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tape recorded interviews on

THE HISTORY OF FOREST POLICY, 1900-1950

1. Clepper, Henry, Executive Secretary, Society of American Foresters.

2. Dana, Samuel T., Dean, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan


4. Granger, Christopher, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, national forest administration.

5. Hall, R. Clifford, Director, Forest Taxation Inquiry.

6. Hartzog, George B., Director, National Park Service.

7. Hornaday, Fred, Executive Vice-president of American Forestry Association; and Pomeroy, Kenneth, Chief Forester for A.F.A.

8. Kotok, E. I., Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, state and private forestry; research.


10. Marsh, Raymond, Assistant Chief of the U. S. Forest Service under Earle Clapp.

11. Peirce, Earl, Chief, Division of State Cooperation, USFS.

12. Ringland, Arthur, Regional Forester, Region 3; Executive Secretary of National Conference on Outdoor Recreation; founder of CARE.

13. Roberts, Paul, Director, Prairie States Forestry Projects;

14. Shepard, Harold B., in charge of Insurance Study, conducted by the Northeastern Experiment Station with Yale University.

15. Sieker, John H., Chief of Division of Recreation and Lands.

DESCRIPTION OF SERIES

Interviews: A Documentation of the Development of the U.S. Forest Service 1900-1950

This Resources for the Future interview series on the birth and development of the Forest Service began as a sudden disturbance in the ever-active brain of Ed I. Kotok in early 1964. One wintry day in early 1964, as we were putting away the tape recorder after one of our last sessions together, I mentioned casually that I would not be in the Bay Area for the summer: I had to go East.

Ed's eyebrows shot up. It was obvious that a final piece had fallen into place in a mental jigsaw that he had been carrying around for some time. He said that there were quite a few of his retired colleagues still in Washington, D.C., some of whom were the original "Pinchot boys." If only, he mused, the Oral History Office could find financing for an entire series on the Forest Service, maybe from a foundation like Resources for the Future.

Henry Vaux, then Dean of the School of Forestry at Berkeley, was the logical one to turn to. He gave advice and counsel on a priority system for selecting the men to interview. From deep in his perspective of specialized knowledge of forest policy, he saw the opportunity to preserve information that would otherwise be permanently lost.* At best, the tape-recorded memoirs could reveal, more frankly than annual reports and official letters, some of the political and economic facts of life that influenced the development of policy in the agency. The actual decision-making process, told first-hand and linked with the official rationales and actions on particular issues, could be useful in appraising contemporary policy questions and their multiple alternatives. Today, as in 1905, forest policy is a field where special interest pressures are in a state of varying equilibrium with the public interest. To see the policies and decisions of the past materialize, to witness through the administrators' eyes the expected or (more often) the surprising effect of those actions in the past - such a visible continuum could provide a depth of experience for those who are presently wrestling with the economic and political disequalibrums of resource management.

Horace Albright, a veteran interviewee of oral history operations, lent his encouragement to us and probably his enthusiasm to his friends on the board of Resources for the Future. We contacted three top-priority potential interviewees to see if they were willing to indulge us in our tape recording scheme, and we received a yes, a no, and a maybe. This changed to two yeses and, in place of the no, a substitute interviewee equally as valuable. By late spring, a modest grant to the Oral History Office marked the beginning of the series, Henry Vaux agreed to be Principle Investigator, and we were off.

* See appendix, Letter from Vaux to Fry, March 20, 1964.
Structure of the Series

The series, with a working title of "The History of Forest Service Policy, 1900-1950", began and ended as a multiple use project. Its major aim was to provide tape-recorded interviews with men in the Forest Service who during most of the half-century had been in policy-making positions. The series also served as a pilot attempt to try the relatively new technique of oral history as a method of gathering primary information within a specific subject field (one which might be defined here as the origins, operations, and effects of policy in public administration). The method, in turn, was hung on the superstructure of a list of retirees who were considered to be able to contribute the most to that subject.

Each major interview contains the standard stock of questions on Service-wide controversies of the past: the attempts to reorganize the conservation agencies - specifically, to transfer the Forest Service out of the Department of Agriculture; the efforts to get passage of federal legislation that would have regulated timber management on private lands; the competition with other agencies and with private owners for land acquisition determinations; on-going issues, such as competing land uses like mining or grazing, which often reflected years of patient negotiation with and bearing up under the pressures of well-organized special interest groups.

Each interview covers as well topics that are unique to that particular person's experiences, so that tracing "policy in its origins, operations, and effects," necessitated a detective job to discover, before an interview took place, those policy questions with which the particular individual had had experience. It was here that an interviewee's own contemporaries frequently gave guidance and counsel; advice was also provided by academic specialists in forest economics, recreation, fire control, silviculture, and so on.

Given questions on the same subjects, the interviewees sometimes speak to them from contrasting points of view, and thereby provide a critique of inner validity for the series. For instance, while Lee Kneipp and Ed Crafts comment on the informal power in Congress of the Forest Service's widespread constituency, other men (such as Ed Kotok) who actually had been in the field and involved in local public relations verify how the system worked.

The structure of an oral history series depends on many factors beyond the control of the oral historian: the health of the interviewee, his willingness to interview, and how much he can or will say about his career. The fluid state of our interview list caused our cup to runneth over more than once with more interviewees than we could add to our original list of three. Twice the list was enlarged - and fortunately funded further by Resources for the Future. The phenomenon of expansion was due largely to the tendencies of a few memoirists (especially Christopher Granger, Lee Kneipp, and Raymond Marsh) to touch lightly on events in which he had only slight involvement, then refer the interviewer to the man who could tell the whole story from a leader's eye view. The result is that some of the interviews on the accompanying list are one-subject, supplemental manuscripts.
Results

One will find more comprehensive and general information in the longer interviews of Christopher Granger (who was the head of timber management), Ed I. Kotok (Research; state and private forestry), Leon F. Kneipp (land acquisition and management), Arthur Ringland (field activities in setting up the new forests under Gifford Pinchot), Tom Gill (international forestry), Ed Crafts (Congressional relations), and Samuel T. Dana (Research; forestry education), the latter interviewed in cooperation with Elwood Maunder of the Forest History Society. Earle Clapp (research, Acting Chief), shunned the tape-recorder and is currently proof-reading his own written account of his career, a manuscript that will be deposited in Bancroft Library along with the other interviews.

The single subject interviews consist of Paul Roberts on the shelter belt project of the New Deal; R. Clifford Hall's account of the Forest Taxation Inquiry, coupled with H.B. Shepard's story of the Insurance Study. A view from without is provided by Henry Clepper of the Society of American Foresters and Fred Hornaday and Kenneth Pomeroy of the American Forestry Association - a trio who provide a fitting introduction to the series for the reader. George B. Hartzog, Director of the National Parks, comments on the relationship of the two agencies; Earle Pelrce gives a first-hand account of the first time the Forest Service stepped in as principal agent in salvage operations following a disastrous blow-down on both state and private timberlands. John Sieker and Lloyd Swift both contributed a telling picture of their respective divisions of recreation and wildlife management. Without these shorter, from-the-horses' mouth accounts, the series would have sacrificed some of its validity. There are of course still other leaders who can give valuable historic information on policy development, men who perhaps can be included in the Forest Service's current efforts to further document its own Service history.

With a backward glance at the project, one can say that the basic objective of tape-recording, transcribing, and editing interviews with top men in the Forest Service was realized. The question of quality and value of the interviews must be decided later, for the prime value will be measured by the amount of unique material scholars use: the candid evaluations of leaders by other leaders, the reasons behind decisions, and the human reflections of those in authority; how they talked in conversation, how they developed trends of thought and responded to questions that at times were neutral, at other times challenging. The value of the series also depends on how many leads lie in the pages of the transcripts - clues and references that a researcher might otherwise never connect in his mind or in the papers and reports he reads.

Since this series was built with tentative hopes that in the end it could justify itself both as a readable series of historical manuscripts and as a valuable source of easily retrievable, primary material, a master index of uniform entries from each volume was developed after the transcripts came out of the typewriter and landed on the editor's desk. Dr. Henry Vaux helped in setting up the broad areas of subjects to be included, and as entries were
added, the Forest History Society at Yale became interested. At present the development of the index is a cooperative enterprise between the Oral History Office, the Forest History Society, and the U.S. Forest Service. A master index of uniform headings from each volume is available at the Oral History Office and at the Forest History Society.

By-products

One frequently finds that the oral history process is a catalytic agent in the world of research. First, it stimulates the collection of personal papers and pictures which, while valuable during the interview in developing outlines and chronology, are later deposited either with the transcript in Bancroft Library or with related papers in another repository.

Another happy by-product comes from the more literate who are motivated by the interview to do further research and writing for publication. Thus, Paul Roberts is currently writing an entire book, complete with all the documentation he can locate, on the shelter belt, its whys and hows. Ray Marsh is meticulously combining both writing and recording in a painstaking, chapter-by-chapter memoir which will cover his earliest reconnaissance days, the administrative posts in New Mexico, the fledgling research branch, and his work with Congress; his stories of those earliest years have already appeared in American Forests. Tom Gill, fortunately frustrated by the brevity of the interviews, which were condensed into the short travel schedule of the interviewer, is writing a more comprehensive treatise that will no doubt be unique in this or any other forest history: Tom Gill on Gill and international forestry.

Also, there is the self-perpetuation phenomenon--oral history begetting more oral history. The interview with National Park Director George Hartzog has led to serious efforts on the part of the Park Service to establish a regular annual interview with the Director--not necessarily for publication. Also under consideration is a Service-wide plan for oral history interviews of all its major leaders, which could serve as a continuation of the series conducted by Herbert Evison in the early 1960's.

Ed Kotok did not live to see the finished series. Just as Lee Kneipp never saw his finished manuscript, and Chris Granger's final agreement, covering the use of his manuscript, was found still unmailed on his desk after his death. All other contributors, however, were able to devote hundreds of man hours to the reading, correcting, and approving process required in finishing a manuscript. Although Ed did not get to read and approve his own transcript, all who knew him will agree that the series stands as one more symbol of his propensity for plunging in where few have tread before.

(Mrs.) Amelia K. Fry
Interviewer - Editor
Mrs. Amelia R. Fry  
Regional Cultural History Project  
436 General Library  
Campus

Dear Mrs. Fry:

The significance of the proposed project for securing information from certain selected people long associated with the development of the U.S. Forest Service rests on two facts. On the one hand, there are a small number of men still alive whose personal experience and memory covers virtually the entire history of the growth and development of the Forest Service since 1905. If we are to secure the best possible insights and understanding of the history of the Forest Service as a conservation agency the recollections and mature viewpoints of these men who were associated with the Service throughout their careers would provide unique and invaluable source materials. The time remaining during which this information could be collected is obviously limited. A second justification is found in the fact that to date there has been no comprehensive historical evaluation of the role of the Forest Service as a conservation agency.

Ise has published a critical history of National Park policy under the sponsorship of Resources for the Future which serves as an initial evaluation of the National Park Service. About 1920 Ise published a study on forest policy but that is obviously now confined to only a very small part of the significant history. A series of views such as are suggested in the present proposal could provide both new source material and the inspiration for a critical historical evaluation of the Forest Service.

The results would be of the greatest importance to the field of forest policy. The Forest Service pioneered both the articulation and the implementation of the concepts of sustained yield and multiple use as policies for natural resource management in the U.S. It instituted numerous innovations in the organization and administration of programs of handling federally owned resources. It developed on a large scale new techniques for cooperation with state and local units of government in such matters as fire protection and landowner education. It pioneered in a number of respects in the development of research as a functioning guide to operational policy of the government. Each of the contributions just enumerated are of the greatest possible significance for forest policy and for important implications going far beyond the natural resources field. The project here proposed would throw much light on the way in which each of the innovations noted above developed and would contribute greatly to our understanding of them.

Very sincerely yours,

Henry J. Vaux  
Dean
INTRODUCTION

Policy within the U.S. Forest Service has come to be decided within the framework of "multiple use" of the land and resources on the forests. But the diversity in the uses has by no means been a static thing over the years, for where there is more than one use, there is competition for use. While Gifford Pinchot solidly established the policy of wise utilization of the trees themselves back in 1905, other forest resources, such as recreation and wildlife, were longer in arriving at that point of secure recognition that brought a proportionate share of staff, budget, and officially-sanctioned programs.

The two interviews here-- with John Sieker, Forest Service Recreation and Land Uses Chief, and Lloyd Swift, Wildlife Chief-- span the period when both areas of responsibility grew from nebulous entities, endowed with little more than hope, to full-fledged divisions. Each man gives a retrospective glance at the years behind him-- one retired the week of the interview, the other was a two-month retiree-- and offers a few words of personal appraisal on the problems inherent in an agency with more than one natural resource under its jurisdiction.

Chris Granger, Tom Gill, and Leon Kneipp each had urged that I interview these two Division directors in the Forest Service series. On relatively short notice, each consented to tape-record, and each insisted on braving the stifling July weather to come to the Resources for the Future building for the interview. There, in the comfortable office borrowed from Marion Clawson-- who was away at the time-- we discussed the long sweep of the development of each Division.

Later, each man reviewed the transcript for corrections and additions before it was finally typed, Mr. Sieker in his home in Arlington, Virginia, and Mr. Swift in San Francisco during a three-day wilderness conference.

Lloyd Swift's family and background contain rich California history, and Tom Gill advised me that his friend is a "good writer"-- even in his forest ranger days he wrote editorials on wildlife that were published in book form. I put gentle pressure on the wildlife man to write a full historical account of his family's migration to California and of his own years as student and forest ranger there. He concurred in this idea, but Lloyd Swift is an active retiree. In his most recent letter (June 13, 1968) he writes, "There is no progress to report-- but I can report on an exciting trip to South America, including time on the Galapagos Islands. Now I am off to Montana to visit wilderness country and catch a few trout." He also was Executive Secretary of The World Wildlife Fund from 1963 to 1966, and maintains a lively consultancy in wildlife matters.

His commitment to creating a viable wildlife management program within the Forest Service met with obstacles both inside and outside the
Service. Inside, it even yet has to share a berth with Range Management in the West. Outside, it sometimes has to fight against the jurisdictional jealousies of the state fish and game commissions. The Divisions' relatively low status in the Service led Tom Gill to admonish me, prior to the interview, to "get Swift's slant that foresters have had and lost their opportunity to be wildlife managers." This gloomy slant, however, does not penetrate the interview with Swift, although he admits, "I had always hoped, and I still hope, that wildlife will stand on its own feet throughout the Forest Service. It does in the Chief's Office." [p. 11]

The Division of Recreation is currently the success baby of the Forest Service, one whose gargantuan growth comes from the pressure of the post-World War II travel explosion that is still escalating. In the ten years after 1953, visits to national forests soared from 40 million to over 110 million annually. In California alone, this resulted in a fiscal leap from $60,700 a year to over $3,300,000 for recreation. Mr. Sieker's career after World War II carried the responsibility--and opportunity--for the "Operation Outdoors" program of the Forest Service. Ending in 1962, it jumped the recreation and land use budget from about two million dollars a year to $65 million for five years. Its immediate successor, the Development Program, was asking $750,000,000 for ten years at the time of the interview.

These affluent days contrast sharply to the 1920's, which are described in a copy of a letter that National Park retiree Herbert Evison sent to Forest History Society head Elwood Maunder this year, giving a vivid picture of the opposition to recreation in Forest Service at the time when young Lloyd Swift was contemplating taking his Forest Service Entrance examination:

"I happened to be present at the organization meeting of the National Conference on State Parks in 1921, and it was at my suggestion, offered to the presiding officer at a morning session...that Arthur H. Carhart was called upon to tell about Forest Service recreational activities. This aroused the famous National Parks Director Stephen Mather protest against the Forest Service engaging in any such activity, which he considered the prerogative of the Park Service at the Federal level. Though I was at the meeting largely at the instance of Mr. Mather, I was also a member of the five-person resolutions committee which brought in a report approving the expanding use of public forests for recreation.

"One of the amusing anomalies of that situation was that at that time there were a lot of Forest Service veterans whose attitude wasn't much different from Mather's; men who considered that the Forest Service was neglecting its real purpose in spending money and man hours on recreation..."
Sieker saw the multiple use policy crystallized by virtue of Congressional action in the Multiple Use Act of 1960 and the climactic last months of the Wilderness Act controversy. He worked with colleagues and the American Forestry Association in getting through a revision of the vexations of the 1872 mining law. In short, Sieker's leadership of the Division of Recreation and Land Uses covers a period of redefinition and growth of recreation as a high priority forest use.

Amelia Fry
Interviewer - Editor
1968
CONTENTS

PREFACE i
INTRODUCTION ix

SECTION I. John H. Sieker: Recreation Policy and Administration in the U.S. Forest Service

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS 1
MULTIPLE USE CONCEPT 6
RECREATION LAND USE IN THE FOREST SERVICE 9
WILDERNESS AREAS 13
RECREATION SURVEY 23
NATIONAL PARKS: SINGLE USE VS. MULTIPLE USE 27
THE MULTIPLE USE MINING CLAIM 34
DEVELOPMENT OF RECREATION POLICY 40
PARTIAL INDEX 48

SECTION II. Lloyd Swift: Wildlife Policy and Administration in the U.S. Forest Service

GAME PROTECTION POLICY 1
EVOLUTION OF A MANAGEMENT POLICY: STATE VS. FEDERAL 4
WILDLIFE AS A PART OF RANGE MANAGEMENT 10
PUBLIC SUPPORT 13
NATIONAL PARK AND NATIONAL FORESTS WILDLIFE 16
RESEARCH 18
POWER RESERVOIRS 21
FOREST SERVICE CHIEFS 25
PARTIAL INDEX 28
SECTION ONE

John H. Sieker: Recreation Policy and Administration in the U. S. Forestry Service
All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between the Regents of the University of California and John H. Sieker. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the Director of The Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to the Regional Oral History Office, 486 Library, and should include identification of the specific passages to be quoted, anticipated use of the passages, and identification of the user. The legal agreement with John H. Sieker requires that he be notified of the request and allowed thirty days in which to respond.
THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Fry: When you first entered the Forest Service in 1926, what were you doing?

Sieker: I started in like almost everybody else, as an assistant ranger and did some timber sale work and some timber survey work. I spent time on the Washakie out in Wyoming. And then I spent the winter cruising timber in Minnesota. Then I got a ranger district and that is the basic job. I was the forest ranger on two different districts for about four years. Then I became an assistant forest supervisor on another forest and then a forest supervisor in Wyoming. And then I came here to the Washington office.

Fry: So you were in Wyoming as forest supervisor.


Fry: And you took his place immediately?

Sieker: After about a year I was made Director of the Division of Recreation and Land Use.

Fry: Were you at Wyoming during the Jackson Hole controversy?

Sieker: Yes. But I had nothing to do with that because that was on a different national forest, even in a different Region. You see, the Continental
Sieker: Divide is the regional boundary between the Denver region, which I was in, and the Ogden region, which Jackson Hole is in. So I know nothing about the controversy except second hand.

Fry: Let's start, then, with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Sieker: The Forest Service had practically no appropriation for recreation in the early thirties. We didn't really recognize much of the problem or much of the need. And many people felt, "These people that come to the forests are a damn nuisance. All they do is start fires and leave a mess and we wish they wouldn't come." But because they were so few compared to the very large area, they did not create too much problem. The only place where this was not true was in California. There, especially in Southern California where we have relatively small amounts of national forest land for a very large population, the impact was greater. The California region did more in the recreation field before the C.C.C. than anybody else. But in general, our recreation effort, before the early '30s, consisted of a few primitive-type camp grounds and picnic areas and the issuance of permits for summer homes and resorts. Of course, we didn't have the highway system we have now. The great touring public were not there in those days. And anyone who would have attempted to foresee the present auto-
Sieker: mobile and highway situation would have had to have had a crystal ball. You can foresee just so far and that's all. Except in California and perhaps a few other places there was no recreation demand.

The C.C.C. came, we had an opportunity, and we took it to build some good recreation sites. We hired landscape architects to make plans. A great deal was done and a lot of things built. At first people said, "This is something nice to do. We'll put some boys to work and so forth." And the next thing we knew people came out and used the forests more and more.

Fry: You were really right on the ground with the C.C.C.s.

Sieker: Yes.

Fry: And did you have the benefit of any advance planning before the C.C.C. hit?

Sieker: I'd say no, although Dr. Meinecke was hired by the Chief of the Forest Service sometime before that to go around and make some general plans of what should a Forest Service camp ground and picnic area look like. Dr. Meinecke really contributed quite a bit. He wrote a little booklet in which he outlined some basic principles of recreation areas. The Forest Service had some pretty sound principles of recreation management. The basic principle was that public use
Sieker: should have priority over private use. Another was that forests should provide forest type recreation as opposed to city park type recreation. Then there was the principle that we should preserve the forest environment by making our facilities rustic and unobtrusive. This led to an extreme in the C.C.C. days. We built a lot of things out of wood in attempts to make them rustic, and they didn't last. This was also complicated by the fact that we were supposed to, in those days, spend little money for materials that could be made natively by the C.C.Cs. You could spend any amount sending crews out to cut down timber, but you couldn't spend much money to give it preservative treatment. You had little money to buy concrete to make things permanent. In those days the thing was do it by hand and put people to work rather than buy materials. So the Park Service as well as the Forest Service fell into the habit of using wood in places where wood should never have been used — and untreated wood at that.

Well, the C.C.C. built very fine camp and picnic grounds all over the United States. And for the first and only time the Forest Service had a capacity for public recreation use which exceeded the demand. When the C.C.C. ended, with the war, we had enough room for all visitors and some to spare, which is the way it should be. The only way in which areas can be given periodic rest periods to recover from heavy use.
Fry: Has it been that way since?

Sieker: It's never been that way since. And it isn't today, although we're making progress today. We're still shy by about -40% of meeting the demand in the way that the demand should be met. (This statement made as of 1964). People are using areas and crowding in between spaces, thereby damaging the site, cover, and everything else.
MULTIPLE USE CONCEPT

Fry: Was there a problem in working in your use for recreation with the multiple use policy since, I suppose, timber management and conservation of the major resource involved had to come first?

Sieker: No, I don't think so. This is getting into a difficult field. The Forest Service has always preached and practiced multiple use. When you talk multiple use you can't say, as you just did, the timber comes first. You shouldn't say it anyway. If you're talking about multiple use, you're saying that the most important thing from a public standpoint comes first. That may be timber in one area, recreation in another area, range in another area, or water production in another area.

Fry: From the standpoint of national policy, where you have to coordinate the priority of usage in each area, than do you try to put timber first?

Sieker: No. We put first what should be first, whatever that may be. It depends on the area. Sure, up in the Pacific Northwest and down in the South there are tracts of National Forest land which anybody would say are of such quality for growing timber that growing timber on those tracts is its highest public purpose.

Fry: No matter how near the large cities are.
Sieker: Well, you have to consider all those things—timber growing potential, recreation potential, and all of its other potentials. And then you put it to the use which serves its highest purpose.

Fry: Is this decision largely influenced by the regional forester?

Sieker: No, this is the chief's decision. Now it's also a law decision. We now have the Multiple Use Act.

Fry: The information from the regional forester is the thing that influences the chief's decision, is that right?

Sieker: No. The chief puts out the decision that we will follow the principles of multiple use.

In this Multiple Use Act of 1960 the Congress said, "The Secretary of Agriculture shall manage the forest for multiple use and sustained yield." This is a very short act and a very well-worded act. And even though it was only enacted in 1960, it simply enacted what the policy of the Forest Service was for many years.

Fry: This has been the policy ever since you've been in, this is my impression.

Sieker: Yes, that's right. It's been the policy ever since Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Wilson told the Chief of the Forest Service to manage the forest for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.
Fry: I suppose the main purpose of getting this enacted as a legislative measure was to take it out of the decision-making area of the chief, or to take it out of the administrative level.

Sieker: No. The main reason was that they wanted Congressional recognition of a policy that was being followed. And the second reason was that they wanted to undo the arguments of some of the commercial interests all over the country that the basic acts which mentioned only water and timber didn't permit us to do recreation and range and those things. In 1897 and 1911 acts didn't forbid recreation, range management, or wildlife management; but because they only mentioned water and timber some narrow-minded people said the Forest Service was violating the law by spending money and time on recreation. We didn't believe that. And we didn't pay much attention to it. But it was always brought up again and again. It was even brought up in some of our appropriation hearings. So therefore it was finally decided that something had to be done about this, we had to get Congress to enact the Multiple Use Act. I don't think this took very long. It seems to me it went through in about three years. And it, in effect, was just legislating past policy.
RECREATION LAND USE IN THE FOREST SERVICE

Fry: Your area of recreation was the one under most dispute, I suppose.

Sieker: It was under a lot of dispute because we were beginning to spend sizable sums for it, and the demand was growing, and it was quite obvious that much more would have to be spent.

Fry: After 1960 there has been a big leap in expenditures on recreation, hasn't there?

Sieker: Yes, there has.

Fry: Personnel for this has jumped, too.

Sieker: Oh yes. After the C.C.C. put us in good shape, along came the war. And for four or five years recreation use, of course, dropped precipitously because of tire rationing and people thinking of other things. Nobody went to the forests. We had no money for maintenance. From about 18,000,000 visitors in 1941, the use dropped down to 4 or 5,000,000 again. But in 1946 the use came right back to 18,000,000. And the facilities that the C.C.C. had put in had gone pretty much without adequate maintenance for those five years. And a lot of the wooden structures had deteriorated. Instead of having a surplus of facilities, we had just about enough. And then, after the war, Congress did not appropriate nearly sufficient funds to do what needed doing. We were on an almost strictly maintenance basis and not enough
Sieker: to maintain. By 1955, in ten years, the use had tripled. The facilities had stayed about the same -- had deteriorated in fact -- and we once again had a 70% deficit in the supply.

Then in 1955 we started Operation Outdoors. That was the first real plan that the Forest Service made to set forth what the recreation situation was and what was needed. And, at that time, we predicted that in five years the recreation use would be 66,000,000. And that was called by a great many people a rather outrageously optimistic prediction. As a matter of fact when 1962 came along, instead of having 66,000,000 visits, we had 100,000,000 visits.

Marion Clawson was right in the middle of this whole controversy as to how fast should we project recreation use. The Park Service projections of recreation use were also coming out at that time and they were low too. Marion was one of the people who held out for higher projections. And he was right.

Fry: I'm wondering about your support on the Hill. Could you give me a picture of the more valuable members of the appropriations subcommittees and others who were helpful?

Sieker: It's awfully hard to do that and be accurate about it. We came out with Operation Outdoors and we set forth a program that went to Congress showing that $85,000,000 was needed for the next five years. We never got the whole $85,000,000 in five years, but we got about $65,000,000 of it in five years.
Sieker: Congress by then recognized the problem. And even though they didn't go as far as we wanted them to go, they did much better than ever before. Our appropriations jumped from three and four million to nine and ten million a year.

Fry: Did the general public help you any?

Sieker: The general public helped a great deal. A lot of letters were written and a lot of organizations supported Operation Outdoors. And, of course, it was also helped by the fact that at the same time the Park Service was coming out with Mission 66, which got much more publicity and was a much bigger program than ours. But the fact that the same appropriations committee worked on Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors was a help to us. The $65,000,000 in five years was a tremendous difference from two and three million a year.

Operation Outdoors ended officially in 1962. It then just merged into the Development Program for National Forests. In the Development Program for the National Forests, which is a ten-year program, we are asking for $750,000,000 for the next ten years for recreation. Whereas we asked for $85,000,000 in five years, we're now asking for $750,000,000 in ten years. This is quite a difference! And the recreation section of the development program is only one section of the whole multiple use program. The Development Program for the National Forests was submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress.
Sieker: It's an official document, otherwise we couldn't publish budget figures. You publish only what's in the President's budget.
WILDERNESS AREAS

Fry: Has the policy to set aside wilderness areas always been a part of the over-all program of the system or has it been separate?

Sieker: Yes. There were some far-sighted men, among them Aldo Leopold. He was one of the first men to grasp the idea that certain sizable tracts of land should be kept in a primitive condition. He was instrumental in setting up the first Forest Service primitive area on the Gila National Forest in New Mexico, in 1926.

He was followed by Bob Marshall who agreed with Leopold and took up where he left off. Bob Marshall was instrumental in conducting our first recreation study in 1937. And the results of that were written up in several forms. That was the first time the Forest Service ever had a large group of people brought together to formulate policies. In 1937 we had a recreation conference in Washington, which formalized many of the policies that had just kind of appeared before the C.C.C.

Fry: Were you in on that?

Sieker: I was not. I was still in the field.

Fry: That also covered, I guess, a lot of the questions that had come up as a result of C.C.C.

Sieker: Yes.

Fry: Are wilderness areas in the national forests defined
Fry: about the same way as they would be in the Department of the Interior?

Sieker: The Department of Interior doesn't have any "wilderness" areas. The Forest Service is the only agency that has recognized and defined "wilderness," "wild" and "primitive" areas. The national parks have such areas but they don't recognize them by those names. They haven't put definite boundaries around them either.

Fry: They're just the back part of the national parks.

Sieker: That's right. Bob Marshall was instrumental in getting a lot of these areas set up -- primitive areas.

Fry: This guarantees such an area against what kind of usage?

Sieker: This guarantees it against timber cutting, roads, special uses for summer homes or resorts -- any development.

Fry: Mining?

Sieker: No, unfortunately not. We have no control over mining in the West. Under the United States mining laws, any individual has a right to go out and file a claim on national forest land, if he can comply with the very easy requirements of the mining laws. This is one of the things that we don't like.

Anyway, Bob Marshall got all of these areas established. He then worked on new regulations and these were finally promulgated by the Secretary of
Sieker: Agriculture in 1939. Those are the present Regulations U-1 and U-2. They've been modified somewhat since then, but not basically.

Fry: What did this new emergence of recreation use cause in the training of rangers and so forth? It took a different sort of outlook, didn't it?

Sieker: That's right, it did. The first thing it did was result in the hiring of many landscape architects. The second thing was a recognition of special staff men in recreation in the regional offices, and then later on the forests, and then later on the ranger districts. And now we have a complete organization from Washington through the regions through the forests of men with special interests and special training in recreation management as a part of multiple use.

Fry: This must have been organized, then, under you.

Sieker: It all happened since the war. The personnel, too, from the C.C.C. that was built up in recreation, left during the war. But this quickly started up again. And since the war we've gradually built up, I think, a very competent organization to take care of the recreation use -- the kind of use that we want to give the people of the United States, that we think is appropriate to the forests.

Fry: As I gather it, most of the opposition to this was outside of the Forest Service. From the time that you know anything about this, was there any opposition inside the Forest Service?
Sieker: No real opposition except what you'd find in any organization. There's always some opposition to change and new emphasis.

Fry: But the philosophy of giving the people lands for recreation was pretty well established?

Sieker: Well, the minute you did that, you took some land that somebody wanted for something else. I mean, this is a kind of internal thing that you would find in any organization.

Fry: Yes I'm sure. The problem of opposition outside of it, as I get the picture now, was largely by people who wanted to be sure that you continued to produce timber for lumber manufacturers, is that right?

Sieker: Well, nobody ever had any idea of not doing this.

Fry: But there might have been a fear on the part of these people. Did this produce any opposition that you had to worry about?

Sieker: Actually, the only effective opposition that you got was the fact that no organization has ever got enough people and enough money to do everything it wants to do. We had an organization of rangers, assistant rangers, forest supervisors, and staff men in regional offices. There was much more work to be done on the natural forests than those people could possibly do. Now here's where your priorities come in. The ranger, even if he works overtime, can only do so much. How
Sieker: much of his time should he spend on timber and how much should he spend on recreation? This has always been a difficult thing to decide and determine. This is the way that whatever opposition there was made itself felt.

And some individuals in a decentralized organization like ours, where the regional foresters have a lot of independent authority, some of them held back the recreation work. In other cases they pushed it. And this varied from place to place. And the supervisor, even under the same regional forester, would push it and another one would hold it back. I don't know how you can really say much about those things.

Fry: The main thing, I suppose, outside the Forest Service was that some of the lay conservation organizations that usually furnish a modicum of support and pressure on the proper Congressmen, were split as to whether recreation should be the function of the Interior Department or of the Forest Service inside the Department of Agriculture. Was this much of a bother?

Sieker: Well, all through this picture comes that old feeling of some people that the national forests should have been in the Department of Interior. They were there originally, as you know. Gifford Pinchot got them into the Dept. of Agriculture. Secty. Ickes darn near got them back. Nothing was ever quite so close. And that old idea has never completely died, although I guess it's about as dead now as it has ever been.
Fry: Did it come up again in the consideration of the wilderness area bill?

Sieker: No. To get back to wilderness, we now have, I think, a most remarkable system of wilderness areas. They cover fourteen and a half million acres. There are eighty-eight areas. They're scattered all through the western states, and there's one in Minnesota, one in New Hampshire, and two in North Carolina -- they are the only ones in the East and they're comparatively very small. One of the ones in North Carolina is 6,000 acres and the other is about 15,000 acres. The one in Minnesota is about 1,000,000 acres; that is canoe water. These areas we have established and protected and managed as "wilderness," with the help and criticism of three principal organizations: the Wilderness Society here in Washington, which Bob Marshall founded. He not only founded it, he endowed it when leaving. He left to the Wilderness Society a sizable fortune when he died in 1939. It was his endowment that really got it started. Then there is the Sierra Club and all its affiliates, the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs and so forth; and the Izaak Walton League. Those three organizations have sponsored "wilderness," have encouraged the Forest Service, and have criticized the Forest Service for not going far enough or fast enough.

Fry: I wonder how these organizations really operate.
Sieker: Our regulations require that when we establish a "wilderness" we have a public hearing. And we hold these public hearings. And the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, and the Izaak Walton League are always there to testify. They are never against the establishment of "wilderness" areas. They will often say, "what the Forest Service is doing is fine, but it ought to be half again as big." And this, of course, helps us in that the lumber people and the commercial outfits are often opposed to the "wilderness." So at least we have groups that are for as well as against.

Fry: And they're rather effective against the lumber manufacturers' associations?

Sieker: Yes they are. The lumber manufacturers and the miners are particularly against "wilderness." The United States Chamber of Commerce was a very firm enemy of "wilderness" until recently. In the last two or three years they've been more or less neutral, I think.

Fry: Why have they become neutral?

Sieker: Well I think it was the feeling of one particular man, who retired, who was opposed to "wilderness." They used to write letters and always object to every "wilderness" proposal, almost just on principle. Just the same as the Sierra Club was in favor of it on principle, whether they knew anything about it or not. But we haven't heard from the U.S. Chamber in the last few years, either for or against. The local chambers of commerce are kind of divided.
Sieker: In some cases they go with the miners and in other cases they favor the "wilderness."

Fry: Do you remember what California's chamber does usually?

Sieker: I wouldn't want to say, I don't really remember.

Fry: The reason I asked was that it used to have a very strong conservation department.

Sieker: Yes, I know they did. I used to know a man named Carpenter in that chamber several years ago; he isn't there any more, and they certainly have not always been against or always for.

Then, of course, the last big battle has been the wilderness bill. That battle isn't over yet (July '64). The Senate twice has passed a good wilderness bill. The House never has passed a good one.

Fry: Are these wilderness bills largely the result of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report?

Sieker: No. I don't think the O.R.R.R.C. had a thing to do with "wilderness."

Fry: I wanted to ask you if you had anything to do with O.R.R.R.C.?

Sieker: Only in an advisory capacity.

* The Wilderness Act was passed September 3, 1964.
Fry: Did you feel that what it recommended as an overall plan for recreation took adequate recognition of the role of the Forest Service?

Sieker: Oh I think so. I was, personally, a little disappointed in the final plan and publication, as were a great many other people. But I recognized that with the membership that they had -- the Congressional membership and the members of the Commission -- it was an almost impossible job to get anything too specific, unless you wanted to have minority reports, which Mr. Rockefeller did not want to have. I think, probably, he got as good a report out of that as was humanly possible with that kind of a group of people. Those of us who work with recreation were a little disappointed that the thing was rather nebulous in places, and that it didn't come to grips with some of the real problems. But, as I say, it certainly stimulated an interest. It was as a result of their recommendation that we have the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Some people will wonder what it's going to do. But this remains to be seen.

Fry: Is it headed up by a man from the Forest Service?

Sieker: Yes, Mr. Ed Crafts.

Fry: Is it given a lot of leeway?

Sieker: It's given a great deal of leeway. It hasn't been given the funds it needs yet. And it has quite a bit of opposition, of course, too.
Fry: That's not in Agriculture, is it?

Sieker: No, it's in Interior.

Fry: But not in National Forests?

Sieker: No, it's a separate bureau. It reports directly to the Secretary of the Interior.

Fry: Is there any feeling that this might enlarge and eventually take in all the recreation lands everywhere?

Sieker: According to its present charter and the legislation establishing it, it can't. But some people worry whether it will grow into that sometime, which I presume would be violently opposed by both the Park Service and the Forest Service, if it ever happened.
RECREATION SURVEY

Sieker: The Recreation Survey is a very important part of this whole thing. We started out in 1958 to make the first detailed inventory of recreation resources in the National Forests. And it was finished and is now being used to prepare the recreation plans for each national forest. And this inventory is very complete. It was based on the premise that we had to find, if possible, enough suitable land to meet the projected needs for the year 2,000. And in most places we were able to do so. That's just suitable land, that isn't development. Suitable terrain is there to meet the projected demands to the year 2000, except in a few isolated instances; Southern California is one of them.

When you get ten or twelve million people around Los Angeles, with only about three National Forests close by, and they're small, you've got an impossible situation. But there are methods in which this can work out. One way is to crowd things a little more. You're going to have to make a choice, either turn people away down there or have eight or ten camp sites per acre, instead of four which is our standard. And the reason we say this can be done is because the Park Service actually uses eight or ten, while we use four. Now when you go from four to eight or ten per acre you've multiplied your capacity by two and a half right there. And if we did that down in those forests we could meet the demand for picnicking,
Sieker: for instance. Other things, like winter sports, you can't. Have you by any chance heard the news regarding San Gorgonio?

Fry: Not regarding winter sports, no.

Sieker: Well, San Gorgonio was one of our biggest battles and one of the most difficult land use decisions we had. And it isn't resolved. (July, 1964).*

Fry: Do you mean whether to put in a ski resort?

Sieker: Yes.

Fry: Is it a private resort?

Sieker: No. It's National Forest land in a "wilderness." This one miserable mountain just happens to be the central feature and most important part of a "wild" area. It also is the best ski terrain within a one day's round trip to Los Angeles. We have said, it's in a "wild" area and it must not be touched. But the local people differ. Of course, the Sierra Club says the Forest Service is right, leave it wild. You've got to weigh these things. Which is the highest use of that land? The Congress has gotten into this, too. In the latest Wilderness Bill,

*With passage of the Wilderness Act in September, 1964, San Gorgonio was designated by Congress as a wild area, unsuitable for development as a ski resort.
Sieker: which is before the House right now, the committee wrote in there that San Gorgonio was out of the "wilderness" and it would be developed for skiing.

Fry: How much weight do you usually give to the demands of local people? Does it depend on how much pressure they are bringing to bear on local congressmen?

Sieker: Well, we don't admit that. Supposing you ask some Senator the same question. It's the same thing. Of course, nobody can deny that local pressure is felt. How much it's felt, that's the question. And here in San Gorgonio we have hope. The Sierra Club is putting on all the pressure it has to keep that a "wild" area. The funny thing is that the local people are divided. At one time the San Bernardino Board of County Supervisors was in favor of the "wilderness," the Mayor of Los Angeles was in favor of skiing, the Chamber of Commerce wanted a public hearing on it, and Congressman Sheppard, whose district it was in, didn't want a hearing. Now this has all changed because Sheppard has announced that he's not going to run for re-election, so we don't know what's going to happen to San Gorgonio.

Fry: What level are these decisions about highest use ordinarily made on?

Sieker: They are supposed to be made on a national level. The greatest good for the greatest number in the long run. This is like quoting The Sermon on the
Sieker: Mount and saying this is the way you have got to live. Sure, but nobody can do it.

Fry: You mean, the method of deciding this varies a great deal from situation to situation?

Sieker: You've got to put your teeth into something. And you've got to consider not only Southern California, but the whole state, and the whole West, and the whole nation. Which is the best? To let this area go? And the worst of it is that the area isn't all ruined by this. There's some of it left "wild." But when you take the heart out of it, how much is it worth? There are 35,000 acres of "wild" area there. The ski area only needs 3,500, just ten per cent of it. And the skiers make quite a point of that. But when you take that ten per cent, you're taking much much more than ten per cent of the value of the area. I don't know how you can gauge whether you're taking half the value or three-quarters. But it's in that magnitude.
NATIONAL PARKS: SINGLE USE VS. MULTIPLE USE

Fry: Did you have anything to do with Kings Canyon being converted into a National Park?

Sieker: Yes. This is the same kind of a problem. We've got two of those going right now, the North Cascade study and the Sawtooths. They're joint studies made by the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Department of Recreation, to decide whether those particular areas should be left in the National Forest or whether they should go to National Park status.

Fry: As I understand it with Kings Canyon, it was never really agreed upon by the Park and Forest Services.

Sieker: It never was. The Forest Service maintained at that time that it should be left in the National Forest. And the Congress decided it, as they may decide San Gorgonio.

Fry: They may not decide Cascades that way, if you can work it out with this joint study.

Sieker: No. But they've taken a part in Sawtooth because there are two different bills in Congress now to make a National Park out of it. Senator Church put in one and Congressman Harding put in the other.

Fry: Do you think, on the whole, that local people prefer a National Park to a National Forest?
Sieker: Certain of them do, yes. A National Park gets more publicity and draws more recreation use. The immediate local commercial interests will benefit by a National Park because the Park Service has more money to spend per acre, and they do things that a great many people want in the way of new roads and scenic drives and things like that.

Fry: Why don't National Forests advertise their recreation grounds more?

Sieker: Well, it's a different kind of country. The original premise was that the parks should include the finest examples of inspirational country and the outstanding scenery -- things that should be protected and preserved from all use except recreation. In other words, the multiple use decision as to what is the highest use is made for the national forests. The Park Service doesn't have to make this. Congress in enacting it has done so. They've said, Yellowstone, Yosemite, King's Canyon, nothing may be done in here -- no timber cutting -- except recreation. And we'd all agree, I think, that the outstanding portions of the country should be developed like that. But what's never really thought of is, how much of that kind of country do you need in the National Park System?

Fry: It becomes a quantitative decision, then.

Sieker: And how much land can the country afford to have reserved for no other use? Certainly, under multiple use you get more over-all benefits from the land. And you make use of more of the resources than you
Sieker: do with the single purpose, although you don't reach the great heights of the one purpose.

Fry: Is this why there isn't quite as much public relations work done on the recreation value of national forests, because it's just one of the values?

Sieker: Yes, it's just one of them. We have little spots that are just as famous as the National Parks. We have many other areas that are just ordinary picnic grounds, camp grounds where people come and have a good time. Nothing spectacular, just a change from where they've been.

Fry: But then when you go up to places like Mount Shasta and the "wilderness" areas ...

Sieker: That's right, Shasta is spectacular, but all you've got to do is go up the northwestern coast there and you've already got other mountains, you've got Rainier. How many more mountain peaks do you need? That is the question. So, why not leave Shasta in the national forest?

Fry: There's no question about Shasta, is there?

Sieker: No, but there has been in the past.

Fry: One other question that I'd like to ask you is, how much are you able to use the other divisions inside the Forest Service, such as state and private cooperation, if needed, for decisions on land use?

Sieker: Oh, we have no trouble at all. Within the Forest Service there's a great deal of cooperation.
Fry: It's easy, then, to have cooperative programs going on. And if research needs something, there's no problem there?

Sieker: There's no problem whatever, no.

Fry: Well I got a little bit of a story from Mr. Show last year on the development of recreation. Did you know Bevier Show?

Sieker: Oh yes, I knew him very well. I haven't seen him recently. How is he?

Fry: His health went downhill after an operation that he had the year before last.

Sieker: Yes, I heard that.

Fry: And he finally died last November.

Sieker: Oh, I hadn't heard that. Last November.

Fry: It happened just a little before the President's death and I think this may be one reason why the news didn't get around.

Sieker: Yes.

Fry: Well, was the inventory of 1958 the basis for the recreation part of the Development Program for National Forests?

*Show, Bevier, S, "National Forests In California", typed transcript of a tape-recorded interview conducted by Amelia Roberts Fry, University of California General Library Regional Cultural History Project, (Berkeley 1965). In Bancroft Library.
Sieker: The Development Program really came out before the Recreation Survey was finished. But it was based partly on that. The Recreation Survey simply made the inventory of the lands that were available. We classified lands as to *suitability* and *availability*. Those are two important things. The suitability would just be the land itself. Is it suitable for "wilderness," let's say? The availability is a multiple use decision. Is it suitable for "wilderness" and is that its highest use? And there's where we differ, again, with the Sierra Club. Mr. David Brower coined the phrase "de facto wilderness." And "de facto wilderness" is that "wilderness" which is in fact "wilderness," but which the Forest Service hasn't set up as "wilderness."

Fry: That's what you call suitable.

Sieker: Yes, we admit it's suitable. Certain groups say — if it's suitable, then it should be made "wilderness" regardless of any other value it may have. And there, of course, is where we part company. We think that a piece of land that's suitable for "wilderness" may also be more suitable for something else. And this is true. San Gorgonio is an example. It's suitable for skiing and it's suitable for wilderness, both. Which one should you put it to?

Fry: Which two uses do you have the most conflict between? Would it be recreation and timber sales?
Sieker: Yes, and this is quite understandable, because timber cutting looks like the very devil in certain locations where clear cutting is necessary.

Fry: So, you just can't mix the two.

Sieker: No. Clear cutting of timber, which is commonly called destruction by many people, is not destruction.

Fry: I understand some species require this for their own second growth.

Sieker: Yes, some require this. I don't like to see a great big forty or fifty acre clear cut from a highway or look across a valley and see it. It looks like the devil. But I know that twenty years from now it won't show up like that. It won't be mature timber again, but there will be enough young stuff in there to have hidden the scar. And I also know that in a hundred years that new forest that's come up will be a more beautiful forest than the old forest would have been if it had never been but because the other forest was a dying forest. But many people simply look upon clear cutting as destructive logging. They say this area is ruined. They don't realize that it will grow up again if fire is kept out and if it's properly managed.
Fry: It seems to me there might be a problem, too, in these forests that are growing back, about how long they have to be protected from the tourists before you can start using them for recreation.

Sieker: The protection isn't so bad, except from hunters and fishermen. Nobody would want to use camping or picnicking grounds in a forest until it was at least thirty or forty feet high. And in the South, here, that happens very quickly, twenty years will do it. Out in drier country, in the mountains of California, Oregon or Washington, it takes much longer. But it does happen and that's the point.

Fry: What about where you don't have clear cutting, where you just have selective cutting?

Sieker: Then we don't have nearly as much conflict. Where we have selective cutting you can always maintain a forest cover and you don't look across a hillside and see bare ground.

Fry: Are the areas for cutting and so forth decided upon by the Washington office, at least in theory?

Sieker: The policies are set up as to the allowable cut — how much you're allowed to cut. But the actual places to cut are approved by the regions. This is done in timber management plans, which have a listing of the compartments to be cut in certain years. And of course sometimes you will schedule something for cutting and nobody wants to buy that. You know, the Forest Service doesn't cut the timber itself. It sells it.

Fry: Yes.
THE MULTIPLE USE MINING CLAIM

Sieker: Now we get into this mining claim subject. And we handled that, too.

Fry: You have some recent legislation, about 1955 I think, that makes it a little tougher to file for the invalid claims, is that it?

Sieker: You see, the mining laws apply to the national forests. And under the mining laws anyone can file a claim on national forest land. And if he finds sufficient minerals to justify a prudent man's further development, he's got a valid claim. He can go ahead and mine without the consent of the Forest Service. And he can even get title to that land by paying the United States five dollars an acre. And the land that he gets in that claim may be worth a thousand dollars an acre, and yet he can get it for five dollars an acre.

Fry: No matter if it's full of Douglas fir or not.

Sieker: Yes. And sometimes that's what they're after. Now, if that's all they've got, they don't get the land. But if they've also got a little mineral showing, they can sometimes get some very valuable timber and some very valuable stream-side land.

I personally think the mining laws are outmoded. They weren't revised from 1872 to 1955. And that five dollars an acre that they pay for the land was the price paid in 1872. Now, back in 1872 when you paid the United States five dollars an acre
Sieker: for a lot of that western mountain land, you were paying its value. That's all it was worth. And that was probably a good law at that time. The objective then was to settle the West and do these things. Now, seventy-five years later we're still using the five dollars an acre. And it's ridiculous now. There isn't a piece of land in the National Forest that isn't worth fifteen to twenty dollars an acre. And yet the mining industry has been adamant in preventing any real modification of the basic mining laws except the 1955 act.

In 1955, with the help of the American Forestry Association, we did get through a slight revision of the mining law, that was the Multiple Use Mining Act of July, 1955. Its principal provisions were: 1) It removed sand and gravel and stone from the mining laws. It said, "These are common materials and you cannot file a claim on the basis of them." That was a big step forward. 2) With respect to mining claims on the National Forest it said, "The United States can manage the surface resources as long as it doesn't interfere with the mining." 3) Then it went on to say about claims filed prior to the enactment of the law that: "A determination of surface rights procedure would be instituted whereby the United States could acquire the rights to manage the surface of previously filed claims." And we have done that.

Fry: You have to work at this claim by claim, don't you?
Sieker: Yes. And when we started this work in 1955 there were an estimated 1,000,000 claims on the National Forest. A mining claim is normally twenty acres.

Fry: Well, that takes a lot of leg-work on the part of someone.

Sieker: It took eight and a half years to do this job. And there was a very strict procedure outlined in the law that we had to follow. You see, before this, the United States could not cut timber on these claims. We had 1,000,000 claims, that's 20,000,000 acres. There are some 10,000 claims left on which we still cannot manage the timber or the surface. There was a provision in the law that if a person made a certain showing he could retain the rights that he had. Congress can't take away rights that it has already given people without due process.

Fry: So it took due process, then, to re-establish the Forest Service's right to the timber?

Sieker: To manage the timber and the surface resources only until the claim goes to patent, however. If he does to patent the mining claimant still gets simple title. It's a little harder, however, to go to patent with a mining claim than it is to just hold it and keep it valid.

Fry: This indicates a very effective and strong mining lobby.

Sieker: You can say that again!

Fry: These would be western men, wouldn't they?
Sieker: Mostly, yes. There's a very strong mining lobby.

Fry: Where do they get all their money?

Sieker: Oh there's plenty of money; Kennecott Copper Corporation, Phelps-Dodge, Anaconda, and many others.

Fry: Does aluminum figure in this?

Sieker: Well they're not involved so much with mining claims in the forest. Most of the bauxite which that aluminum comes from is in the lower country.

Fry: However, it seems to me these large miners wouldn't care too much about surface rights. They would really be in this for the minerals in the ground, the gold, silver, copper, lead, and so forth.

Sieker: Well, they've got something under present laws and they want to keep it. Now it's a little easier for them to operate when they get title. And they'll fight hard to keep it. Actually the only real answer to mining on government land is leasing. There should be no way in which a person can take government minerals without paying for them. You can't do it with oil and gas; you have to lease. And the thing that makes me so mad is to hear these people get up and say, "You can't operate under a lease." And yet the oil and gas industries operate under leases from the government and make excellent profits.

Over the years the mineral estate and the surface have become separated in a great many cases. And many companies here in the East operate with only sub-surface rights. And they're very
Sieker: successful. It's just that it's easier to do it if you can get it all. And they don't think of all the abuses. Now if nobody abused the mining laws it would be bad enough, but not only are they bad that way but people take advantage of them and go in and file on claims where they had no intention of ever mining. They just wanted to get the land. And the record of the number of mining patents that had ever produced minerals in commercial quantities is very small. They're used for other purposes.

Fry: Yes. This is true all over California.

Sieker: That's true, absolutely. There are summer homes on them. There are resorts on them. They're made into farms and everything else except being used for mining. And yet they were gotten under mining laws which in 1872 were developed to help develop the West. And that was fine. But they should have been repealed about 1900.

Fry: Do the miners ever ally themselves with the agricultural interests to bring pressure on these claims?

Sieker: I don't know.

Fry: Has this been more of a problem than grazing?

Sieker: Grazing isn't settled yet either. I don't have any personal knowledge of grazing, and I don't want to talk about it. I think you ought to only talk to people who can speak with some degree of knowledge on a subject.
Fry: But you do think that the miners are a lot stronger than the livestock interests?

Sieker: Oh yes. The mining problem is a much more serious problem. The problem with livestock is that the Forest Service issued permits and the holders of those permits want to make believe that those are lifetime estates. Now, they haven't got a leg to stand on. It's just the opposite with the mining people. The law says, "This is a lifetime estate." And the Forest Service believes that this ought to be repealed and it ought to be a permit or a lease.

Fry: Is there a definite plan underway now for further legislation on mining?

Sieker: I don't know of any, no.
DEVELOPMENT OF RECREATION POLICY

Fry: In other fields of forest conservation, there has been a great deal of work done on legislation by the Forest Service. Have you ever been able to write your own legislation?

Sieker: Very often we have what you'd call an administration bill. The Forest Service, of course, can't propose legislation. No bureau can. It has to go through the Bureau of the Budget. With the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, we can ask for legislation.

Fry: Even if it isn't a budgetary matter.

Sieker: Oh yes. The Bureau of the Budget is the President's adviser on legislation. Or sometimes a member of Congress asks an agency to do what's called legislative drafting service. If we are asked for drafting service, we comply. But we say, "Here's what you asked for." We make no commitment as to the position of the department or the administration. And when legislation is brought up that effects the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture goes through the Bureau of the Budget. The Secretary of Agriculture can't take a position on legislation without the consent of the Budget Bureau.

Fry: I see. So it would just be a friendly congressman, then, who could originate this.

Sieker: That's right.
Fry: One of the main areas of questions that I try to get at with everyone I talk to are the different ways that policy can originate and then gradually change or evolve. In your case it sounds like it was pretty much a departmental matter all the way through. Would you say it was?

Sieker: That's kind of a hard thing to say. Naturally, you'd expect that any suggestion of policy would come from the Chief of the Forest Service or somebody in the Forest Service. The Chief has authority to go ahead with certain policies. With others he needs the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Chief of the Forest Service would not have had the authority to publish "Operation Outdoors" as it was published because it had an outline of appropriations needed to implement it. That very fact would have made it improper, because this was not, at that time, part of the President's budget. So the Chief of the Forest Service took the Operation Outdoors program to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary cleared it with the Budget Bureau and published it. And the same thing was done with the Development Program for the National Forest. Certain things are delegated by the Secretary to the Forest Service and other things are not.

Fry: It was the gradual use and the increase in use of these lands for recreation by the general public that brought it to the attention of the men who were more sensitive to this, is that right?
Sieker: That's right.

Fry: And it was the work of Leopold and Marshall, then, that eventually made this into a concrete program?

Sieker: Well, Leopold is "wilderness" primarily, not recreation.

Fry: But "wilderness" is considered a part of the recreation program.

Sieker: It is a type of recreation. I said that Leopold was the man who started the concept of "wilderness," not public recreation. Bob Marshall was greatly interested in both, wilderness and public recreation, and he started the Forest Service thinking about both.

Fry: Is it also true that California was pretty much of a leader in developing recreation?

Sieker: They certainly were. They had more pressure there. And they also had an explosive fire situation in California which made it necessary for them to look at recreation areas more critically, so as to prevent fires by providing safe places for campers and picnickers. The average person going out in the forest doesn't realize what a dry forest is. I mean, a city person is liable to build a fire and go away and leave it, or build it in a place where even if he tried to put it out, he couldn't. So the first steps that were taken in California and several other places where forest fire danger sometimes gets critical, is to provide safe recreation areas. And then in California where water is
Sieker: critical, sanitation and the prevention of pollution are more important than in the Rocky Mountain states, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana, where there weren't enough people to create the same kind of pressure.

Fry: Do you mean this brought about more formal regulation sooner?

Sieker: That's right. It became a problem in California before it did in some of the less densely populated areas. Surrounding Denver, Colorado, there's probably twenty times as much National Forest land available per person as there is around Los Angeles. Right now there are twelve million people around Los Angeles. I would guess that there are less than three million acres of National Forest land within a day's roundtrip of there. Around Denver there is a lot more than that. All of which means less intensive demand. And intensive demand is always the thing that makes land use problems tough.

Fry: I suppose, also, you have more personnel per acre around the Los Angeles area than you have elsewhere.

Sieker: Oh yes!

Fry: I was talking to a man in the Trinity Shasta National Forest last summer who had, among other things, the recreation administration in his jurisdiction, and he said that they had increased the number of rangers working in recreation there by an enormous amount, four or five times what it had been just in the last two or three years.
Sieker: Oh there's no doubt about that. We've also done a great deal in winter sports, you know. That's grown rapidly since the war.

Many people don't realize that in the Western United States the major ski areas are on the National Forests. The Park Service doesn't want major ski areas. They don't want the development and necessary improvements, such as cleared slopes and lifts. Now you can do all the ski touring you want on the National Parks, but they do not want ski lifts. And the public right now does not want to climb up hills. They want to be carted uphill and ski down.

And we have the major ski areas. Even Sun Valley, which is considered one of the biggest and best private ski developments in the United States, has some of its best ski terrain on the National Forest. In Squaw Valley, California, where the Winter Olympics were held, the bottom of that valley is pretty much private land, but the ski slopes are National Forest land. The F.S. issues permits for ski developments and this is big business. Our resort and ski lift permits bring in pretty close to a million and a half dollars annually in rental fees. A land use fee is charged, based on a percentage of the sales. This is an equitable arrangement.

Fry: I suppose surrounding communities in areas like that don't exactly oppose the Forest Service's use of this land. (Laughter) It must be pretty lucra-
Fry: Active to the surrounding communities.

Sieker: That's so very true. We have almost a thousand commercial public service facilities in the National Forests. And they have a private investment of probably close to seventy-five million dollars.

Fry: I see. And they just pay you an outright rental.

Sieker: Yes. They do not get title to the land. They get a permit which may be up to thirty years in duration.

Fry: In the National Parks this is arranged, I believe, with a percentage of either gross profits or net profits.

Sieker: Both for them. Ours are all percentage of gross sales.

Fry: And then do you also have only one concession of a kind at a certain place, so that this becomes a monopoly?

Sieker: No, we don't go that far. We put in what is necessary to satisfy the public demand.

Fry: So you might have more than one ski lift run by different people?

Sieker: Yes, but it isn't too practical in one area to have two different outfits with ski lifts because the skier wants to buy a day ticket to ride up, come down, and ride back up again. Now if you had two different outfits this wouldn't work. You couldn't buy a day ticket, probably, that
Sieker: would be good on either one of them.

Fry: It might be a little hard, too, for controlling some things that make it possible for these people to break even. A seasonal activity like that is not always awfully lucrative for the man who runs it.

Sieker: That's right.

Fry: Well, I can't think of anything else that I should ask you. Can you think of something else?

Sieker: If you think of something else, you can call me.

Fry: All right, fine.

Sieker: Of course we've talked about recreation, public use, winter sports, concessions, and "wilderness," mining laws, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Wilderness Bill, and Forest Service policies. I don't know what else there is.

Fry: That sounds like enough. Thank you very much for coming up here today, and if any additions are needed, I'll call you.
John Sieker, Forest Service Head of Recreation and Land Uses, To Retire in Mid-July

John H. Sieker, head of National Forest recreation for more than half of his 38 year Forest Service career, has announced his retirement as of July 18.

Under Mr. Sieker's stewardship, recreation use of the National Forests has more than quadrupled during the past quarter century. National Forest Wilderness Areas, set aside for hiking, hunting, fishing, and scenic enjoyment, now cover 14.5 million acres. The Forest Service has instituted a new Visitor Information Service as an important aspect of acquainting the public with the expanded scenic and recreational opportunities in the National Forests. Some 4 million acres of marginal lands, mostly on the Great Plains and the Texas Panhandle, have, under Mr. Sieker's direction, been contoured and planted to become 19 National Grasslands managed in the public interest by the Forest Service. Other special land uses—namely mining of coal and other minerals and the extraction of oil and gas—have increased many fold in the past years, and this, too, has been part of Mr. Sieker's responsibility as Director of the Division of Recreation and Land Uses.

Native of New York City, John Sieker attended Princeton University and went on to Yale to receive his master's degree. He was given his Forest Service appointment a few months after his graduation, and for the next dozen years he served on National Forests in Minnesota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. In 1938, he transferred to Washington, D. C. to serve as assistant chief in the Division of Recreation and Land Uses. Three years later, Mr. Sieker rose to become director of that division.

Earlier this year, Mr. Sieker was honored with a USDA Superior Service award "for exceptional high level achievement in conceiving and directing recreation and minerals management programs, and for his key role in safeguarding the internationally acclaimed Wilderness System with the National Forests."
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GAME PROTECTION POLICY

Fry: Has there been a game protection policy from the very beginning of the Forest Service?

Swift: The Forest Service people, in the early days, took a great interest in protecting wildlife where it needed to be protected. And so the rangers, for example, often did a lot of law enforcement work. The law enforcement work nowadays is done by the state game departments. But back in the early years of the Forest Service many states didn't even have a fish and game department, or if they did they were so poorly financed that they lacked staff enough to do the enforcement work. So the Forest Service, then, carried the job of game and fish law enforcement on the national forest lands. They would arrest violators and take them to court, and help in that way. So, right from the beginning the Forest Service personnel and the Forest Service policy was one of being interested in game as a resource of the national forest areas. You must remember that during the formative period of the Forest Service the people using these federal lands possessed a carry over of the pioneer feeling that the wildlife was there to use as they wished. So there was, in the early settlers, a lack of appreciation of the fact that the game resources had to be managed. Some of the species, such as elk, were hunted to the point where they virtually
Swift: disappeared from their native range. The same thing was true with the antelope and other species. After 1910 there was a growing interest in wildlife restoration. A number of approaches were promoted by the Forest Service. The service would try to get the state to close the season entirely, so there was no time during the year when it was legal to shoot, say, elk. Then there was a big movement to establish refuges — both state and federal. The famous Kaibab Refuge on the Grand Canyon, legally called the Grand Canyon National Game Preserve, is administered by the Forest Service. It was proclaimed by President Theodore Roosevelt. But there were also many state game refuges. They were established very often at the urging of the Forest Service. Then there was also a selling of the idea that if there were enough animals, say, elk or deer, to shoot, maybe you could shoot just the males but not the females. So the Forest Service promoted that as a management tool because you could harvest off some of the buck population without hurting the basic breeding herd. And in that way you could continue to increase the deer numbers. That idea was part of this restoration philosophy, and became widely accepted.

Another part of this restoration which was particularly true of elk occurred between 1910 and 1920. The elk were captured in Jackson Hole and also in Yellowstone Park and shipped to various
Swift: parts of the Rocky Mountain region and even to the Pacific Coast, and then released. Many of the elk herds of today, which occur in considerable numbers and which are an important species to hunt, actually were restored through stocking operations. So you have these various steps: there was the closed season, the refuges, the buck laws, and the transplanting.
Swift: The idea of protecting animals, particularly big game, was oversold. So that there came about overpopulations in deer and elk, for instance. It just got out of hand. They'd come into their winter range and there wouldn't be enough feed for them, and they would starve. And that led to a very major controversy between the state and the Forest Service in the form of the litigation over the Kaibab.

The Forest Service took the position that the deer on the Kaibab had reached excessive proportions and that they must be reduced in number. The state refused to go along with this proposition. And so the matter was taken to federal court. And the ruling was that the Forest Service or the United States had the right to protect its property, namely the land and the forage and so on that grows on the public land.

Fry: You mean the animals in the forest were not considered a part of Forest Service property, legally?

Swift: The basic law of the United States as interpreted in most courts appears to be that the wildlife is the property of the people and held in custody by the state, rather than the federal government. And, therefore, when you hunt resident game in any state you buy a state license to do so. Migratory game is something else. So in talking about resident
Swift: game, as deer would be, then the state law would apply. The federal government and the state government could not reach an agreement on herd reduction and this matter went to court. The federal government's position was upheld by the court.

Shortly after that the same sort of thing came about on the Pisgah Forest in North Carolina. There was a similar situation where the deer had reached excess proportions. They were damaging the forest. The Forest Service sought relief through a hunting season which would kill does as well as bucks. The Forest Service went ahead, since this was a federal refuge, and held a season in defiance of the state regulations. This threw the issue into court again. And, as in the Kaibab case, the position of the federal government was upheld. About that time the Forest Service gave a great deal of thought to wildlife management policy and its dealing with the states. They had encountered much trouble trying to swing the public and the states from the philosophy of full protection to the philosophy of management, where the herds had been built up then they ought to be cropped. That's the sensible thing to do. But the idea of protecting animals was so ingrained in the public that even if state game departments wanted to go out and shoot does, we'll say, they could not get the support to do it. It was that difficult. There were so many places that showed up on the
Swift: national forests where something should be done about these excess numbers, that about 1940 the Secretary of Agriculture came out with a regulation known as G 20 A. This regulation, in effect, said that the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Forest Service, could take whatever action was needed in order to get management of these herds. And that meant that if they wished they could set a season, charge a fee, set a bag limit, and all of those things that are necessary to carry out a public hunt on a national forest area.

G 20 A was bitterly opposed by the state game departments because to them it was an outright case of federal encroachment on the province of the state. The states would have none of it. And the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners plus the regional groups, such as the Western Association of Fish and Game Commissioners, gave the Forest Service a very bad time on this. Their annual meetings, or other meetings, would get pretty rough. Actually, the Forest Service never did use G 20 A. But the very fact that the Secretary of Agriculture said that he had the authority to take management steps shook up this whole situation and caused people to take another look. And at the same time the state game folks and the public in general, the sportsmen, began to see that there was some logic in this business of harvesting females or cutting herds down when there were too many. So I think
The stimulus that G 20 A gave to taking another look really advanced game management in the United States. It wasn't so very long then until the state game folks began to line up with the Forest Service to go out and talk to the public and say, "Look, there are too many animals; let's have a doe season." And it was really, I think, a natural evolvement from one thing to the other. The Secretary of Agriculture took G 20 A off the books about 1944, I think. It was set aside because we were making progress with the states. However it continued to be a point of issue because many of the state folks felt that the Secretary of Agriculture having once said he had the authority to manage fish and game, was likely to say it again. And so the state people who engaged in this controversy never forgot it. And there remained for many years a certain degree of suspicion of the intent of the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture.

But in the two decades since then, it's been largely forgotten. The leaders in the state game movement have changed. And now if you said to a state game director, "What do you think of G 20 A?", he probably wouldn't know for sure what you were talking about. The result, then, has been good, I would say. And in the meantime the states and the Forest Service have developed a very wonderful spirit of cooperation. They work together very effectively. And it's a joy to behold. I'm conceited enough to take a little credit for that
Swift: myself because I was the Chief's representative in dealing with the state game people.

Fry: After your master's degree, your first job was the range survey in Plumas Forest, California?

Swift: Yes, that's right.

Fry: And then you went to work in the regional office, so you witnessed a lot of the changes you have been talking about.

Swift: Yes, but primarily later when I was in the chief's office.

Fry: How did you go about winning over the men in the state game commissions?

Swift: It was largely a matter of dealing in a factual manner with these state people; telling them that after all we had a responsibility to manage a land resource and that we must do it under the law. So far as we were concerned the state fish and game law applied and we wanted to get the job done through the application of the state law. As a matter of fact when G 20 A was removed, it was replaced by another regulation which was called W 2. W 2 outlined the basis for cooperation with the states. It was a very sound approach, and one which you could build from. It said:

First: The Forest Service has a responsibility of managing these lands and making the land management decisions, including how much wildlife shall be supported.
Swift: Second: The Forest Service shall recognize that the management of the wildlife resource shall be done through the application of the state game law.

Third: The Forest Service will work with the states in preparing programs and plans to carry out these objectives through cooperation in the application of the state game law.

It took a few years to get the state folks acquainted with the objective and policy. And in the meantime the Forest Service had placed in each regional office a regional wildlife man, a very top hand who understood the philosophy of cooperation. And so, gradually, the sincerity of the Forest Service's approach was recognized, and the spirit of cooperation took root. It never stopped growing.

Fry: That was a real turning point then.

Swift: Yes, a significant one.
WILDLIFE AS A PART OF RANGE MANAGEMENT

Swift: There is another part of this Forest Service picture which concerned me very greatly and still does. Up until the time that the Division of Wildlife Management was created, which was around 1936, wildlife was part of range management. And even today the wildlife man in the western regions is in the Division of Range Management, except in Ogden where they have a full division. In the East it's different. The wildlife man is usually tied in with timber or recreation or one of the others.

I have training in range management, and I think I understand that field of work. I have very good friends who are in the range side of the job. But I've always felt very strongly that wildlife must not be a part of range management. Because they are competitive. When you have deer and elk eating forage you're bound to have some stockmen who think that forage ought to be saved for cattle and sheep. And so if wildlife and range are under the same man he's in a difficult spot. So it's not good. A wildlife man should be free from this entanglement with range, so that he can speak out in the policy making of the Forest Service and say, "By gosh, wildlife has got to have a better break in this situation."

All during my career I pushed to take wildlife out of the regional range management
Swift: divisions and put it up independently, if possible, as it was done in Ogden. Or put it with some other division, like recreation. The reason for this is that in range management the job is too often one of trying to reduce the number of livestock. For the most part, we've always had too many livestock. There is no strong philosophy of producing something for public use and recreation. Now, the wildlife people must have this philosophy because that's what wildlife management is all about. You're producing fish and game for public use and recreation. Range men as a group don't have this approach, although many individuals do and carry it on in a very fine manner. So it's not a blanket thing. But as a general philosophy, it's true.

Fry: Could you educate me on your terminology here? When you said, "Livestock animals," did you mean domestic livestock?

Swift: That's right.

Fry: I thought, perhaps, in your field you can also call deer and elk livestock because they graze.

Swift: No. They'd be game animals, as contrasted with domestic livestock, which would be sheep, goats, and cattle. So I had always hoped, and I still hope, that wildlife will stand on its own feet throughout the Forest Service. It does in the Chief's office.

Fry: But not in the regions?
Swift: Only in one. Of course there is a way to get around that, and that is if the Directors of the Divisions of Range and Wildlife Management are wildlife people, as is the case in California now. The man there is a wildlife man. And he worked for me at one time. But historically the man in charge of the Division of Range and Wildlife Management is a rangeman, not a wildlife man.
Fry: Do you have time to tell me about the public support that wildlife management has had since you first became head of this? The organized public support is rather specialized, isn't it -- The Audubon Society, The Wilderness Federation, and others?

Swift: Actually, the wildlife people in the Forest Service are keen chaps. They're some of the most valuable people in the whole organization. And the reason they are is that in the first place they have a deep understanding of the need for multiple use. I mean, they've got it better than most Forest Service people. They understand that wildlife is something that you produce along with other things. You produce wildlife along with timber and along with forage. It's part of recreation and so on. Very often we have timber people who see nothing but timber; range people who see nothing but range. But that's not characteristic of wildlife people. They're pretty sensitive to coordinated land use.

Fry: You mean they're the main ones in this policy making group who look at the total ecology of the whole thing?

Swift: They're more likely to. But, generally, they're not high enough up to participate in policy in a strong way because they're part of a division, rather than being a division head. The other thing
Swift: is that the great bulk of the people who enjoy the national forests, enjoy some aspect of wildlife. I mean they fish or they hunt or they just like to see these animals. And so the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Sport Fishing Institute, feel closer to wildlife men than they do to others in the Forest Service. The Forest Service wildlife man is a chap who is accepted by these conservation groups. He has a natural opening in dealing with these folks. And for that reason the wildlife people in the Forest Service have been very important in acquainting these outside agencies with what the Forest Service is doing and, in turn, picking up the feelings of these people and carrying it back to the Forest Service. And it's been quite a valuable interchange, very important.

Fry: What about the legislative policy on wildlife? Can these groups help you at all in that? Or do they come to you for help?

Swift: It's much broader than that. These groups help across-the-board in the whole field of conservation. And they are, actually, among the most important people bearing upon legislation affecting public land. They're of great importance because they have a strong interest in this. And they're knowledgeable people. They're action people. And so they have been a major factor in protecting or advancing the multiple use concept on the
Swift: national forests. There isn't any question about it.

Fry: Have you had any problems about their being over-educated?

Swift: Yes. This matter of does I mentioned, you see, was a straight out case of being oversold. That happens. It's not so much a problem any more because the professional type people have come up to the leadership inside and outside the Forest Service. You take these conservation groups, they're now being led by professional type people who understand these matters. And they're not so much guided by emotion and so on. They base their decisions on facts a good deal more than years ago, which is very fine.

Fry: And they use the services of the educational institutions around and things like that.

Swift: Oh yes.
Fry: What about when a national forest adjoins a national park? What problems does this bring up in wildlife management? A national park has a little bit tighter control, doesn't it, on its wildlife?

Swift: Yes. On the national park, it's federal control. The state may exercise some jurisdiction over fisheries, perhaps, but for game they have no jurisdiction. What I mean is that if you want to fish in certain national parks maybe you've got to have a state game license and there may be a state fish stocked. But there's no sport hunting on the national parks. It's prohibited. Very often there are national forests adjacent to the national parks. In certain cases there has been the feeling that maybe some of the animals drifting out of the national parks were being unduly reduced by hunting on the national forests. And that would go back primarily to the times when the philosophy was, "You've got to protect these animals." That's not so true any more except uncommon and rare species. As a matter of fact I don't think it's so very important now because, again, the professional folks are the ones who are guiding these programs. They realize that you can have too damn many animals in the park, just like you can out in the national forest. And that was very forcibly brought to the attention of the people in this country in the
Swift: Yellowstone elk herd situation. You've undoubtedly heard about it.

Fry: Whether to deputize hunters?

Swift: That was part of the controversy. But the central issue was, are there too many elk? And the Park Service and most biologists agreed that there were. The argument was on, how do you reduce them?

The relations are quite good between the Park Service and the Forest Service.
Fry: What about research? Does your office conduct any research on wildlife?

Swift: Not my division. My division was an administrative division. That's a good question because there is in the Chief's Office a Division of Range Management and Wildlife Habitat Research and there are similar divisions in the regional experiment stations. They have quite a large program of research in wildlife habitat.

Within the federal set-up the thing breaks down along the lines of the Forest Service carrying on the research that has to do with habitat, with the environment; and the Fish and Wildlife Service working with the animals themselves. There's sort of a gentleman's agreement there, if you want to call it that. But it's more than that, actually. So very often what happens is that there will be a team of which there'll be the Wildlife Service's animal man and the Forest Service's plant and soil man working together on the wildlife program. But you can't be rigid on this thing because it's impossible for a man to do an intelligent job on animals unless he understands plants and vice versa. So there's a natural drift in both directions. And I think it's quite sensible. It would be silly to take any other view. But as a basic thing, that's the way it breaks. And that doesn't go back so terribly many years, though. This
Swift: interest, really strong interest, of the Forest Service only goes back about fifteen years. It's only been since then that they've had money to put on much of a program in wildlife habitat research.

Fry: Was the natural habitat of animals taken into consideration when the National Forest Administration Group was deciding on land use plans for a national forest area?

Swift: Yes, sure, that comes into it. It's part of the program planning, in which you take a multiple use approach. Actually, every piece of land in the national forests is supposed to have a multiple use plan, in which wildlife would have its consideration along with recreation, water, and everything else. To come back to your question, the matter of fish, which I haven't mentioned until now, is coming into great prominence in the use of public lands. One of the things that I advocated was that every regional office ought to have a fisheries biologist on the staff. And nearly every one of them has, now. That's quite important because everything done with the land affects the watershed and the stream channel, which after all is the habitat of the fish. If you build a road in a certain way so that it impinges upon the stream it affects the temperature of the water, the amount of silt in it, and all that sort of thing. It's the same way with logging and grazing. If you overgraze it destroys the
Swift: vegetation and causes erosion. It kills the stream bank shelter plants and so on. So that in order to have the best type of fishery habitat there must also be the very best type of land management. So speaking just of fisheries now, you can't avoid the proposition that the care of the habitat, goes right back to anything done on the watershed. And for that reason the fisheries biologist is a key man when it comes to deciding these matters of land use. Now, there have been some very sharp controversies in the last few years on the location of highways because they affected the streams and hurt the fisheries. There have been a few cases where the Forest Service has said flatly, "You cannot build a highway according to these specifications because it does too much injury to the stream." Some rather bitter battles between the Bureau of Public Roads and the Forest Service have occurred over that very issue. But now the public is understanding these relations and the state fish and game departments are into it in a very strong way, so that in the future I think it's going to be automatic that every time a major highway is under planning right from the very beginning fisheries relationships will be considered. So the progress is good. There are still problems, but the trend is in the right direction. But there have been some awfully mad people along the way because their favorite trout stream has been spoiled. (Laughter)
POWER RESERVOIRS

Fry: What about dams and power installations?

Swift: That's taking up a lot of the time of the fisheries biologist I referred to.

Fry: So many of the power dams are in national forest territory.

Swift: That's right and that's very important because the biologist is working with the fisheries man from the Fish and Wildlife Service and with the state game department. We couldn't have visualized it, say, fifteen years ago, how much time this takes. But it's important. My gosh, you can have dams and fisheries and other recreational values with a little sensible planning. Or you can forget planning and destroy recreation and wildlife values. There's the matter of water release and things like that. How much water shall be released below a dam? Where shall the water come from? Should it come from high up in the reservoir level or from the bottom of the dam where it's especially cold? You just don't guess at these things. It's a technical matter. They all have to be decided.

Fry: Yes. And in the past, at least, there's been some resistance on the part of the private power companies. I'm not talking about the TVA type.
Swift: Oh yes. There's been resistance on the part of all of them, whether they were public or private. But, as a matter of fact, on the basis of my experience, it has in most cases been easier to deal with a private outfit than it has a public one. And some of the worst have been municipalities.

Fry: Really! The small ones?

Swift: Not the small ones so much as the cities. They're very autocratic. And they say, "We've got to have water for our people." Sometimes they're extremely difficult to work with on adjustments for the benefit of the fish.

Fry: Were you on hand when TVA was organized?

Swift: Yes, but I was working in the West.

Fry: You were in Denver then?

Swift: Yes. I can say that the TVA Fisheries biologists, particularly Reuben W. Eschmeyer, who is now dead, did some very wonderful work on fisheries management in impounded waters. It was his pioneer studies and his personality that broke a lot of taboos, which had been holding back advancement in fisheries management for many years. Eschmeyer, through his work, showed that there wasn't any sense in having closed seasons in these impoundments. You might just as well let people fish all year long. Now that was a pretty shattering idea. It broke tradition completely. The contributions of the TVA, through scientists like Eschmeyer,
Swift: were really substantial.

Fry: I understand from one of the power company officials in California that the Pacific Gas and Electric Company now has a big program to keep the sportsmen apprised of fishing conditions in its power company reservoirs, and that this has created a loyal constituency for them.

Swift: I'm not familiar with that.

Fry: It seems to have increased the cooperation between P. G. and E. and the wildlife and game officials.

Swift: Yes, that's part of this recognition of the value of the fisheries.

Fry: And I guess now they are more recreation minded.

Swift: Oh yes, definitely.

Fry: Do you think this is true in other parts of the country? Or is this just P. G. and E.?

Swift: No. I think it's a national trend. There are some rough spots in it, of course.

Fry: What sections of the country would you say need the most education?

Swift: I wouldn't want to comment on that.

Fry: I wonder whether you'd want to comment on any senators and representatives who were particularly helpful?

Swift: There's the Pittman-Robertson Act (1937 Wildlife Restoration Act). Key Pittman of Nevada and
Swift: Willis Robertson of Virginia were the sponsors. It's had a great effect because it, perhaps more than anything else, started the movement to put the state game departments on a professional basis. Under the application of the Pittman-Robertson Act this aid money would be given to the states. But the people the states hire for the Pittman-Robertson program have to be technically competent people. So it brought, automatically, a body of well-trained people. And these folks moved on into the other parts of the organization and became directors and so on. That had a very fine effect. And it encouraged the collecting of factual information and the use of it in a management way. So that the Pittman-Robertson Act was quite an important step. The same thing now applies to fisheries. We now have the Dingell-Johnson Act of 1950, which does the same thing for fisheries.
Fry: Can you compare the chiefs of the Forest Service and their effect on policy regarding wildlife?

Swift: I knew every Chief of the Forest Service from Pinchot on down. It's getting so that there aren't too many people who knew every one of them. (Laughter)

That's a difficult thing to comment on. As I knew them, they weren't anti-wildlife. But they just didn't give it the push that it deserved because public use of national forest lands and this great volume of hunters and fishermen and so on, hadn't come about yet. There wasn't any great problem except that they did support these things which I explained about these protection measures and then this business of, "Let's harvest the crop when you have plenty of them." They supported all of those things. But so far as recognizing the key position of wildlife in the multiple use program and the very wide contacts that the wildlife people had with the conservation organizations and the general public and the state game departments and so on, I don't think that the chief foresters saw that until the time of Lyle Watts. He saw it very clearly, I thought. So have the others since him. But now Ed Cliff is the Chief of the Forest Service. His first job in the Service was as a wildlife man. He was employed as a Forest Service wildlife techni-
Swift: cian, and a good one. And that's been a part of his blood. He never lost it. And he understands these relations with the state game departments and with the sportsmen. He's a hunter and fisherman himself. Cliff is giving the Forest Service the kind of understanding leadership in wildlife management that it needs. And it's because he understands it.

Fry: When did you become a separate division on the national scene?

Swift: That was about 1935-36, when Dr. Homer L. Shantz was brought in from the University of Arizona as Director of the Division of Wildlife Management under the National Forest Administrative Group in the Washington Office.

Fry: Did Watts have any special training or background that would lead him to be more sensitive to wildlife?

Swift: I couldn't say, except that it was just part of him, like it is with some men. (Laughter)

Fry: Thank you very much for coming up to the Resources for the Future offices today.

Swift: I hope this has been of some help to you.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service
Washington, April 12, 1944

Lloyd W. Swift Named Forest Service Wildlife Chief

Lloyd W. Swift, native Californian and member of the U.S. Forest Service since 1923, has been named chief of the Forest Service Division of Wildlife Management, in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He succeeds Dr. Homer L. Shantz who retires April 15, after many years in the department.

Mr. Swift takes up his new duties at a time when the big-game population on national forests is larger than at any time since 1900, latest Forest Service reports showing a total of 2,291,000 animals, including 2,157,000 deer and 193,200 elk. In 1921, according to the same report, there were 585,000 deer and 43,900 elk.

A graduate of the University of California, the new Forest Service wildlife chief came to Washington as an assistant to Dr. Shantz in January 1942. For three years previous to that assignment, he was in charge of wildlife management for the Forest Service Rocky Mountain Region with headquarters in Denver, Colo.

Beginning with the Forest Service as a junior range examiner in California national forests in 1923, Mr. Swift spent the next ten years engaged in range and management surveys, erosion-control projects and wildlife investigations. Much of his work was concerned with the coordination of range production with range utilization by both wildlife and domestic herds.

Mr. Swift was born on a ranch in Amador County near Ione, Calif., and later moved with his parents to a ranch near Placerville. He is married, has two small children, and lives at 323 North Oxford St., Arlington, Va.
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Lloyd V. Swift, Director, Division of Wildlife Management, Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture

Rearred on a livestock ranch in the Sierra Nevada foothills, he completed his academic training in California schools, graduating from the University of California with a B.S. degree in Plant Science in 1927 and an M.S. degree in Forest and Range Ecology in 1930.

Since entering the Forest Service in 1929, he has worked on various assignments in both administration and research. He has held the top wildlife position in the Forest Service since 1944.

He authored a number of published manuscripts dealing with wildlife on National Forests and co-authored the Range Plant Handbook, which is currently used throughout the Forest Service.

He has attended several international conferences on conservation resources in various parts of the world, including the meetings in 1960 of the International Union for the Protection of Nature and Natural Resources, which was held in Warsaw, Poland, and the Fifth World Forestry Congress, in Seattle, where he served as a member of the Secretariat. During that same year he completed a 3-month assignment with the International Cooperative Administration to the State of Israel to prepare a Program for Conservation and Wildlife Management.

Mr. Swift is primarily responsible for the excellent cooperative working relationships the Forest Service enjoys with the several State fish and game agencies.

ADDENDUM—July 1968:

As you know, Mr. Swift retired from the Forest Service (USDA) in May 1963 and became Executive Secretary of the World Wildlife Fund. He retired from this latter position in November 1966, but has continued professionally as a consultant in conservation matters.
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Graduated from the University of Oklahoma in 1947 with a B.A. in psychology, wrote for campus magazine; Master of Arts in educational psychology from the University of Illinois in 1952, with heavy minors in English for both degrees.
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