don't use anything else, they use toilet paper and that sort of thing.

ERM: An ever-increasing per-capita use?

FWG: Yes. But they have no accountability for the production of these things so they can sit back and say, "Well, this country is rich enough so we don't have to use these forests. We don't have to do this; we don't have to do that." And increasingly they get fanatical about it. Many of them are wealthy or well-to-do, and they command positions where they can influence public opinion or belong to organizations that get much publicity in the news media. That's the philosophical part of it.

Now the practical application of it is, of course, this attack on the policies of the Forest Service, to a lesser extent on the Park Service, certainly on the Bureau of Reclamation and water development people, as evidenced by the recent Nader report here.

ERM: Don't you suspect sometimes that there is a peculiar psychology involved here? All of us are involved in the creation of the environmental problem in one way or another. We're polluters, all of us, by having cars. We use, wastefully use, a lot of finished products that become pollutants of the environment. I suppose we all feel within ourselves a certain guilt about being a part of this. Don't you suspect that we derive some relief from our own guilt feelings by being able to say, "Look at that dirty SOB over there and see what he's doing to our environment"?

FWG: I think there is some of that. I also think the leadership of many of these organizations is extremely self-centered. That has been brought home to me in some of these contests about parks that involved usable resources. I agree with you, everybody has a concern about the environment. If they don't, they are stupid because all you have to do is look out the window or drive the highways to see the need for concern. Nobody likes ugliness. That is, most people don't like ugliness. They don't like steel factories near them. They prefer that they be someplace else where somebody else has to look at them. To some extent there is that.

I also think many of these people who are so prominent are extremely selfish and self-centered in their attitudes because they pass off the impact of these preservationists' proposals on other people with a wave of the hand and no real consideration whatsoever. When they were talking about the redwood national park of northern California, both the Park Service and its supporters said, "Well, we have figures to prove that within five years the local employment would be greater with the national park than without it." The figures probably are debatable. But in any event, they neglected entirely to

give any consideration to the man who made his living running a chain saw or driving a tractor in the forests as against a job making beds in a motel. If the lumber operation is stopped because the timber is taken for park purposes, is the logger going to cash in on a restaurant catering to tourists or making beds in a motel or that type of work? Most probably, he's going to be out of work, and the problem to him and his family and his kids is very real.

I think the same thing evinces itself in the preservation pressures for setting aside lands without roads and so forth. I would guess that 85 to 90 percent of the people of the United States, either for physical or financial reasons, are not able to go and enjoy the beauties and benefits of wilderness areas. They don't have the time. They don't have the money. They don't have the physique, or they don't have the inclination to take young children on a lengthy backpack trip.

I don't think that that aspect gets much consideration from people who want, for example, to keep Mineral King more or less isolated in its present condition so they can go up there and enjoy it free of polluting people. The five million other people who might enjoy it if it were developed as a good skiing area, get no consideration. Let them go someplace else, or let them go to the city park. Yet those people are the kind that are really paying the bills for these others.

ERM: They control a larger number of votes, do they not? If they were more articulate in the expression of their recreational needs, the Congress would be responsive. But they are not very articulate.

FWG: They are not articulate. They are not organized, and they are not financed. And many are not aware of the consequences of some of the use-restricting proposals. Perhaps these are reasons why they hire the Forest Service and like agencies, to help represent them. I've been sympathetic to broader uses of the national forests during my career, and I've worked at it. One of my first jobs when I went to the regional office in 1936 was to examine, along with other people, about fifty thousand acres of land on the east side of Lake Tahoe in Nevada, which was then owned by Hobart Estate Company and the Carson and Tahoe Lumber and Flume Company. It included large segments of the shore of Lake Tahoe. This land could have been bought at that time for $325,000, a few dollars an acre.

The Forest Service didn't have the money, I guess, in competition with other needs. It didn't have too much inclination, either. So the opportunity went by the wayside. I have carried a continuing

interest in that ever since. I think the finest thing the public could have done was to have secured for public use practically the whole Nevada side of Lake Tahoe from Glenbrook north to the state line. This land was later bought by George Whittell, a millionaire real estate operator who later sold some of it for development. The Forest Service recently has acquired residuals of it, and the state of Nevada also has acquired some. Some of the choice lakeshore has been developed, such as the residential area at Incline. This now is lost to public use.

I take some pride in the establishment of national recreation areas like Whiskeytown-Trinity-Shasta NRA [National Recreation Area] in northern California. These are established by legislation, and the multiple-use concept of recreational use of the national forests is written into the statute. The overriding value is considered to be recreation and aesthetics, but all other consistent uses are authorized.

I worked to continue public ownership of the national grasslands, formerly Land Utilization Projects, through the Plains States, not because I was primarily interested in the forage they produced--they do support extensive, local livestock operations--but because I thought that they represent a type of land that has much public value and which the public should retain and which offers some things that the national forest lands and even the national parks don't have--large expanses of grass and appurtenant wildlife. They are important watersheds. Many were dust bowl areas at one time and have been revegetated at substantial cost to the public. They have excellent potentials for wildlife, not only for hunting, but songbirds, small wildlife, the endangered blacktail ferret, for example. I think those kinds of lands should be conserved just as much as the Douglas-fir types or the ponderosa types.

But my interest has been in increasing the public estate for people-use and people-benefit. There is a valid place for parks that encompass one-of-a-kind natural or historic phenomena or sites, and for wilderness areas to "keep a little bit of our country as it used to be," as Senator [John] Stennis once told the National Forest Reservation Commission in defense of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area purchase program. But my interest chiefly has been in the Chevrolet segment of the public and the kids and grandkids that will be in that group--a throwback, perhaps, to the [Ferdinand A.] Silcox programs of people-service of the 1930s. I would like them to have wood, water, and forage, but also plenty of land to recreate on as a matter of right and not of special privilege.

Equality of the Multiple Uses?

ERM: In the Forest Service's developing multiple-use program before and after 1960, there have been tendencies to refer to the various uses as having equal status in Forest Service administration. What does equal status mean in your consideration of the history of the past ten or twelve years?

FWG: My view is that it means they are entitled to equal consideration according to their quantity and quality and utility; utility being used in the sense of intangible benefits as well as tangible benefits. I think that's the intent. It contrasts to the concept of dominant or primary use with other uses to be correlated to the extent that such can be done without interfering with the dominant use. What the Forest Service, I believe, is trying to say is, "We don't conceive of any use as being a dominant use. Let the chips fall as they will in regard to a particular area."

ERM: In other words, it does not necessarily follow from that, that each use is going to get equal appropriation of funds or equal vestment of manpower and time. There is no such thing as making a clear division of the kitty, putting it in equal baskets for each of the uses.

FWG: No. I think it means that the Forest Service would endeavor to develop each of them to its optimum extent within its abilities and funding. Due to reasons not of its own making, it doesn't get the funding to develop some uses to any extent which would fully meet the public needs. That doesn't mean that the Forest Service considers it of lesser importance or lesser benefit. It's been easier to get appropriations for timber sales and timber management than it has for recreation or wildlife. But the Forest Service, to the best of my knowledge, has gone up each budget time with requests for what it considered necessary to do the job in each of these functional categories.

ERM: And the Congress chips and peels away at them.

FWG: Well, there is slippage and erosion all the way along the line. You know the budgetary processes involved. The Forest Service proposes, and the Department of Agriculture has a budget and a budget ceiling, so it trims and fits so that Forest Service requests fit into the departments's overall ceiling along with all the other agencies in the department. Then it goes to the Bureau of the Budget, which does some more trimming to fit it into the president's budget ceiling in

relation to all of the other functions of the federal government. Then it goes through two appropriations subcommittees, one in the House and one in the Senate; then to the full committees in the House and the Senate. By that time many things have happened to the original proposals.

ERM: It doesn't look the same when it's coming back.

FWG: It's considerably thinner.

Legislative Precedents

ERM: We covered some of this earlier, but I'll ask it anyway. Was it true, as the lumbermen claimed, that because of the 1897 act, the two primary purposes of the national forests were timber and water?* [Richard E.] McArdle, as chief, says no. Does the Forest Service in general agree? Was such felt to be the case before the 1960 act?

FWG: I think you have to draw a distinction between the purposes for which national forests may be established and the uses that might be made of them after they are established. The 1897 act says that no national forest shall be established or enlarged except to improve or protect the forest and to provide a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of the people of the United States or to assure favorable conditions of water flow. And, of course, as I think Pinchot makes clear, no sooner had the national forest system been established than the question of range use cropped up. One of his real early problems was to get some control of the use of the national forest areas by livestock, which use was historic as were hunting and fishing and camping.

That same question--of criteria for reservation or acquisition versus legitimate subsequent use--was posed some years ago in relation to the Weeks Law. The issue was not exactly the same but is equivalent in principle. The Weeks Law as amended authorizes

---

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

the purchase of lands within watersheds of navigable streams for timber production or regulation of the flow of navigable streams. So the question came up--I think it was probably raised by Secretary [Harold] Ickes before the National Forest Reservation Commission--in relation to proposals to buy some lands within the Weeks Law national forests, the market value of which clearly was for recreational use. It may have been in regard to lands in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area; I'm not sure. But,anyway, they were recreation lands.

That question was presented to the attorney general by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior for advice. The attorney general's advice, generally speaking, was that if a certain tract of land met the primary requirements of the Weeks Law, in other words, if its administration by the Forest Service would promote either timber production or watershed protection, then the fact that it was also useful and might be used primarily for public recreation made no difference. In other words, if it met the first prescription, you could buy it, and what you did with it after you bought it was a matter for administrative decision, providing it wasn't contrary to other laws. I think the long history of multiple use throughout the management of the national forests proves that the 1897 language has not been considered as restricting the uses of the national forests once they were placed in that category.

ERM: The question is always raised as to whether it was mutually contradictory for the Multiple Use Act to give equal consideration to all uses and, at the same time, say that this act is, "supplemental to, but not in derogation of, the purposes for which the national forests were established as put forth in the act of June 4, 1897."

FWG: I haven't seen any legal interpretation of the meaning of that or the real background of it. I guess my personal view would be about like the attorney general's opinion. The Multiple Use Act applied to the management and use of the resources of the national forests; the 1897 act prescribed criteria for selecting them and reserving them from the Public Domain. I personally don't see any real contradiction there.

The history of this question is, as I understand from the things I have read, that the timber industry people in particular thought it probably would bolster their position in regard to maintaining timber as one of the important uses by pointing out that these national forests had to be established for either timber or watershed. Therefore, you'd better very well keep that in mind when you make your multiple-use

plans. That was their position, not necessarily the Forest Service's.

Milestones in Evolution of Multiple Use

ERM: If you were to look back across your career in the Forest Service, what would you single out as the legislative milestones over the years? Do you have a mental picture, particularly in regard to a development of multiple use, possibly starting with the act of 1897 and going on from there?

FWG: In my mind it has been more an evolutionary thing. There are, of course, some acts that the Forest Service considers as landmark legislation along the way. The 1897 act is one; the 1905 act; the Weeks Law of March 1, 1911, supplemented by the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924. The latter two established, not only the land purchase and acquisition programs through which the eastern national forests were established, but also the cooperative private forestry and cooperative fire protection programs. The CCC program was a milestone event, you might say, because it really did pick up the development of the Forest Service programs and gave them a long boost forward.

The developing pressures on land, with which the Forest Service really didn't have anything to do but which it has had to take into account and deal with, I would say, was probably the critical event of the last couple of decades that brought this whole matter of more effective land use and of desirable land ownership into the forefront. That is not a real definite and specific instance in itself. It's just an accumulation of events and development in the country's social and economic progress that has brought this about.

I think, following this thought, that the Multiple Use Act is a useful tool, and I think it's well worthwhile, but I don't look at it as landmark legislation because actually it confirmed what was already a policy of the Forest Service. I think the Land and Water Conservation Fund, for example, can be considered major landmark legislation because it established the principle of massive federal aid to the development of outdoor recreation on not only national but also state projects.

The recent Environmental Protection Act is going to have a very material influence on the use and management of all public property, maybe more so than some of the others as time goes on. It is already the basis of much of the litigation, for example, concerning public projects affecting the environment. I don't know whether that's the response that you had in mind, but sitting and looking at my navel and meditating, that's about what I come up with.

Role of Private Conservation Organizations

ERM: What private groups outside of the Forest Service have been particularly active in furthering the cause of multiple-use legislation? Can you think of any that have taken a positive role?

FWG: As far as I know, it has been a sort of catch-as-catch-can matter. I think some of the more progressive industrial forestry groups, such as those that represent small ownerships in the South and cooperative organizations, have supported it. I guess the American Forestry Association did in the late fifties. The Society of American Foresters, of course, is multiple-use oriented and has supported it. I don't know of the so-called conservation groups. The National Wildlife Federation, I think, has supported it since it became convinced it was desirable.

ERM: The Wildlife Management Institute.

FWG: Perhaps; I'm not familiar with that.

ERM: What about the Izaak Walton League?

FWG: The Izaak Walton League was helpful in the legislation, but I think it meets itself coming back a little bit because, while it's primarily dedicated to providing hunting and fishing opportunities and facilitating that type of recreation, it also has been quite active in support of park projects that eliminate hunting entirely. To the best of my knowledge, Joe Penfold and the Izaak Walton League have supported the multiple-use efforts of the Forest Service. I was trying to think of the grouping of the conservation agencies for which Ham [Hamilton] Pyles works.

ERM: The Natural Resources Council of America.

FWG: Yes, which really is sort of a coordinating organization to which many others belong. It was active and, as far as I know, is still supportive of multiple use of national forest lands.

ERM: But it takes a lot of different Indians under its hat.

FWG: Yes, it does. Those are the ones that come readily to mind. What I was thinking when I made my first remark was that in specific situations where it is to their advantage to do so, organizations like local chambers of commerce or even the official county and regional boards or the planning boards of various public agencies of one kind or another also support multiple use. In my experience, most of them relate that to a specific situation and not to it as a general concept. They don't know and don't care that much about it.

I mentioned the Klamath Falls attitude toward the Klamath Indian Reservation in the late fifties. Acquisition as a national forest would bring about administration of it under sustained-yield principles and multiple use, because the Forest Service recognized its game, fish, range, and recreation potential as well as the timber crop. The local people there supported that national forest status as against unconditional transfer to private ownership, which would be pretty much a single-use situation and possibly a cut-and-get-out proposition.

CURRENT TRENDS AFFECTING THE FOREST SERVICE

Traditional Forestry Education

ERM: What would you say about the preparation you were given in forestry school? Was it adequate to help you fulfill your duties in the Forest Service?

FWG: At the time it was adequate technically. The areas where I felt I was really short of knowledge and experience were not in the areas that you were very likely to get from a forestry school. In the matter of fire protection, the only way you could learn to become a competent fire fighter was by going out and fighting fires. I suppose, looking back now, it would have been better had there been more emphasis on psychology and people relationships and that sort of thing. I can see that now, but I didn't feel it at the time. Of course, my early growing-up period, as I mentioned, was spent in Nevada City, an environment where youngsters spent a lot of time running through the woods hunting and fishing and that sort of thing, so I wasn't in a strange environment with either the people or the area when I took these jobs in the Forest Service.

ERM: You were quite at home.

FWG: I was at home with the people and the way they lived. They were more addicted to burning the brush and things than they had been around my home; people were more disciplined there. But I could relate to them. I didn't have much trouble with that. And I could relate to going over the hills and the things that we needed to do in fire fighting, looking out telephone lines, surveying, and road and trail work.

Ecology Programs Threaten Forestry Schools

ERM: Samuel T. Dana has proposed that five years of forestry education

should now be required because the Forest Service's multiple-use policy requires broader training for forest administration. What do you think of Dana's proposal? If you agree, what new approach must be taken?

FWG: I don't know whether the answer is five years, differences in curriculum, or earlier and more on-the-job training. I certainly agree that more comprehensive training is required of forest land administrators now than when I joined the Forest Service in 1930. The whole job of outdoor land management or wild land management is far more sophisticated, far more intensive than it was at that time, even making allowances for the eastern national forests at the time, where there were greater people pressures by far than in the West.

For one thing, and this goes to the very heart of what you are talking about, there now is this matter of competition for lands and the necessity for making a given area of land yield more than one benefit. The technology of land management has developed, maybe not in the same relation as the space program to the concepts of the thirties, but almost in a geometric progression beginning, I would say, with the termination of World War II. So I agree with Dana that we have got to turn out people who are much more comprehensively trained than they were forty years ago.

ERM: Do you see problems for your profession in the proliferation of specialties within the field, such programs as those in the schools of landscape architecture, which train broadly based resource people with an emphasis on ecology? Should such things be merged within programs of schools of forestry or schools of natural resource management?

FWG: Well, I think that foresters who are actually engaged in the field of wild land management are going to have to become more comprehensively trained if they are going to remain the generalists and the managers and oversee the work of these specialists. Or else they are going to have to become skilled in some of these specialties themselves.

I don't believe that for most of the functions they perform in forest land management or wild land management we need to have a landscape architect trained in the same way that you train him for

municipal parks or for private-building landscaping. I think there is room there for a merging of a degree of their skills with a degree of the forester's skills, and personally I think schools ought to be creating hybrids of that sort who are competent enough in both fields to do the job of assisting a timber-sale technician in laying out timber sales, roads, and other improvements in ways that do not destroy the landscape. This requires a quite different technology, probably, than landscaping the buildings at Rancho Bernardo or doing a golf course.

I think those people who have a bent for game and fish management and development also need some of the more traditional forestry training to know the resource with which they are working and what can be done, particularly if we are going to have multiple use, which is a merging of all these uses to give the greatest total benefit rather than the greatest yield from one particular thing. They should know soils; they should know the characteristics of forest types with which they are working--the hardwoods in the East as contrasted to the Douglas-fir. They should know what the forester can do in manipulating forest types. The forester, on the other hand, should have competent understanding of what trained specialists can do in the way of propagating game and fish and what the environmental requirements are for the wildlife that he is dealing with.

ERM: Does the emergence of so many new ecological study programs throughout universities and colleges represent a failure of the forestry profession?

FWG: I wouldn't say it represents a failure on the part of the forestry profession. I don't think any of us who worked in the forestry profession would say that. I like to think of it as a land managers' profession because that's really what it is now. Much of it is not forestry in the European tradition or even the Gifford Pinchot tradition. It is working with people and with wildlife and range and watershed and so on. But, anyway, there have been failures in performance--in the way concepts were applied--that no doubt have contributed to some of the ferment about ecology.

ERM: Do you feel that the forestry schools have moved swiftly enough to meet these challenges outside of their own areas?

FWG: I think many of them have not. I think that probably some of them have. The University of Michigan, perhaps, has moved that way, and Syracuse. The University of California is more broad-based than perhaps the University of Washington.

Forestry and Environmental Hysteria

On this matter of ecology, don't you think that the ferment, the concern, and so forth, is generated more by the whole environment--the dirty rivers, dirty air, and the messes that people can see visually? If the rivers weren't fouled up by industrial and human wastage, if we didn't have the smog and the air-pollution problem, if we didn't have the noise-pollution problem that comes from jets and so forth, the impact of what the foresters have or have not done would not by any means have generated the concern that is manifested by all the ferment of this ecology bent that is going on throughout the country.

ERM: I think that is true, but I also think that an awful lot of the onus for these ills rubs off, as far as the public mind is concerned, on the forester, on the logger, on the commercial timber user. In the morning paper today there is a story. "Redwoods periled by nearby logging, geologists testify. Short-sighted, modern logging practices are destroying the soil that California's rich redwood forests need to continue their reproductive cycle, geologists and conservationists told the legislative investigating committee Friday." It goes on to quote this professor of geology at Berkeley and several others. The bête noire is the bulldozer of the forest operator and the logger who is creating the silt running down the streams and clogging them up and polluting them. So I think it is in part due to industrial pollution that it gets into the eyes of the average citizen. But they also assume that a lot of this pollution goes back to the users of the land way back in the hills.

FWG: I have no doubt of that. I'm not saying that there wouldn't be a lot of public concern about the way our forests and other wild lands are managed and used. I'm just saying that this ferment and very strong emphasis on what they like to call ecology, rather than antipollution or a better, cleaner environment, is caused by things that aren't at all related to the utilization of wild lands. Personally, I think it would be at a much lower level if it weren't for these other things.

But forestry practitioners have always been concerned about utilization of forest lands. I mentioned Mulford's speech in 1930 in which he quotes some of the moves to stop all logging in the Sierra Nevada because of assumed adverse effects on the watershed and on the streams, a deep concern in California then and since. Of course, in my own home country people moved, back in 1870, to stop hydraulic mining because it was silting up the Sacramento River and running over all the farmlands down there. They put my grandfather out of business.

Certainly, as people get around in the affluent society with thirty million automobiles or however many there are in the country, everything that the forest land manager does is going to be under closer scrutiny. He had better, I think, move to minimize these impacts. And there is much to be done, governmentally and privately. Nonetheless, I can't help but feel that there has been generated a high degree of hysteria in the matter, too, and that the adverse impacts of timber use on the environment receives publicity far out of proportion to the importance of this problem in the total environmental picture.

ERM: By the various conservation and preservation groups?

FWG: Who look at only their particular interests, their particular desires, without, in effect, running up a cost—benefit estimate on what they see that they don't like or do like. I'm not familiar with this particular incidence in the redwoods, you mentioned. A lot of that soil, perhaps, can be damaged through logging. I know this from the Forest Service experiences. I think we are beginning to move to correct it now. In many of the areas that were logged the roads did far more damage to the scenery and to the soil than the actual logging itself, which in turn led to this attempt to devise balloon logging to minimize roads and to revive high-lead logging that also would reduce road impact.

Going back to the forest schools, yes, they need to bring into their curriculum more on the ecology of wild lands and the pros and cons of various forms of management. Basically, however, I think the answer is strong grounding in fundamentals--basic ecology, soils, plant physiology, economics, psychology, etc.--that enables students later to move soundly with changing public needs.

ERM: There is a contemporary crisis that confronts forestry. Criticism of forestry is determined and very well financed by the preservationists—conservationists groups. These seem to be getting a great deal of support now from other disciplines developing in the universities, some of them very modern and new. Do you see their efforts as undermining forestry, perhaps seeking to get a grip on the position which professional foresters have had as primary stewards of the nation's forest lands?

FWG: Yes, I think that is true to some extent. I think the American people soon are going to have to decide how much of their national estate they want to set aside and preserve to look at for purely aesthetic purposes, which really is what the preservationist people are driving at in a large measure. As to other professional people, other than

foresters, I think it's always been true that some of the other disciplines would like to get in. I don't think they want to get into the actual management of lands so much as they want to become the powers behind the scenes, the planners who tell what should be done or what will be done with resources and leave to somebody else the hard work of trying to reconcile that with some of the other national necessities, such as wood for houses or paper and foreign exchange and all the other things that enter into it.

Just before I retired, I wrote a memorandum to my then deputy chief, Red Nelson, who himself has since retired and been replaced by Ed Schultz, pointing out that during the previous couple of years the Forest Service, through our Region 9 office in Milwaukee, had considerable contact with the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources on the matter of wild land planning. In fact, the region had financed for one of its brighter young men a year of graduate study at the University of Michigan in this matter of land planning.

We had had a contract with the university to do a study of the southern portion of the Manistee National Forest from the standpoint of what would be a desirable program to achieve the best mix of public—private lands, including the ownership of key rivers, such as the Manistee River, and also programs of land use and development. These contracts and the studies revealed a large number of agencies which were attempting to get into the land-planning business, including the universities and the local governments in the state of Michigan, HUD, HEW, and many private planners for hire.

The gist of my memo was that the Forest Service had better get busy and do a better job of planning out the uses of the national forests in detail or somebody else would be in there planning it for them. I think that is along the lines that you are mentioning. Whether these people would actually want to take over the administration of all the problems or whether, as I say, they would like to do the planning and let somebody else do the work, I don't know.

ERM: Isn't that what lies behind, perhaps, the strong drive for eliminating the Forest Service or amalgamating it into a new monster agency that might be called a natural resources department?

FWG: I think, of course, that is partly behind the recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission. It's long been an ambition of the National Park Service to become the functional manager of all recreation on federal lands. I'm not familiar with this reorganization proposal in detail--whether it would splinter the Forest Service or

move it intact or break up the national forests by transferring large areas to parks and national recreation areas. The Public Land Law Review Commission definitely would break up the national forest system and the Forest Service.

Criticisms of Clear Cutting

ERM: Last night I read the published hearings on clear-cutting practices on national timberlands. These hearings, as you may know, were before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the United States Senate and were held last year in April, May, and June.* They have been published in three volumes, the first two of which I obtained last week. The third I hope will be forwarded to me.

These volumes are loaded with discussion, not only of clear cutting, but of the whole multiple-use policy and its application or, as many of the witnesses or those testifying stated, the malapplication of multiple-use policies. The layman reading this record can't help but be impressed by the intensity of feeling on both sides. There is a flood of passionate feeling and thought put forth by the people who took part in these hearings. It leaves one with a mixed feeling as to just what to believe about this whole mess.

I wonder how Congress, confronted with such a wealth of information, response, statistics, grants, and interpretations, can find its way. There are a number of things here that relate to much that was put on the tape by you yesterday. It would be impossible for us to even begin to examine this in any substantial way here in the last interview session. But I wonder if we might just touch upon a few things that are included here.

FWG: I might say, I'm not familiar with the hearings or the reports.

---

*Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Management Practices on the Public Lands, U.S. Senate, 92d Cong., 1st sess., 5, 6, and 7 April, 7 May and 29 June, 1971.

ERM: For example, I remember your mentioning yesterday Major Evan Kelley. You must have known Kelley in the course of your career.

FWG: I knew him rather distantly. I knew him by reputation, of course. He was one of the old-timers in the Forest Service. He was a regional forester in the northern region at Missoula for many years and later headed up the guayule project during World War II. The government was searching for domestic sources of rubber, and this guayule plant was one of them. The Forest Service headed up the effort to grow guayule as an alternate source of natural rubber. Evan Kelley was the chief of that project. My personal acquaintance with him was not very close.

ERM: There are two pages in Part I of the hearings that I would like to share with you and then have you comment upon them. Mr. Grover and I are going to read from pages 385 through 387 in Part I of the Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, which were held April 5 and 6, 1971.

FWG: Who were the members that held that hearing?

ERM: I believe they are listed here: Frank Church of Idaho, chairman; Henry Jackson of Washington; Alan Bible of Nevada; Lee Metcalf of Montana; Mike Gravel of Alaska; Mark Hatfield, Oregon; Gordon Allott, Colorado; Paul J. Fannin of Arizona; and Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma.

FWG: Yes. That's the membership of the committee, but I was wondering who actually held the hearings. Usually it's one or two of them.

ERM: It depends on the date. This one is of Monday, April 5th. Present were Senator Church, presiding, Metcalf, Allott, Fannin, Hansen, Hatfield, Bellmon. Also present, Porter Ward, professional staff member; Charles Cook, minority counsel; and Thomas Nelson, assistant minority counsel. For the hearing on the 6th of April, I'll have to check through and find out.

FWG: I was just curious. That makes quite a difference usually as to how these hearings develop.

ERM: You mean as to the weight of the various people present?

FWG: Right, and the trend they take.

ERM: Would you care to comment on those two letters as I have just read them?

FWG: Well, I have little personal acquaintanceship with the situation. They don't reveal how it came up. I don't know, in particular, what proposal of Sandvig's required Chris [Christopher M.] Granger's approval or nonapproval. Presumably it must have been a recommendation for some type of project to cut down range use and rehabilitate certain ranges, and he got a negative response on it. I have some recollection that [Earl D.] Sandvig did make a public issue of the Forest Service range practices in the Rocky Mountain Region, that is, Region 2. He was later transferred to chief of personnel from his range job. I have no acquaintanceship with all the circumstances that went with it or justification.

From what I remember, the big battle over turning the ranges over to the states or to private ownership, of the late 1940s, had just been concluded. I think I mentioned yesterday Lyle Watts's comment that he was satisfied that the question of public ownership of the western ranges had been settled for his lifetime. And it wasn't more than a couple of years until the question was revived again. Perhaps there was some reluctance to start a hard-nosed campaign to reduce livestock and so forth on the ranges in the context of the time and political climate.

I've always felt that the Forest Service could have been more aggressive in pushing the positive side of some of these range questions, which it has done to some degree. The reseeding of range on a planned pattern, so that instead of having to cut down on livestock use, more forage is produced and the livestock that's there can be accommodated, is more progressive than just reducing livestock. But public land management, like politics, is the act of the possible, and what is desirable isn't always possible at a particular time. As far as Kelley's reply is concerned, it was more emotional than helpful, I imagine, to Sandvig. It was the reply, again, of a person who would not have to take personal responsibility, political or otherwise, for what was done.

ERM: These two letters are dropped into this record of the hearing without any seeming relationship to the testimony of anyone. There is no indication of who put them in, except that they would seem to support the contentions of those who were critical of the Forest Service.

FWG: The implication is that the Forest Service is again bowing down to

the commercial interest, in this case, the lumber interests. I think it goes, again, to our discussion yesterday, the example of clear cutting in the lodgepole types. There are some of our people on the ground trying to revitalize the timber stand on these lands. The way they do it is by clear cutting, and they get very strong criticism from a segment of the public that isn't concerned with timber production, but with recreation and the aesthetics.

Had the service moved strongly in the Sandvig situation to reduce grazing and perhaps put local ranchers out of business or reduce their incomes, it probably would have been highly criticized at the time, at least in the locality. Possibly it should have pushed ahead and done that in the face of that criticism. Possibly it should push ahead on some of this clear cutting and other types of operations that are receiving criticism now because technically they are correct.

I don't know why this correspondence was put in that record, but I assume the purpose of these hearings was to publicize what the Forest Service was doing in its management activities, to lay stress on clear cutting in the project on the Bitterroot. Probably they were put in there to show that as far back as twenty-five years ago, people were concerned that the Forest Service was selling out to certain commercial interests.

It is kind of ironical because one of the big battles of the Forest Service has been to get the range use under better controls, going back to the excesses that followed World War I. It's not an easy thing to cut the livelihood or the economic base of people who depend upon it for their living. I think I mentioned Floyd Iverson elsewhere. Floyd has had some real personal experiences in that regard, and he can probably elaborate on it.

Freedom within the Service

ERM: I have heard criticism of people within the Forest Service on these same lines before. Their contention has been that the man on the ground, even the man on the ground at the regional research station doing specific research, is very often ignored or his research allowed to just stand unpublished because his thesis ran contrary to an established policy that was in effect at the time. I wonder if you have seen

evidences of this yourself. This is criticism from the inside of the Forest Service.

FWG: I would guess that those situations have arisen and continue to arise. I don't consider that I personally have been ignored in these things that I have tried to recommend or do. I have been rejected as to many of them. Sometimes I think I have been passed over too lightly, but that's a matter of personal pride and egotism. When you come up with what you think is a fine idea and those above don't think it's so fine, you tend to feel a little disadvantaged and neglected. I don't have personal knowledge of too much of that sort of thing.

I do know that on this matter of formalized multiple-use planning that we discussed yesterday, that many of the ideas that were advanced by Everett Jensen in his initial work in Region 5 in the late thirties got pretty much of a brush-off from some of the superiors. The fact that they were later picked up by others and developed and put into operation doesn't really, I'm sure, make Jensen feel any less critical of the fact.

I am sure that goes on other places. Many of them are honest differences of opinion. You have issues of reducing cutting cycles or rotation ages in timber that might, if done, increase allowable cuts. These are pros and cons. Somewhere along the line somebody has to make the decision. I can't really say that I have personal knowledge of specific instances where people came up with factual or scientific data and that was brushed aside or buried purposefully to accommodate policies of the Forest Service. In all aspects of public land management, and especially in regard to those controversial, there are important questions of timing, method, side effects, and, increasingly important, public understanding. Frankly, I don't think the Forest Service has been sensitive enough to these factors in many cases.

ERM: This is not, in your view, typical.

FWG: I would say it's not the typical. I think one thing is that none of these things are very simplistic, even though people might think they are. If you look at all the various factors as an administrator must do, there are pros and cons, and costs and benefits, on all sides. Those are not always taken into account by the people who have a rather specific, limited function. I say this not in defense because I know that in the Forest Service, as in any other organization, there are times when people get brushed aside and their ideas rejected by their superiors. However, on matters on which I felt strongly I always was able to get a hearing by those above.

Generation Gap within the Service

ERM: Is there any generation gap involved in this? I'm talking of a generation of foresters who grew up under one set of circumstances and with an education that was highly oriented to needs that were obvious at that time, as against another generation of younger foresters coming along with a new set of priorities and concerns and with an education of a different order.

FWG: I think there are generation gaps between people. I think there are some people in the Forest Service and every other organization whose ideas become fixed and they don't change. So those ideas may be translated into policies, and in some instances those who are in administrative positions relate back to their early training. Frankly, I don't think it relates back as much to the education they might have had as it is to their early training and experiences. They have done things and they see the results of it and they think those are good and they don't change. Personally, I don't think it's so much of a gap between generations and education as it is between the thinking processes and the experiences of different groups of people.

ERM: Could you illustrate?

FWG: Not precisely. What I am trying to say is that the Forest Service, probably in common with every other large organization, has people in the older-age classes whose thinking is more diversified and outgoing--if you want to call it liberal--than the thinking of some of the younger-age-class people in the service. And vice versa. I can't put my finger on any example of it.

I would say that the personnel policies of the Forest Service, at least in recent years, have resulted in the elevation of many of our middle generation personnel into positions of responsibility. Following that along, the young-age-class people are rapidly moving up into positions of responsibility. For example, take some of the recently designated regional foresters. There, to me, is the younger generation. Jay Cravens of Region 9 is one. I don't know precise ages. I imagine Jay is still under forty-five. And Ted Schlapfer in Region 8, and Vern Hamre in Ogden--all people in the various stages of middle life, you might say. Following behind those you find people in their early or mid-thirties in the supervisors jobs, a position for which they used to have to reach a high degree of maturity before they got to it.

I wouldn't say there is a true generation gap. I would say that the gap is between the people whose thinking has crystallized on the basis of previous experience and those whose operating objectives and methods are outgoing and whose thinking is elastic enough to take in various suggestions of new or different ways of doing things. In other words, some people are receptive to new ideas and willing to take the chance of putting them into effect, and often many of our older generation people are just as elastic that way as are the younger people, and vice versa. That's the best I can tell you on that.

ERM: You were starting to tell me a story about a man you knew years ago in the Forest Service by the name of Hedges. Would you repeat that?

FWG: Well, you had just read an extract from this hearing by the Subcommittee on Public Lands that was apparently a speech published in the Congressional Record, presumably by Senator [Jennings] Randolph of West Virginia.

ERM: This is the one that appears on pages 403 through 408, Part I.*

FWG: It relates to the controversy and the public agitation over area-control management or clear cutting of some of the forest areas in West Virginia. I was about to say that I don't have any personal knowledge of the particular circumstances, but I did keep up some correspondence with an old-timber of the Forest Service who had long association with that area. His name is William Hedges.

He joined the Forest Service approximately in the period 1911 or 1912, about the time the Weeks Law authorizing land purchases in the eastern United States was enacted and put into operation. Hedges had actively participated in laying out many of the areas included in the Monongahela National Forest as well as those in the Jefferson and George Washington national forests in Virginia and the Daniel Boone National Forest in Kentucky. He also had spent most of his career in the actual examination and acquisition of lands that now comprise these national forests. He retired, I suppose, ten or twelve years ago.

---

*"Forest Service Practices Need Revision To Strengthen Multiple Use For Public Good," in hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Management Practices on the Public Lands, U.S. Senate, 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971, pt. 1, pp. 403-408.

Along about late 1968 or early 1969 he wrote me several letters detailing that he had made some trips to his old stomping grounds in Virginia and had seen some of the clear-cutting areas. Parenthetically, he is a native of Virginia. Bill was very agitated about these and expressed the view that certainly that kind of management didn't exemplify the type of forestry that he had conceived and had in mind at the time he was busily including these areas in the national forests and arranging for their purchase by the government.

His reaction to them was basically from the aesthetic standpoint. He objected to the scars on the hillsides that they left and, I guess, to some extent, the mess that followed them because typically the stands in these old areas that were purchased are either the residuals or a volunteer growth often of species that are not commercially very valuable. So I would expect that there was a mess in the areas that Hedges looked at.

But the interesting thing to me is that here was an old-timer of the Forest Service who after he left the Forest Service became more and more sensitive to the aesthetics of the area and the pleasures they gave him to go back and look at a restored forest, his memory going back to the early days when these practically all were cut over, burned over, and very badly devastated areas. I sent him some publicity material illustrating the benefits to game and fish management of this type of cutting with the creation of openings and of browse and forage from the shrubs and sprouts and other types that come back in clear-cut areas. But this didn't really convince him. He still objected to them as messing up the countryside. This is an example of the technically sound being rejected, not by a superior, but by a colleague.

ERM: Isn't there quite a bit of the criticism stemming currently from old-timers in the Forest Service who are, in a sense, giving the critics of the Forest Service hard information and a basis for criticism?

FWG: I think that's true in some instances.

ERM: It was true of the Bitterroot National Forest.

FWG: Yes. One of the leading critics there was a former supervisor of the Bitterroot area. Of course, there is a division of views within the Forest Service as far as that's concerned. Many people deplore the effects of type alterations, whether they be sagebrush spraying or area management of timber, and there are people within the service, I am sure, who disagree with a policy of pushing roads into remote

areas and other management practices. Their views are influential in some instances; and in some, they aren't.

In regard to these former people, it is always a little hard to segregate out, of course, what you might call the facts from their own particular predilections or tendency to perhaps say, "Well, I planned it this way, but my successors fouled it up and did it this way. They were wrong and I am not about to forget it." I think there are two sides to that, too.

ERM: When you came into the Forest Service in the late twenties, would you characterize the Forest Service as a homogeneous group who were pretty largely in harmony with what policies were being pursued, as compared with the situation today in which there seems to be a considerable division of opinion within the service?

FWG: I don't think you had, at that time, the issues and the questions upon which the differences of opinion arise today, at least in my experience. They might have in other places. Through the thirties the national forest management was strongly oriented to opening up the forests and to fire protection and to technical matters such as range surveys and improvements, timber inventories, and methods of harvesting timber that were professionally sound. There wasn't much difference of opinion that when a fire started, you got on it and put it out as quickly as you could. There might be differences of opinion as to details and there were.

For example, it was the practice then to put a fire dead out before you left it. That was fairly expensive with large fires. You'd have to leave crews there and put water on the logs and the snags and fell the snags. These so-called mop-up operations might take weeks. There were advocates of, Why do all this? It would be less expensive to take a chance on a breakdown than it is to go through this routine on every fire. There were, and are differences of opinion as to whether it pays to put out every fire in the high country, for example, following a lightning storm.

There were some differences of opinion on methods of timber cutting and silvicultural practices. Those were taken account of and changed or modified materially over the time I was in Region 5. For example, the old practice in the late twenties of taking 80 percent of the ponderosa pine and mixed conifer stands was modified very drastically. By the time the late forties rolled around, it was almost reversed. It was later modified, too.

So there was a questioning. A lot that originated out of planned programs of the people who were administering the forests. Questions of what's the best silvicultural treatment of the mixed conifer on the west slope and the ponderosa pine stands on the east side of the Sierras were investigated throughout practically his whole professional life by Duncan Dunning at the experiment station. Their previous concepts of what was good silviculture underwent a very material change in that ten- or fifteen- or twenty-year period.

These questions of intensive recreation versus dispersed types or primitive types of recreation, of timber production versus aesthetics, of what you might call community support from the lumber industry versus tourism, and preservation versus multiple use hadn't reared their ugly heads at that time. So there was less reason for division, and the organization was much smaller and the problems they had to concentrate on were pretty specific. The national forests needed more roads and trails, fires had to be put out, the ranger counted the sheep in and out, and so forth. There wasn't that much question about it.

ERM: The crisis that seems to be blowing up today may have its roots in fundamental philosophical differences of opinion.

FWG: Yes. I think it goes to the concept of what benefits the national forests and other public properties should yield. That concept is as varied as the people who use the national forests or benefit from them. Of course, the theory of multiple use is that you can provide some of these benefits for everybody. That's its strength and its weakness. If you don't believe that, why, then you don't believe multiple use. If you do believe it, then you think, regardless of the imperfections in application, that it's a sound principle and the Forest Service should get busy and make the application work.

We talked yesterday about the divisions among people who are interested in recreation. To some the principle benefit is primitive lands unaltered, preferably the most beautiful of the primitive country, where people enjoy that type of scenery with very limited interference from other members of the human race. To another person the recreation benefit may be a place to camp with an automobile or to hunt. There is really more conflict between people whose needs and desires are diverse in that regard than there is in many of the other areas.

Growth of Environmental Awareness

ERM: I wonder to what extent you might comment on this thought. We have over the last hundred years built up an economy of abundance unprecedented in human history. But there seems to be a grave, growing disaffection with this idea among, not just the young people and students, who seem to be the most articulate spokesmen, but to a growing extent in other age groups as well. I wonder whether this doesn't enter into the picture to a very considerable extent. In other words, there may be a shifting in the public mind as to what the basic values and priorities should be in the present and future.

FWG: It seems true that this affluence, which, of course, is by no means universal, mixed with the concern about some of the more visible evidences of environmental deterioration--the air, the streams, and water--alters the concepts of what people want from their public lands. How far people who are disenchanted ostensibly care to carry this matter of disengaging from commodity production is anybody's guess. Ten million automobiles were sold last year in the United States. All those are going to be running and many of them are going to be running through the national forests and parks.

Sure, there will be a changing evaluation of what people want, due to increasing affluence and due to, I think, further detachment from the sources of the commodities that form the basis of our affluence. Most of the present generation of youths haven't had a rural environment to grow up in. The generation of which I am a part predominantly stemmed out of rural areas or small towns, places where you could run in the woods. We didn't feel the need for some of the things that the city-bred people feel.

The work I did was oriented to the idea that there was going to be more and more demand from public properties, particularly the national forests, for the amenities that they afford, and less and less emphasis on the commodities. I have made this statement many times to my bosses and the chief that if the man on the street were asked about the uses of the national forest, he would probably say that he couldn't care less how many millions of board feet of timber were produced. He would be concerned about having a place to go where he could enjoy the outdoors in an attractive environment. If he was somewhat more sophisticated, he would be concerned with clean water and that sort of thing. But primarily he would view the national forests as places for nature studies and recreation. It was my position that the Forest Service better join that movement, rather than be taken

into it by the scruff of the neck. The challenge of multiple-use management is to offer this kind of environment and still produce adequate timber, paper, water, and meat.

Recreational Threat to the Service

ERM: In that regard do you think that the introduction and passage of a multiple use bill was generated in large measure by a recreational threat to the Forest Service? Was it in any way a reaction to the National Park Service's Mission 66, which had so much publicity?*

FWG: Yes. As we discussed yesterday, part of it was the move for dedication of lands for park purposes, so-called single use. But I think the great increase in recreational use and interest in recreation and all these things that go with it, of the fifties and sixties, was one of the important factors leading up to the sponsorship by the Forest Service of the Multiple Use Act.

When you say recreation pressures, I think there is a competition between the recreation use and timber use that sparks the thing off. And at least one of the factors that led the Forest Service into the support of the Multiple Use Act was a desire to make recreation a better financed and better and more important use of the national forests. We talked yesterday about the fact that there was no specific congressional endorsement of recreational use of the national forests and about the long-term interest of the National Park Service in promoting its control of all recreation uses in the nation, including those in the national forests.

One of the things that I was interested in and advocated was the extension of the Forest Service activities into the nonhunting-fishing phases of wildlife and recreation. I felt and still do, and I know the present chief feels the same way, that the interests of people in bird watching or in the propagation of songbirds or of small animals for photographic and nature study, the saving of

---

*Howard Stagner (Assistant Chief, Mission 66, National Park Service), "A Second Look at Multiple Use," American Forests 66, no. 2 (February, 1960): pp. 24-25.

endangered species, and in such things as natural history features and the archaeological features of the national forests are going to grow in importance along with occupancy use for recreational purposes. Of course, the Forest Service is moving in that direction. The Kirtland warbler management area in the Hiawatha National Forest is an example of that. All those things, I think, are going to become more important in the future, and I hope that under the Multiple Use Act and multiple-use plans they will be given more prominence than they have in the past.

Reorganization of Natural Resource Departments

ERM: Fred, you wrote an article for Trees, The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1949, called "Other Federal Forests."* In this article you discussed timberlands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the various military branches, TVA, and the National Park Service. Do you believe that America's timber production and conservation in general have suffered as a result of these numerous divisions in federal forest management?

FWG: My assignment at the time for the yearbook, Trees, was to explore and present the forest resources of federal lands other than the national forests. And those you enumerated were the chief ones. I suppose it's fair to say that the commercial use of forests, the production of lumber and pulp and so forth, have been reduced to some extent by the dedication of these forests to uses such as national parks. The Olympic National Park is an example of this. The other agencies enumerated permit timber harvest and have applied forestry practices to timberlands they administer. Yosemite has substantial volumes of merchantable timber.

Personally, of course, and as I think I wrote into the article, the use of trees for the enjoyment of people for their spiritual and recreational involvement is as legitimate as sawing them into boards. So I wouldn't say that this is necessarily a waste. It has, without question,

---

*Fred W. Grover, "Other Federal Forests," in Trees, The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1949 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949), pp. 381-390.

reduced some of the outflow, but with the present state of the nation, why, it's a use we can afford within reason. And that's one of the key questions, keeping it within reason and bounds. The same thing is true of the several billion board feet that are tied up in the national forest wilderness areas.

As to the others, such as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, it has made timber available to the markets on behalf of the Indians under professional forestry management. They were not free agents, for the timber belongs to the Indians. But in any event, like all the rest of the public forestry organizations within the limitations imposed upon them by the owners, why, they carried out a professional forestry job. The BLM [Bureau of Land Management] did the same on the O & C [Oregon and California Railroad] revested lands and the Coos Bay wagon-route grant lands, which it manages through the act of 1937.*

ERM: Do you think this multiplicity of agencies involved in forest land management derives itself from our skepticism of government and our need for having checks and balances? How do you interpret this creation of so many agencies all involved in duplication of service?

FWG: I believe it has developed mostly as spin-offs of the principal missions of these agencies, plus some local and agency politics. National Park Service forest land management is strictly protective, in accord with its mission. In the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the military managed forests, it is a contributing activity toward their principal purposes or objectives. Personally, I think this situation is okay as it follows the principle of unit land management--territorial integrity, if you wish--rather than functional dispersion.

In my mind, the only real overlapping is in the functions of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. I think the problems and the resources and geography are closely related there and so closely allied that there is a duplication. Now whether that duplication is good or bad depends on your philosophy and on some of the facts you might come out with.

It has been said by lots of people that this competition is good for both agencies. And I think there is a degree of truth in that because there is some spirit of competition in the beneficial sense of technical and professional people attempting to apply their skills to

---

*Act of 28 August 1937, ch. 876, 50 Stat. 874, 43 U.S.C. sec. 1181a-e (1964).

their problems in ways that might be considered outstanding. On the other hand, there is no question that the duplication of administration costs some additional funds and creates in the public mind the impression of duplication whether that is so or not.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is the arm of the federal government that acts on behalf of the federal government as trustee of the Indians. The Indians are the true owners of the reservations and the beneficiaries of them. The forestry functions of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are only one of the bureau's tasks and probably a minor function, at least historically.

ERM: How well do you think the interests of the Indians have been served?

FWG: I have no basis of judging that except that to my knowledge and observations the bureau has attempted to utilize the Indian timber resources for the financial benefit of the Indians under practices that would at least assure the perpetuation of it. Broadly, I would say their interests have been served as well as the interests of the other people of the United States through the other agencies. Whether the bureau got as much money as it could for timber or whether it used too much of those funds for administration or whether it was right in logging certain areas, I have no way of judging.

ERM: The BIA [Bureau of Indian Affairs] is in a state of disarray at the present.

FWG: Yes, it is.

ERM: And forestry is rather low on the totem pole.

FWG: Of course, it was rather a dispersed activity anyway as compared to the total bureau, as I understand it. The emphasis increasingly has changed to welfare and education and health services and so forth by the BIA or by HEW [Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]. The Klamath reservation is a little more productive, but the Indians there decided that they would rather have money than the annual income that it yielded, so it was disposed of. I guess the Navahos probably run their own show. I think you are probably right. I have understood that in many places the Indians have progressed to a point where they would just as soon dispense with the forestry services of the bureau. Warm Springs in Oregon is one such reservation where the tribe has really taken hold of its forest resource and is going to make it an asset the way they want to.

The mission of the national parks is rather clear. If you consider timber as one of the natural assets which should be preserved through

the national park system, why, then it is perfectly legitimate for that system to include, at least, what might be considered premier or ecologically exceptional stands of timber.

ERM: Do you believe that multiple use of the nation's resources would be in any way facilitated by the creation of a department of conservation or natural resources management, which would include the Forest Service, the National Park Service, and these other agencies? Or do you believe that the diversity of agencies is perhaps a better long-run plan than that which has been projected?

FWG: Well, I think a department of natural resources or at least the terminology involved there is quite absurd because the proposals run only to federal forest and range lands, primarily, and park lands, whereas the agricultural lands, the rivers and their basins, the air, the water, minerals, the Great Lakes, the huge reservoirs, fisheries, and all the rest of our natural endowments are natural resources of high importance, as is our people base. So the terminology is absurd.

Whether there is any advantage in putting together the land management agencies and the land and water development agencies of the federal government into one department is, to me, pretty doubtful, not because of this aspect of competition so much, but because I don't think that the natural resource conservation problem of the country as a whole is centered in the federal lands. At least, it's not predominantly centered in the federal lands.

I think the functions of the Department of Agriculture throughout the rural areas of the country on primarily private lands are as much a part of the conservation of natural resources picture as are management of the national forests or the national parks. And so I think that it should be a department of rural affairs--department of rural life, if you want to call it that--that would deal across the board with these problems. And I don't think the present proposal, which will fractionate programs under some rather nebulous groupings or concepts, is the answer.

I personally agree with the findings of the Hoover Commission of 1950 that one beneficial action would be to transfer the land management functions of the Bureau of Land Management to the Department of Agriculture, at least bolstering its role as a department of rural affairs to that extent. After all, the cropping of grass from the public lands or the cropping of timber from them or the use of them for outdoor recreation differs little on the unreserved Public Domain from the same uses on the national forests. The Hoover Commission recommended this

on the basis that the Agriculture Department was best equipped with technical personnel, research, and programs to deal with the soil and its products.

ERM: The Public Land Law Review Commission moved in the opposite direction in its recommendations.* Why do you suppose that?

FWG: I was not privy to the debates and discussions of them. I was quite disappointed that their report was a unanimous report, including as signatories public members, for the reason that I think that whole investigation was political and personal. There is no question there is a need for review of the old public land laws. Many of them have become obsolete. Certainly the mineral laws are disadvantageous to good conservation of the public lands.

But the commission's study was concentrated mainly in the interior and insular affairs committees of the two houses. All the congressional members were from those committees, as was the chairman, and these outnumbered the public members thirteen to six. One of its purposes was to advance the prestige and the scope of those committees. Another was to presumably recover for these congressional committees some of the authorities and privileges that some of the members had thought had been usurped by the executive department or other committees. So I can understand why they came out with the result that they did, but I think it was certainly an ill-advised and politically inspired recommendation. I am surprised that some of the public members would accede to it rather than writing a dissent.

You may recall that the Hoover Commission, which investigated the organization of the federal government, concerned itself with the functions of the departments in regard to public lands. It had a committee on natural resources or conservation; I forget the name of it. Anyway, that committee came up with recommendations for a department of conservation or natural resources. And there were other committees that dealt with other subjects. But when the full committee got into the matter, it rejected the recommendations of this committee and recommended that the functions of the Bureau of Land Management having to do with renewable resources and soil be exercised by the Department of Agriculture.

---

*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), 342 pp. See also George Banzhaf and Company, Study of Public Land Timber Policy, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1969).

That was a nonpartisan, rather objective committee of high level. It wasn't particularly oriented to any furthering of political aims of any segment of Congress or of the parties. I think it was a far sounder recommendation than the one issued by the Public Land Law Review Commission, which is rather confused and meets itself coming back in some places. But it obviously has a bias against the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service. In fact, if implemented fully, its programs would destroy the national forest system and the Forest Service. I cannot believe that this would benefit the people of the United States. This, of course, is a personal view. I have no inside knowledge into the workings of the Public Land Law Review Commission or how it arrived at its conclusions.

SOURCES FOR FURTHER MULTIPLE-USE STUDY

Suggested Interviewees

ERM: Fred, you had several suggestions for me this morning, of people who might be interviewed on tape?

FWG: My suggestion was that you add to your list of people who might contribute something to the general subject of forest history, the name of Dewey Anderson. Mr. Anderson, as I recall lives, at least during the summer, in the vicinity of Portola in Plumas County, but spends winters elsewhere. He has a long history of layman interest in conservation problems, in California particularly, but also nationally. He is well acquainted with political issues going back at least to the beginning of the forties, probably well into the thirties. I believe he occupied a position at one time with the Public Affairs Institute in Washington, D. C., which had a conservation division or committee dealing with nationwide conservation programs. Mr. Anderson is a very interesting person to talk to. I believe he would be able to contribute some very interesting background on the various efforts along the line of conservation policy and conservation politics.

ERM: Would this have to do particularly with the labor and with the position of labor and the need for employment and so on?

FWG: That probably was the platform from which he operated in his earlier life. But I don't think that his present interests are intimately related to labor. He was a member of the state legislature for a number of years. He has done considerable writing, including an article on Lake Tahoe in the National Parks Magazine during the last two years. While he has a background of involvement in the labor movement, I don't think his conservation efforts are particularly oriented to labor.

Another person whom I don't know personally, but who has made a number of speeches and written a number of articles on the subject, particularly the movements toward increased wilderness or parks, is Virlis Fischer of Las Vegas, Nevada. Those are the two I had in mind when I brought this up.

ERM: I would appreciate any other suggestions that you might have to make as to other persons that might be interviewed. We are going ahead this coming year, that is, the rest of 1972 and probably well on into the seventies, with an accelerated program of oral history. This is dependent, of course, entirely upon what special funding we may be able to get behind this through various groups, including the Forest Service but not exclusively the Forest Service. And while we have on our list quite a good number of people have been recommended to us as good respondents for oral history interviews, we are always looking for further suggestions so that we can crank these into the considerations in making selected lists if we do get the money to go ahead with a new series of interviews. If you can think of any others that you would recommend and indicate in what areas you think they may be particularly well-informed to speak, we would very much like to have this either now or later in notes and letters of transmittal.

FWG: I don't have any further suggestions at this particular time, but I would be glad to drop a note if any come to mind. I was wondering on the purely industrial side, if you have had any contacts with Kenneth Walker of the Walker family that had controlled the Red River Lumber Company until it ceased operations in the late forties.

ERM: I know of Ken Walker and I believe I met him some years ago at one or another trade association meeting. I think he is a very articulate fellow, a fine speaker.

FWG: Yes. I became acquainted with him when I was in the regional office in San Francisco, and we negotiated some quite extensive land exchanges with the Red River Lumber Company--exchanges of their land for national forest timber around late 1939 into the 1940s. He at that time was the official representative of the Red River Lumber Company in matters having to do with their lands and properties. He, at that time, was a pure industrialist lumberman, whose interests were in terms of logs for the mill and profits for the company. Since then, of course, the Red River Lumber Company has ceased operations and the properties have been dispersed among the members of the Walker family in various ways. Kenneth Walker operated--maybe he still operates--a mill in Susanville, but what I was thinking more was that he would have the background of the Red River Lumber Company going back probably to its Minnesota history.

ERM: The old T. B. Walker operations back there.

FWG: Yes. And T. B. Walker, of course, came out and, through various devices, accumulated for the company a million and a half acres of prime timber along the Sierras, principally in Lassen and Plumas counties. He may not be willing to talk at all, but even the regular operation in California is a significant part of forest history. Along in the early forties, particularly after the World War started, Red River Lumber Company was probably the largest producer, on an annual cut basis, of any mill in the country. Westwood was a company town owned and operated by the company, one of the last of those of substance. If you decide to take on the industrial side of forest history, which I am sure you will, you might get something interesting out of it from Mr. Walker. He, at that time, had considerable pride in the company and in its accomplishments.

ERM: Have you maintained any contacts with him?

FWG: No, I haven't seen him since that time, so I don't know how his reactions are personally. Millard Barnum in San Francisco, who was chief of the Division of Lands for many years there and before that was in charge of all the exchange and other land acquisitions, was well acquainted with Kenneth Walker and may still keep up contacts with him. Incidentally, Millard Barnum was one of those who encouraged Everett Jensen to do the formal type of area planning or management direction that I think initiated and began the system of multiple-use planning that the Forest Service uses today.

ERM: I remember you mentioned that in some length in your interview yesterday.

FWG: Barnum's experience goes back to around 1922, I think. And he might be a worthwhile candidate for you to talk to.

ERM: In the second series.

FWG: Right.

ERM: Who else in the Forest Service do you think of as possible interviewees? We've mentioned McArdle and Florance as the main two who should be included. What about Art Greeley?

FWG: I was just about to suggest that. Greeley came into the Washington office as deputy chief in mid-1959. I mentioned that for about eight months I pinch-hit in that position until he transferred from the Regional Forester position at Milwaukee. So he would have been involved in the discussions and so forth concerning the Multiple Use

Act. Art, of course, was one of the Department of Agriculture representatives on the study team that studied the North Cascades area of Washington in the sixties. As you know, that was a joint Agriculture-Interior study but unluckily, Interior had three members and Agriculture two. The majority recommendations eventually resulted in the North Cascades National Park. Greeley is intimately familiar with that, if he desires to talk about it. If Art cares to talk about it, some of the background of that study might be interesting to you, because it posed very clearly the question of multiple use of a large area versus restricted use inherent in a national park proposal.

ERM: I have great personal regard for Art Greeley. I think he is a man of really outstanding personal integrity, moral convictions, and I would like to get to him with a tape recorder and see what he is willing to put down on the record. He seems to me to be in a sense a man who is in many ways a conscience of the Forest Service headquarters office. Do you concur that?

FWG: I don't know about the conscience of the Forest Service, but Art is a very sensitive person. He has deep regard for the rightness of things. He is probably overly conscientious in trying to do the right thing or to assure that other people do the right thing. In that regard, yes, I would agree with you. Art is an extremely hard and able worker for the Forest Service.

He carried the burden of a lot of programs, and he had the courage of his convictions in such things as the North Cascades, where he fought very strongly against the park concept because he knew the country and he could see no public advantage from it. It wasn't personal with Art. I think that like many of the rest of us, he couldn't see where the public was to gain anything by transferring land already secure in public ownership and use to park status. The same thing goes for some of the other things that he has personally taken charge of. I think he would be a worthwhile subject for you if he cares to elaborate. I guess you know that he is studying for the ministry.

ERM: Who among other men who have recently retired from the Forest Service would you think might be most articulate and willing to expound on different areas of forest history, not just necessarily those that have come out of headquarters, but from field positions.

FWG: I suppose a large number would be able to contribute something substantially. I would suggest perhaps in connection with this

multiple-use study, and also more generally, Floyd Iverson, who retired from the regional forester job in Ogden, Utah, about a year and a half ago. Floyd grew up on a ranch in Modoc County. He went through several chairs from junior range examiner to forest supervisor to assistant regional forester for range in a couple of regions.

He went to Ogden, Utah, when Chester Olsen retired, as regional forester, and became involved with all the complex conservation issues that go with Idaho, Utah, and Nevada public lands. He must have been there twelve to fourteen years. His work included the program of the Forest Service to get better control of range use practices, installation of multiple-use planning techniques, and a push for multiple use as a public program of the Forest Service.

Floyd is extremely able, very conscientious. I don't think he is very verbose, but I think he would be willing to talk as we are talking, and I think he would have quite a lot to contribute. He certainly is familiar with the background of many of these things from the standpoint of the man on the ground who had to put them into effect.

He would be a good balance, I think, to Herb Stone, who's career ten or fifteen years before he retired, was in the timber area of Oregon and Washington. The timber business was where the pressures were on Herb, whereas Floyd's problems were more in the line of range use control, watershed betterment, and recreation and land use policy, including this Sawtooth study that I mentioned among others.

ERM: Can you think of an old-timer, recently retired, who had spent his life at the ranger level, who was ahead of a ranger district most of his life, one who is able to speak out and clarify things at that level?

FWG: None comes to mind at the moment. If I do dredge up some names, I'll be glad to drop you a note on them. I am sure there are some. The only problem would be whether they moved about enough to have a broad enough understanding. Many of the old-time rangers tended to stay pretty closely in place.

ERM: An interview at that level would, in a sense, be a very concentrated picture in itself, and would be evaluated as such. But I think it might have a lot of merit.

FWG: I'll see if I can in conversation with some of the other folks around here, come up with some names for you.

Bibliographical Sources

ERM: You had a suggestion there in regard to acquisition of information that would help us on our bibliography and multiple-use project both.

FWG: I neglected to mention that Carl Wilson, who is assistant regional forester in the regional office in San Francisco in charge of watershed management and multiple-use planning, has written a thesis for his master's degree from the University of Montana on the subject of the application of a multiple-use program by the Forest Service on the ground. I suggest that in the course of your study of the multiple-use programs in the Forest Service, you may want to get a copy of this from Mr. Wilson and review it or have it reviewed. It does go into what he considers are the positives and the negatives of the Forest Service's application of multiple use.

ERM: Does that have a pretty good bibliography?

FWG: It has a fairly good bibliography, which may be of value to you in your project for accumulating a bibliography of national forest historical publications.

ERM: You say that Gene Bergoffen of the legislative office in Washington wrote a thesis.

FWG: Gene Bergoffen was assistant to Reynolds Florance and still is in the legislative liaison branch of the Forest Service. Gene is a Syracuse-trained forester and also has a law degree and is a member of the District and Virginia bar associations. I have been told that in the process of getting his law degree, he wrote an exposition of the legislative process and the legal questions involved in the enactment of the Multiple Use Act. I haven't seen it. It is second or third hand to me. But if Gene did do that, it no doubt is a scholarly and accurate account. It might well worth be looking into.

ERM: I have been very favorably impressed with Bergoffen in my discussions with him.

FWG: Yes. He is a very intelligent and personable man, and knowledgeable of the law and the conservation aspects of programs like multiple use. He has participated in preparation of many legislative reports and drafts of testimony on various important bills.

ERM: What was the 1951 thesis at Yale? *

FWG: I don't have the copy of it, and I don't have the title. But I can supply that at the time I might review this transcript.

ERM: Well, I think we've just about exploited this interview to the maximum before I have to start to gather all my chickens here and put them in a box to get ready to go. I want to thank you very much for coming over today.

FWG: I was happy to do it.

---

* The work here is wrongly dated in the text of the interview above. Mr. Bergoffen presented in partial fulfillment of requirements for his masters degree at the State University of New York College of Forestry at Syracuse University, in January, 1964, a thesis entitled "The Multiple-Use - Sustained Yield Law." This is a case study of administrative initiative in the legislative policy-forming process. See also an earlier work not authored by Mr. Bergoffen, "Management of Public Land Resources," Yale Law Journal 60, no. 3 (March 1951): 455-482.

APPENDICES

Qualifications which any National Forest Area should possess if it is to be changed to Park Status

1. It should be superlative scenery or part of the logical administrative unit of superlative scenery.

2. It should be large enough to justify independent administration.

3. It should not be a wilderness area in the back part of national forest lands where the entire administrative unit would be a wilderness. Such an area, even with wilderness written in the law, would be almost impossible to retain as a wilderness.

4. It should not contain timber, grass, or water, on the development of which a large number of families are dependent for their livelihood, unless either a method can be first worked out for caring for these families or the commodity development of the area would cause such major damage to extraordinary scenic values that it would seem worth sacrificing the livelihood of an important number of people in order to preserve the superlative. The presence of mineral values in an area should not preclude its establishment, both because there are ample substitute mineral areas which can be developed to supply America's needs and because unlike the other commodities it does not make for permanent civilization based on sustained yield.

There is no intrinsic reason why either the Park Service or the Forest Service is better equipped or is the more appropriate agency to construct and administer recreation roads, recreation trails, observation areas, resorts, or campgrounds. In practice the Forest Service has on the whole done a better job with all of these, but there is no reason why the Park Service should not do as well under better leadership. Picnic grounds and organization camps are not generally appropriate to national parks where use should be focused on forms of recreation which do not conflict with the enjoyment of the superlative or the primeval. However, on non-park lands under administration of the Park Service that agency has done a better job than the Forest Service with organization camps, probably a worse job with picnic grounds. Because of these facts no notion that the Park Service is in any way a better agency to administer forest recreation should condition the consideration of proposed park additions. Such consideration should be based on the fundamental principles of recreation land status enumerated above.

Robert Marshall

ROBERT MARSHALL, Chief,
Division of Recreation & Lands

NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAM FOR THE SHAWNEE HILLS OF SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

Introduction: Opportunity for Area Development

The Shawnee Hills of southern Illinois rise in an 80 mile area between the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The terrain varies from steep, rough hills and high bluffs along both rivers to the rolling hills of the central section. Narrow ridgetops look down on deeply incised, wooded valleys. Many sculptured outcrops, mostly sandstone, occur along the valley walls.

A good part of the Hills are within the Shawnee National Forest. This Forest was established in 1933 and consists of two separated units in the southeastern and southwestern parts of the State. Composed of scattered tracts and blocks interspersed with private holdings, the National Forest lands total 211,021 acres or 31 percent of the total acreage within the Forest boundaries. About 90 percent of these lands were purchased prior to World War II. National Forest land purchase programs since have been small, and little progress has been made in further consolidating National Forest lands in this area.

The Shawnee Hills area has suffered a progressive decline in population and a general slowdown in economic development. Realizing the plight of southern Illinois and fearing a possible worsening of the situation, local community leaders took action to stem the area's decline.

As a first step in the program for economic betterment and stability, a resource analysis was made by the local people. They found that the Shawnee Hills have great potential for outdoor recreation; that the forest industry can be revitalized; that the watersheds and soils can be protected through reforestation and proper land management. These objectives, they believed, could best be planned and attained through National Forest programs. Accordingly, the Secretary of Agriculture was asked to extend the boundaries of the Shawnee National Forest, consolidate ownership within its present boundaries, and undertake an accelerated program of forest resource development, especially of recreation resources.

At the request of Federal, State, and local leaders interested in the economic development of southern Illinois, the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture undertook two studies in the fall of 1962 of the land, resources, and economy of the area. The purpose of these studies was to determine the desirability and feasibility of National Forest expansion based on:

1. A proposal to link the two existing units of the Shawnee National Forest by extending the boundaries to include an area known as the "Shawnee Gap" (see map inside cover).
2. Acquisition of additional lands within the present National Forest to facilitate public development, protection, and multiple use management of recreation, timber, water, wildlife, and other resources.

This report briefly summarizes the findings of the two studies and the recommendations for a National Forest program geared to full resource development as a responsibility of Forest Service management and as an aid to the southern Illinois economy.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Williamsburg, Va. VISITOR SERVICES CONFERENCE December 1, 1959

WIRTH STRIKES BACK

Director Wirth certainly laid it on the line at the opening session yesterday. As most of the conferees are aware--particularly those from the great natural scenic areas, and those engaged in Recreational Resource Survey Planning a calculated and cunning campaign of misrepresentation directed against the National Park Service has been underway for many months.

Within the Park Service, and this is intended only for Park Service eyes and ears, it must be clear that the Director's fighting gauntlet fell directly at the feet of the Forest Service.

For months, the Park Service has received stinging blows from Forest Service spokesmen--ranging from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Petersen on down to Forest Rangers who visit campgrounds. When the sugar coating is stripped from their propaganda it boils down to this: "Don't support the establishment of new National Park areas under MISSION 66. That would mean 'non-use' of the land. Support the Forest Service 'multiple use' policy and taxpayers will get more and better recreational areas while commercial interests foot the bill."

Ye Dailye Ranger Staffe is aware, as all of you are, that for many, many years the field people of both the Park and Forest Services have built up in many instances fine friendships. Many of you may be aware that the field folks of the Forest Service are not in sympathy with the campaign--directed from Washington against the National Park Service. As the Director's speech made it clear, however, the time for Park Service people to sit tolerantly, but impatiently on the sidelines, has now passed.

The time has come for Park Service people to speak up and meet this campaign of misrepresentation with the truth and firm supporting facts. In so doing bear in mind this passage from the Director's talk: "...you can preach all kinds of uses, but the only intelligent approach to my problem of land management is to survey and study the matter, determine the primary use, and then take the proper steps to see that its administration is placed in the agency designated by law to do that particular job."

Copies of the Director's talk and a clear-cut factual analysis of so-called "multiple use" by Howard Stagner of the MISSION 66 staff are available for conferees to take home with them. They can be picked up in the lobby of the Motor Lounge or at the so-called "Nervous Center."

Foreword

This report is a part of the broader Sawtooth Mountain Area Study Report prepared jointly by the U. S. Forest Service and the National Park Service. It attempts to identify the historical values in the study area and to assess their significance.

Apparently this report marks the first attempt to prepare an organized history of the Sawtooth Range. Due to the limited time permitted for the study, all phases of the Sawtooth story could not be investigated with equal intensity; but every possible effort has been made to present a well-rounded, overall view of human activity in this important and picturesque section of Idaho.

When a task of such magnitude is undertaken in such a short time, it is inevitable that much reliance must be placed upon the knowledge, talents, and previous labors of others. In the present case, the writers have been extremely fortunate in receiving the unstinted assistance and cooperation of a number of highly qualified individuals and institutions.

The sources of such assistance have been acknowledged by footnote references at appropriate places throughout the narrative, but the writers feel that special words of thanks are due to the staff of the Idaho Historical Society, who placed the full resources and facilities of that most valuable institution at their disposal without reservation. In particular, permission was given to quote at length from a number of the Society's publications and from its reference series, some numbers of which were prepared especially to assist in the present study. Our deepest appreciation is expressed to Mr. H. J. Swinney, Director; Dr. Merle W. Wells, Historian and Archivist; Miss Janice Howie, Secretary; Miss Nancy Miller, Archival Assistant; and to all other staff members. Without the vast knowledge of both the historical source materials and the actual terrain possessed by Dr. Wells, this study would have been a very faulty document indeed.

Also, special thanks are given to the past and present personnel of the Boise, Challis, and Sawtooth National Forests who have gathered a vast amount of information concerning the history of the Sawtooth Range. This material, in awesome bulk, was cheerfully placed at the disposal of the writers, who came to have a deep respect for the value of these manuscript forest histories.

Victor O. Goodwin

John A. Hussey

SUMMARY

The addition of the "Mountaineer Unit" to the Monongahela National Forest with restoration and conservation (wise use) of its surface natural resources, would materially aid in solving the socio-economic problems of the area. The area is suitable for National Forest purposes, and extension of the existing National Forest is both feasible and practical.

Forests and forest lands are a basic and major resource of the Unit. Under present conditions, these lands are not producing either the economic or public benefits of which they are capable.

A desirable National Forest Program for the Mountaineer Unit would involve the purchase of approximately 550,000 acres. It is estimated that these forest, watershed, and submarginal farm lands could be purchased by the Federal Government from the private landowners, through voluntary sale, for approximately $12,000,000 over a 7-year period.

As rapidly as the land is purchased, a program would be undertaken to protect and develop all resources of the forest for the maximum sustainable yield of which the land is capable. Management would be directed toward

multiple use and sustained yield of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish.

Expenditures for protection, management, and development would be geared to the rate of land purchase. Relatively small initially, these expenditures would materially increase as land is purchased and placed under management.

A program of this nature and scope would provide jobs and business opportunities that fit local skills and needs in an area where 22 percent of the labor force is persistently unemployed.

The purchase of worn-down or poorly used farms would reduce agricultural pursuits on areas unsuited for farming. Restoration and development of the natural and potential resource capacity of these lands would form a base upon which a stable economy could be maintained for the future.

The success of the Monongahela National Forest is a good indication of what could be expected from the "Mountaineer Unit". Under multiple use and sustained yield management, the Mountaineer Unit could provide:

1. EXPANDED OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES.
2. INCREASED WILDLIFE POPULATIONS FOR PUBLIC HUNTING AND FISHING.

3. A LARGER VOLUME OF QUALITY TIMBER.

4. IMPROVED WATERSHEDS.

5. MORE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

6. MONETARY RETURNS TO FEDERAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

The Monongahela National Forest to the east, has served as a proving ground for programs on comparable lands with similar economic and social conditions. About 60 percent of the forest land area within the exterior boundary has been purchased. Today, it offers a wide variety of recreation opportunities, including fine hunting and fishing, an expanding supply of timber, and improved watersheds above the urban and industrial complexes on the Monongahela and Potomac Rivers. Receipts to the U. S. Treasury in 1960 from the forest were $680,000, from which $0.21 per acre was returned to the counties in which the National Forest is located. Intermingled and adjacent private lands have benefited from the demonstrated practice of good land management and protection.

FOREWORD

This report on alternative programs for development of the Big South Fork, Cumberland River, has been prepared as directed by Section 218 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-483). It represents a coordinated, cooperative effort of the Chief of Engineers, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture, together with the affected States of Tennessee and Kentucky. General supervision and direction of the study were provided by a Steering Group formed at Departmental level in Washington, while the compilation of the basic material and the formulation of the various plans were the responsibility of a Field Task Group composed of representatives of the agencies of the departments operating at the field level.

The report summarizes the results of the studies in as concise a manner as possible. Detailed documentation is contained in other reports prepared by the Field Task Group. The general descriptive material was assigned to the Corps of Engineers, with inputs from other agencies on specific subjects for which they had particular competence. Discussions of the six major alternatives considered in the report were assigned: Acceleration of Existing Programs to the Soil Conservation Service, Agriculture; Reservoirs to the Corps of Engineers; Scenic Rivers to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Interior; National Recreation Area to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Interior: National Forest to the Forest Service, Agriculture; and National Park to the National Park Service, Interior. Each alternative presents a sound developmental plan, shows land required for implementation, indicates the estimated costs, and then shows its local impact upon the area economy in terms of increased employment and income.

The report does not suggest the selection of any one alternative as being superior to the others since this was considered beyond the mandate set forth in the Congressional Act.

A separate report, also under the authority of Section 218 of Public Law 90-483, has been prepared by the Corps of Engineers on the Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir, updating the feasibility study presented to the Congress. That project is described only in sufficient detail in this report to give the reader a basis of comparison with the alternatives.

§ 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 ar' .eclared 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.)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK
YORKTOWN, VIRGINIA

OPENING REMARKS BY CONRAD L. WIRTH, DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, VISITOR SERVICES CONFERENCE
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA, NOVEMBER 30, 1959

It is our purpose at our biennial meetings to analyze ourselves, our organization, and our work, and to project into the future ways and means to do a better job. There is really no other reason for having such a meeting as VISITOR SERVICES.

A Nation that succeeds must have three basic ingredients, and the United States of America has three basic ingredients. Briefly they are: Abundance of natural resources; the will to develop the knowledge on how to use these resources; and, third, the vigor, ambition, and humanitarian approach to life as individuals and as a group. While the National Park idea encompasses all three of these ingredients, the last point--American Personality--is the ingredient which is fed and nourished by the National Park idea.

I am not going to dwell on the first two ingredients, even though they are very important, but I do want to talk about the third ingredient and its value to the social and cultural growth in America. I can do so very briefly.

First, what I have called the American Personality, is just as important to our Nation as are rich resources, and know-how.

Secondly, this "Personality" was a product of our long contact with the land. The wilderness is in our blood.

My last point is simply that the National Parks highlight America's determination to preserve our tie with the wilderness and the land, and thus to preserve one source of our strength of national spirit. The National Parks preserve the natural landscape and historical places, and in doing so also help preserve the strength of our national character.

It is appropriate that this conference, VISITOR SERVICES, is designed around the principle of presentation of the natural history and historic features of the areas of the National Park System to the public, so that the social, cultural, and inspirational values contained in them will be forcefully and intelligently imparted to the public through our interpretive program.

The accomplishments in the first three and a half years of MISSION 66 along this line are beginning to show some real results. The

results have been very favorably received, and it is time to take stock and get the second stage of our mission into orbit. We are not shooting for the moon! On the contrary, we are going to be on the earth for an awfully long time and it is best that we understand it and appreciate it, and know how to take care of it and enjoy it. As far as MISSION 66 is concerned, however, "the honeymoon is over" and we are beginning to reach the hard facts of life. It took a tremendous amount of hard work and concentration by all of you to get MISSION 66 off the ground, but now I call on you to put your best foot forward so that MISSION 66 will be completed. Besides increased work effort, it is going to take some real deep and sound thinking to carry the program on to completion.

The first three and a half years have seen a lot of very fine facilities installed; interpretive improvements, many visitor centers, improved housing, etc. Old installations have been improved and rehabilitated. Our organization also has been strengthened to meet the demands of increased use. But, all of these things need further attention. They need improvement both in quality and simplicity. I want to underscore quality and simplicity. Our protective and interpretive personnel are as fine a group of men as you can find anywhere, and their work is backed up and facilitated by equally effective and dedicated administrative, maintenance, and construction forces, and high professional competence in many fields. I am proud of the many commendations I read or hear about National Park Service personnel in all parts of our organization. However, we must accept this only as a spur to greater effort. We must never develop an attitude that because what we have is good, that it is also the best.

We have started our training center, it is doing a good job, but it must be expanded, and it will be expanded.

The concessioners have gone forward shoulder to shoulder with us, and the services to the public which they and we furnish are beginning to bear results. We appreciate greatly their attitude and help. Their presence here in strength is a true indication of the spirit of partnership that exists.

I won't try to enumerate all of our progress, but, generally speaking, it has been good. It has had a wholesome effect on our own organization, and it has had a decided influence on other agencies, both Federal and State, throughout the country. MISSION 66, while a single program, reaches every unit of the Service. I know there have been some areas that have not felt it's full impact as yet, but I am sure it won't be long now before every area will begin to realize real values from the program. I urge all of you, especially those that have not received any substantial help as yet, to have faith in MISSION 66 and be optimistic. Optimism is the best cure I know of for hard knocks--and we will have our share before this program is through. Some of them are already showing their ugly heads. I would like to say a word about one of them right here. This relates to the plans for the future of the National Park System, and our responsibilities under the Recreational Survey Act of 1936. This

involves sound planning to determine primary land use, as contrasted with jumbled-up multiple-use. Our program in relation to rounding out the National Park System, and administration approved part of MISSION 66, finds an opposition rallying around and beating this old tom-tom called multiple-use.

They are using a number of publicity outlets and spokesmen to proclaim that the cure for all problems of land management rests in that term "multiple-use," and to stigmatize and deride efforts to establish further National Parks as descending to "single-use" and even, if you can believe it, to non-use. There is almost a frantic effort being made to get the public to swallow such catch phrases as the misleading, discredited "locked-up resources" slogan.

I can only judge this greatly stepped-up campaign as an effort to so confuse the basic issue that this part of the approved MISSION 66 program will be stalled, not only before the creation of additional areas can be proposed, but even before proper surveys and studies are made.

It is hard to believe that there are those who would misrepresent basic planning principles and, by doing so, defeat the establishment of a much needed and well-rounded-out National Park System. I only wish they had the courage to face up to the real issue which is a study and survey that will not hide under "multiple-use", "single-use," "non-use," or "lock up resources," but which will determine the case on the basic issue which is "primary use." The real question is, to what "primary use" should any given logical unit of land be put to, to best serve our country. You can preach all kinds of uses, but the only intelligent approach to any problem of land management is to survey and study the matter, determine the primary use, and then take the proper steps to see that its administration is placed in the agency designated by law to do that particular job. I am perfectly willing to agree to any program where judgements are rendered on this basis and not on, "I got it, you can't have it" basis.

So much for that, Let's now get down to some of the basic facts.

I urge each and every one of you, while you are here, to analyze and discuss the visitor services you see around you--not only in the areas under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, but in this excellent restoration and interpretive program of Colonail Williamsburg. As you know, Yorktown and Jamestown while under our jurisdiction for a long time came into their own when completed two years ago for the 350th Anniversary of the landing of the first permanent English settlers at Jamestown, and the 175th Anniversary of the surrender of Cornwallis. I think it is a very good job, and I do want to compliment Stan Abbott, Tom Vint, Ed Zimmer, Elbert Cox, and their staffs, for doing what I consider an excellent job. I think you will agree with me. As far as Colonial Williamsburg is concerned, it is a perfectionist job of which there is none better in these United States, if not in the entire world. So you have a laboratory here in which to study and absorb, and I hope it will inspire you in your job back home.

I can't pass up Colonial Williamsburg without saying just a few words about the men that conceived the idea and carried it out. No words that I can put together can ever describe properly the value of the impact that this restoration has had on America.

Colonial Williamsburg clearly portrays the life of Colonial people, their culture and their diplomancy. It explains the basis of the American Personality and it instills in those who see it that personality whether they know it or not. To the late Dr. Goodwin and to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and those who worked hard and long to develop and carry out their concept and objectives, America will profit greatly from your efforts and shall always be grateful.

Now I have found that if a Director will read through old reports he will find that there were some pretty smart people around in the early days and he will be surprised also to note that some of what he thought were his original ideas were at least occasionally put on record in the somewhat dim past. Just as a text or future guide for VISITOR SERVICES, I would like to read you a statement made by a military superintendent, Col. L. L. Brett of Yellowstone, 44 years ago. The Colonel's discussţion was dealing specifically with rangers but let us here consider the word "ranger" to mean everyone in our organization.

> "Too much stress cannot be laid on the necessity of inspiring in this park ranger force the loyal spirit of public service; and men who will not arise to the full realization of the fact that they are engaged upon a grand work for the public good have no place in this service and should be eliminated. To guide and inspire is the peculiar work of those in charge, and to impress on the personnel the highest motives in this sphere of the public service will require conduct which produces the greatest amount of benefit upon these rangers when sharing in their field work."

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

December 11, 1959

As you may have noticed from your newspaper, the National Park Service has just completed its biennial conference of top Service officials and park superintendents. The theme of this year's conference, held last week in Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, was "Visitor Services."

Beyond the obvious problems of accommodating millions of visitors to the National Parks and protecting the scenic, natural, scientific, historical and recreational values of these areas, we have a vital mission in making them more meaningful to the American people. These were the subjects discussed at the conference.

I feel that you will be particularly interested in a letter to me from Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, containing a six-point directive to the Park Service and read to the conferees. I am sure that all those interested in the future of the Parks will strongly approve and support these six objectives.

As the 10-year MISSION 66 completes its fourth year, it is inspiring to have the Cabinet officer--upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for proper use and preservation of the National Park System--give such positive indication as to the direction in which management should go. The emphasis upon, and promise of support for fundamental purposes and objectives is, I am sure, encouraging to all the millions of people who find enjoyment and inspiration in our Nation's heritage as represented by the areas under jurisdiction of the United States Department of the Interior, through the National Park Service.

Due to some developments of the past few months, I felt it necessary, in my remarks opening the conference, to call attention to a campaign now under way and which can only be judged to have as its objective forestalling progress of the Secretary's Directive No. 2. This has to do with rounding out the National Park System to meet a vital and growing national need. Too many people, even our friends, do not fully appreciate that carefully studied and selected enlargement of the National Park System is a most important part of MISSION 66. The expressed fear of many people that the dedicated lands of the National Park System may be overrun and even destroyed by future recreational demands may be a valid concern if this part of the approved MISSION 66 is neglected or thwarted.

The National Recreation Resources Review Commission, which was established by law to study the recognized critical need for planned land reservation for future recreational needs, has and will continue to have my full cooperation in any attempt the Commission may make to solve this problem.

The campaign which gives us so much concern has been indirect. Largely it is cloaked under advocacy of the "multiple-use" cure-all for all land management problems. It stigmatizes "single-use" with particular emphasis. The old and completely discredited catch-phrase of "locked up resources" is again appearing in print and further disparagement is being added by stating "the key is being thrown away." No person or agency, so far as I can determine, is actually named. However, the examples which are given establish identity beyond any reasonable doubt that the targets in this campaign are all those including private citizens and organizations, who feel that there are important parts of our scenic and scientific heritage still remaining whose preservation is vital and necessary.

I have seen nothing which derides any other type of land use, such as logging, grazing, mining, etc., as "single-use," and therefore undesirable. The term seems to be reserved exclusively for those situations in which assured preservation of all scenic and scientific areas which may be judged to be of national significance is needed. For these reasons, I spoke frankly about the matter to the Park Service officials and furnished them with an analysis of "multiple-use" as the National Park Service views the matter.

Copies of Secretary Seaton's letter and the analysis are enclosed. I hope you will read them carefully. Your comments and thoughts on this increasingly discussed matter will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Conrad L. Wirth

Conrad L. Wirth
Director

Enclosures

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR FREDERICK W. GROVER

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Forest Service. "Projects of Many Uses: Other Federal Forests," by Frederick W. Grover. In Trees, The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1949. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949.

_____. The Mountaineer Unit: West Virginia. Upper Darby, Pa.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1962.*

_____. National Forest Program for the Shawnee Hills of Southern Illinois. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.*

_____, and Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Sawtooth Mountain Area Study, Idaho: History. By Victor O. Goodwin and John A. Hussey. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.*

_____. Sawtooth Mountain Area Study, Idaho: Summary. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.*

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; U.S. Department of Interior; and U.S. Department of Agriculture. Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Kentucky-Tennessee: Interagency Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.*

*Frederick W. Grover contributed to these studies.

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.

Bergoffen, Gene S. "The Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Law: A Case Study of Administrative Initiative in the Legislative Policy-Forming Process." M.S. thesis, Syracuse University, June 1962.

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.

_____."A Report on Forest, Watershed, and Related Resource Conditions and Management, Pacific Northwest Region, 1958," by J. Herbert Stone. 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, Eastern Region and Northwest Forest Experiment Station, 1958," by VerneL. Harper and Russell B. McKennan. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. 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. General Integrating Inspection Report. Typed. 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. Typed. 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, George, 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.

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, Virlis 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.

Glascock, 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.

_____. "Wood for the Future," The Land 11, no. 3 (January 1953): 270-275.

_____. "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 Dailye 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.

Eldredge, 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.

Kneipp, Leon. Tape-recorded interview in 1963 by Amelia Roberts Fry. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library University of California. In process.

Kotok Ed. Tape-recorded interview in 1963 by Amelia Roberts Fry. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library University of California. In process.

Marsh, Ray. Tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry and Fern Ingersoll. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library University of California. In process.

McCaffrey, Joseph E. Tape-recorded interview in 1964 by Elwood R. Maunder. Forest History Society. Santa Cruz, California. In process.

Roberts, Paul. "Forest Service, Issues and Legislation to 1951." Tape-recorded interview in 1965 by Amelia Roberts Fry. Regional Oral History Office Bancroft Library University of California. In process.

INDEX