

Maureen and Mike

# Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

## **Archives and Special Collections**

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: [library.archives@umontana.edu](mailto:library.archives@umontana.edu)

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

## **Oral History 271-01**

**Interviewer: Dick Shannon**

**Interviewee: Thurman Trosper**

**May 15, 1991**

Dick Shannon: The subject of our interview for the oral history sequence this afternoon is Thurman H. Trosper who lives in the area of Ronan, Montana where he was born some years ago. He was a graduate of the University of Montana Forestry School before World War II. Then, in 1946, after service with the Marine Corps he became an employee of the Forest Service. After serving on a number of National Forests in Region One, he became supervisor of the Bitterroot National Forest in 1955 and served in that capacity until 1960. In 1960, he moved back to Washington, D.C. and was a part of the team that worked on the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the last significant land management act drafted inside a federal agency as opposed to being drafted within Congress. The subject of our interview this afternoon has to do with the origins of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 and the involvement of the number of people who were involved in that process.

Thurman, if you might, just set the stage and tell us about how the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act came into existence.

Thurman Trosper: When I was transferred from the Bitterroot back to Washington, D.C. as part of a career move, I ended up in a division called the Division of Legislation and Program Planning. Ed Crafts, Dr. Crafts, was the Assistant Chief in charge of those two divisions. This was a training session for me and I worked part-time in the Division of Program Planning. We were involved at that point in the preliminary work for the Recreation Bill that came about later on that set up the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The other part of my duties was to work on legislation and my specific task was to write position papers supporting or not supporting various pieces of legislation that were introduced into Congress. You understand that when the Forest Service responds to a piece of legislation, it comes out in the name of the Secretary. It's never the Bureau; it's the Secretary's position. I would get a bill handed to me to write a position on for the Secretary. I said, well gee, this sounds like a great idea. I wonder who thought that idea up.

Why wasn't it thought up earlier? I'd go to the files and dig through the files and I'd usually find a file about two inches thick that'd been talking about this particular idea for the last 30 years! I'd read the file and then come out with a position paper.

Well, during that period, the hierarchy of the Forest Service decided that they needed a particular piece of legislation to authorize multiple use. They'd been talking about multiple use for the last 30 years, but nobody really understood what multiple use was. It was a very vague concept. At the time, the motivation for the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act really grew out of the Wilderness Society's initiative to introduce a bill which, in effect, would take the decision making for wilderness outside of the ...would no longer be established by the administration, internally, but wilderness would be established congressionally, by Congress.

DS: That battle really started about 1958, didn't it?

TT: It started earlier than that. It started about 1955, '56. The decision of the Wilderness Society was made up at Bud Cheff's place. We were up there at a council meeting. The Forest Service finally reached the conclusion that - based on two or three major aspects of wilderness - first of all, there was a wilderness other than the national forests: on the public domain, in the national parks, on the wildlife refuges. These agencies were very reluctant to establish any kind of wilderness policy. They had no wilderness policy. The other motivation was that the Wilderness Society became convinced that the Forest Service, although they had the idea originally under ...Aldo Leopold ...They were kind of the prime movers of the wilderness concept. Of course, that goes way back into the last century under Muir. But the Wilderness Society reached the conclusion that the Forest Service was going to keep the wilderness areas small, restrictive, and that they couldn't rely on the Forest Service to continue the wilderness policy that really had been generated and came out of the Forest Service as a concept of setting lands aside for wilderness. Of course, this goes back to ... Prior to 1939, the wilderness and the national forests weren't called wilderness; they were called "primitive areas."

DS: Right.

TT: Bob Marshall became the Recreation Chief in the Forest Service and he thought, rightly, that the standards should be rewritten to exclude roads and to exclude certain kinds of uses within the wilderness. So, he came up with the Use-1, Use-2, and Use-3 regulations which were standards

that were more restrictive than the old primitive area standards. Under primitive areas, you could have roads; you could have all kinds of nonconforming uses - use of power saws, use of mechanized equipment. Marshall wanted it more pure than that, so he wrote the use regulations. This required the Forest Service to go through and reclassify, or restudy, all of the old primitive areas that had been established.

I think we have time to go into an aside here, because this is kind of significant too as far as wilderness is concerned. And this ties back into the reasons for the Multiple Use Act. The Forest Service ... if you look back, the inter-agency fights were going way back into the '20s. There was one of really intense competition between the Park Service and the Forest Service as to what agency would manage these federal lands. The Forest Service had beautiful, beautiful areas. They were pristine areas. The most inexpensive way to create national parks was to set aside parts of the national forests and make them national parks. This was part of the motivation. There were really two parts to the motivation for the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. This fight went on and on and on. Going back into the '30s, when President Roosevelt was president - about 1933 - he created the Olympic National Monument and extended the boundaries. This, of course, set a very clear signal to the timber industry and to the Forest Service that these lands were up for grabs and that the Park Service was making huge inroads on national forested land.

This land managing business: as far as the federal government is concerned, an agency really doesn't amount to much unless it has lands to manage. Park Service, the Forest Service, had to have lands to manage. You had this ongoing fight between the Park Service and the Forest Service for jurisdiction over these federal lands. After that signal out of Olympic National Park, the Forest Service then quickly started a program. This was quite a long period of transition, but the Forest Service could see that they were going to have to do something with these wild lands and do it quickly. So they immediately created a lot of primitive areas. If you go back and look at the date that the primitive areas were established, you'll find that most of them were established in 1936. This was strictly a political move to prevent the Park Service from coming in and saying we can do a better job of managing these lands because we'll give them parks status and this brings a lot of benefits and publicity to local areas and local communities.

As a matter of fact, the present Speaker of the House, Mr. Foley, complained to the Forest Service when I was back in Washington. He was a young congressman then. He said the way

that you manage national forests, you don't know whether you're on the national forests or off of them, you don't have any publicity, they mean nothing to a community. But once you create a national park, there's a focus of attention and communities prosper because it brings in tourism, they gain status, you have facilities, you have roads and trails, and you have visibility. It means a great deal to these local, small communities to have this kind of visibility with a national park whereas with a national forest, it's really humdrum and meaningless. You don't know when you're in it; you don't know when you're out of it.

This is maybe straying away from multiple use a bit, but [I'm] just laying some background on why these things came into being, why the Multiple Use Act seemed to be needed. This initiative, this act, came out of the Forest Service; it didn't come out of Congress; it didn't come out of private groups. It was strictly a bureaucratic initiative, sponsored by the Chief and his staff to get a piece of legislation. Of course, there's all ways you can rationalize and come up with reasons why you need a piece of legislation. Well, in this case the Forest Service said look: we don't have clear administrative authority, legislative authority that is. We don't have clear legislative authority to manage recreation or to manage grazing - although, they'd been managing grazing under the old act of 1897. Historically, they were meant for grazing. This was the rationale that we need this Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. Everybody set aside their work and went to work on developing this Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. Anyhow, everybody in the Chiefs office was working on it. Ed Crafts, my boss Dr. Crafts...

DS: He's the author, by the way, of the two part article "On the Origins of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act" that appeared in the *American Forests* in June and July, 1970. His is the only principal, authoritative work that's been published in this country on the origins of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960.

TT: That's great. That article is kind of a classic article. It doesn't tell the whole story because the whole story has to be understood in the context, as you say, of the politics at the time and the drive of the National Park Service to create more national parks out of national forests, the drive of the Wilderness Society to get wilderness established as a congressionally mandated authority. The Forest Service's counter-move to those initiatives was to push for the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. It was very important at that point for the Forest Service to contrast the single use that occurs on a national park with the multiple uses that occur on a national forest,

yielding much, much greater overall public benefit than you get from single use on a national park. This was Ed Crafts' theme. Of course, if you analyze this, this just doesn't make any sense at all because on national parks you have recreation, you have watershed management, you have wildlife, you have scenery, you have everything except timber tracking.

DS: And in some cases, you've got grazing.

TT: And in some cases, you have grazing that was established before the parks were established. The real motivation, then, for the Forest Service on pushing the Multiple Use Act was to come up with a clear-cut mandate from Congress that the national forests would be managed for Multiple Use.

DS: And, above all, including the word "recreation".

TT: They started with recreation. They put them alphabetically, with recreation, timber, wildlife, and so on. Watershed. So we all turned our hands to getting this act through. Crafts was, first of all, a very brilliant administrator. Of all the bureaucrats that I worked with he was one person that knew how to get things accomplished. He was the primary liaison between the Forest Service and Congress. He knew how to work Congress. He prepared this first bill and pretty well convinced both committees in Congress - both the senate, and the house - that this act was needed. They were reluctant: but you've got all of these authorities, you have all of these acts. And they would cite the acts. Why do you need this additional authority? The Forest Service rationalized: we need it because we have to have a clear cut authority for recreation, for grazing, and for wildlife. We have to have these particular authorities. The reasoning on the hill was that this is an innocuous piece of legislation; it's not going to cost the taxpayers any money. Why don't we go ahead and do it?

They did approve and acquiesce to the Forest Service initiative to push through the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. It got down to getting it into a bill form. It had been in bill form; it had been modified some because of the timber industry's concern, because of grazers' concerns and so forth. When they got right down to the committees, the committees said we need a definition for a "multiple use"; we need a definition for "sustained yield". The Forest Service, for reasons that I will never understand, was very reluctant to produce these definitions. When you're trying to get bills through Congress, one of the first things you have to do is be very explicit about your terms

and about your definitions. But the Forest Service ... I think their reluctance stemmed from the fact that in any administrative agency, you like your authorities to be vague and general because this leaves a whole area for administrative discretion, for agency decision making within these broad, undefined guidelines. I think that was really the reason that the Forest Service did not want to have these definitions. When Congress put the Forest Service's feet to the fire, they had to produce these definitions.

One morning, I came to work and my boss said I want you to write a definition for "multiple use" and "sustained yield" right out of the blue. I was to do this job. That's a pretty important assignment. A young forester doesn't have that opportunity every time, so I set about writing what I thought would be a good explanation for multiple use, a good rationalization. As a good, loyal, dedicated bureaucrat, I knew that the Forest Service wanted to keep the guidelines as broad as possible, maintain their administrative discretion not only now, but into the future, and to keep things as general and vague as possible. So I wrote a definition that said, look, multiple use doesn't necessarily have to take place within every acre at one time. It needs to be over large areas and also over time because the uses will change over time. That was my contribution to multiple use. I wrote a definition for sustained yield, but Ed Crafts' administrative assistant, a lady, Ms. Combe, wrote *the* definition for sustained yield. She alone put that together - a nice little package for sustained yield which is quite explicit and I think I wouldn't have any argument with it. But the definition for multiple use, if you look at it, leaves everything for the administrator, for the guy on the ground in time. Of course, that was the intent. I feel no reluctance about admitting why it was done because, when you're working for a bureau, they have your full time and attention. They're paying you to protect their interests.

That was kind of the genesis of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. Just to summarize, the Forest Service had, really, two primary motivations for getting this Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act: one, they wanted to have a way of contrasting their style of management with that of the Park Service because, at that time, the Park Service had staked out 25 areas on the national forests that they wanted as national parks. The director of the Park Service at that time was a fellow by the name of Connie Worth. The most inexpensive way to create a national park was to create it out of the national forests - no outlay of public funds for acquisition. The other reason that the Forest Service wanted this Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act was as a bulwark against

the Wilderness Act. They had been very successful, up until 1960, in preventing the Wilderness Act from being enacted. My old friend - a very close friend of mine - Howard Zahniser, then the executive director of the Wilderness Society, had worked long and hard to produce a Wilderness Act that was acceptable to everybody. He drafted and re-drafted and re-drafted to accommodate the miners, to accommodate the grazers, and to accommodate the timber people. There was no Wilderness Act in 1960 and it looked like it would never be passed primarily because Congressman Aspinall sat in the driver's seat. He was the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The Forest Service had gotten to him and the grazers and said we don't want this act. He bottled it up in committee and kept it in committee until 1964.

Anyhow, let me go on and tell you about this, which is related to the motivation of the Forest Service. These 25 areas that Connie Worth had staked out on the national forests ranged from the Oregon Dunes, to the North Cascades, to Waldo Lake in Oregon. These were very beautiful, high-class areas that met pristine, one-of-a-kind, Park Service standards. You have to realize that even Glacier National Park was a national forest before it was a national park. That was created before the turn of the century or about that time. It was created, I think, exactly when I don't remember. But it was a national forest. One of the paradoxes was that the forest ranger - there not being at that point a bureaucracy that was locked in with a whole thought-out, conventional wisdom of its own - was advocating Glacier National Park as a national park, not a national forest. It was too unique, too pristine, to be a national forest. He was advocating a national park. About 1909, Congress agreed and made it a national park. This was before the competition got so intense. Shortly after the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act was finally rammed through Congress ... And it was really rammed through Congress. Everybody, including the timber industry, was actually amazed, absolutely amazed, at how fast this thing went through Congress, without a hitch, because of the steamroller that Dr. Crafts had created. Signed, sealed, delivered and bingo, we had the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act. Unfortunately, the Forest Service had gotten this wonderful policy of multiple use, but up until now - according to my dear friend that had worked with us on the congressional side, Mr. Bob Wolf - you can't find any place in the national forests where you can say this is multiple use in action. There's no example; there's no refinement. You don't find it on the ground. He's written quite a good article on this topic.



To carry on from the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act ... This act did not stop the Park Service initiative. The Park Service was still out to annex national forest land. I was given an assignment right out of the blue. The Chief called me in and said, "I want you to work over here in the Division of Information and Education and I want you to sit down and think of all the ways that the Forest Service can come up with to stop these inroads of the National Park Service on national forest land." They didn't give me a promotion for that; they just transferred me from the Division of Program Planning over to the Division of Information and Education. They gave me a title called "Multiple Use Relations." I don't think they really wanted people to know what I was doing. I had another person upstairs on the next floor that was in charge of multiple use. His name was Neal Rahm. He eventually became Regional Forester out here in Missoula. Neal and I would confer once in a while. We had a great lot of laughs about our various roles. He was in charge of multiple use and I was in charge of multiple use relations. I had a small staff. My task was to come up with all of the ideas that could be implemented to give the national forests visibility. This was at a time when we had one of the real, dedicated, broad gauge chiefs: Chief McArdle. He's the last such chief we've had. The rest of them have been primarily, politically, timber-oriented. But this chief had great breadth of vision, great depth of vision, and he understood what the role of the national forests could be.

Anyhow, I worked diligently on this project for about three months, coming up with all of these ideas. I developed a laundry list of things that the Forest Service had to do if they were going to get visibility and to bring the national forests into the modern day. I didn't realize at that time - I thought that this would be a very simple thing to do for the bureaucracy to change the direction and to get people to understand that the national forests were really, ultimately, public lands. The audience was the general public; we were serving the general public, not the timber industry or the wildlife industry or anybody else. We were serving the general public. It would be very simple to bring this program about. After working on this program and talking to all of the hierarchy - the engineers, the timber people, and the recreation people - I came up with this laundry list and this included little things such as getting the national forests on all of the road maps that the oil companies put out, coming up with a series of publications that would put the role and the mission of the Forest Service in a context so that the general public would understand what we were doing. Not to get away from ... but to enlarge on the publications: up to that point, the Forest Service publications were primarily technically oriented.

DS: In house.

TT: In house, technically oriented, not for the general public. I came up with a laundry list of about 25 publications that we should write and produce. The first one, of course being a member of the Wilderness Council at that point ... That was about the time that I became a member of the Wilderness Council.

DS: That's the Wilderness Society Council.

TT: The Wilderness Society Council. I said, well, the first publication really should be on wilderness. So, I set about it. I put that at number one. We'll write that one first. But then we had publications in line for recreation, various aspects of recreation, wildlife, various aspects of wildlife, watershed management, right on down through. These would be produced in sequence as fast as we could produce them and get them out into general circulation. At this point, I was working very closely, of course, with Reynolds Florence, who was the assistant to Ed Crafts and legislative liaison. He would usually call his young troops in periodically. He had kind of a junior staff. He would tell us about what the Forest Service was doing and what the plans were.

I would raise a question for Reynolds Florence: "why is it that the timber industry is so adamant against wilderness and why isn't the Forest Service giving this wilderness more visibility and giving it more support? It sounds like, to me, that the Forest Service is passing information to the timber industry; is that so?"

Reynolds would say, "No, indeed we wouldn't do that. We wouldn't pass information to the timber industry." I knew they were doing this. The Forest Service loved wilderness, but they wanted to keep it in-house, they wanted to keep it small. A minimum number of acres would be dedicated to wilderness - lands that couldn't be used for anything else, "wilderness on the rocks" we termed it.

One of the other things that I said that we had needed to do if we were going to compete with the Park Service: we had to come up with motorized information tours on the national forests, nature trails, and interpretative rangers on each national forest to actually meet the public and to interpret what we were doing. We had to have visitor centers as good as or better than the National Park Service. We had to get into a signing program, so we had to put up nice signs so

that people, when they reached a national forest, knew they were in a national forest and not a national park or a wildlife refuge. This was a national forest.

The chief called me in to make a presentation to the chief of staff. This was really quite an honor, but also quite awesome. Here was this young forest supervisor back there telling the whole leadership of the Forest Service where they had to go if they wanted to protect their national forest lands. I gave the presentation. It took me about an hour; I had all kinds of charts and I had everything in detail. I got through: dead silence, absolutely dead silence. Pretty soon, McArdle leaned back and said, "Well, this is what I've been telling you people for the last 10 years." I knew then I had the support of the main man. I had to channel and devote resources to developing a program that would give the national forests visibility.

Ultimately, this program became a thing called "A Visitor Information Service." At that point, we had no name, no designation. Then I attached dollars to what these things would cost and how fast we could hope to move. At the outset I said we need about \$50,000 per region just for the planning - planning for visitor centers, where should they be, what should they be. We would have to get landscape architects and architects involved. We would have to develop information programs on that at the regional level. They would have to have at least that much money to do the events planning with the idea that, ultimately, the goal would be to build one visitor center per region. That would be the initial goal. This may take five or more years. Well, I would get the money set up and the next thing I knew, I would find out that the money was gone.

Ed Cliff was then in charge of National Forest Administration which is probably, next to the Chief, the most powerful administrative position in the hierarchy. He's the guy that calls the shots on what happens on the national forests. Ed Cliff was primarily - not exclusively, but primarily - a timber man. He was committed to cutting timber; he had no time for building visitor centers or even planning for visitor centers. I would discover that my \$50,000 per region had evaporated in the preliminary budgets. I'd run into the Chief and I'd say, "Chief, if we're for real with this, we've got to fund it."

The Chief, being the kind of person he was, would say, "I agree." He'd stick the money back in the budget. This went on, along with variations of it, for a long time. One of the things that the Forest Service did was to appoint a committee composed of engineers and architects to develop a

sign program. We had to come up with slogans. There were all kinds of slogans. One of them was, "The Land of Many Uses." This was one of the slogans that came out of the I & E Shop [Division of Information and Education]. I used to tell our old friend Ben Kelly that we were developing all of these signs, symbols, and slogans. He would say, "I kind of suspected that because I look on you as being symbol minded." (laughter)

We got this program initiated and we came out with the first publication - a beautiful, beautiful publication on wilderness. I wrote a one page policy statement that said, in effect: wilderness is a Forest Service idea; it was our idea from the beginning; we stand by it, we're going to protect it, we're going to manage it. I made it as strong as I thought the Chief would sign it. I took it into the Chief and said, "This is the centerpiece of this document. This is the Forest Service policy on wilderness." He made it a lot stronger. He took out some of the weasel words and he tightened it right up.

DS: This is McArdle?

TT: McArdle. Yeah. He made it a lot stronger. We went ahead and produced this document. I was working with a little guy by the name of Rudy Wendelin to do the artwork. He was a beautiful artist. I was so damn proud of that and I don't have a copy of that thing today. Maybe there's one in the archives. The Visitor Information Program ... This was kind of an insight to me. When you get something like that committed by the agency, locked on to what has to be done, you don't have to worry about it anymore. They follow through and do it. Here was the charter; here was what you had to do. Eventually, the Forest Service put half a dozen guys in there on the Visitor Information Program and they followed right through with it, everything that was in the outline. Just like clockwork. That program didn't protect all of the national forests. We won most of the battles, but we got down to the North Cascades. It was the last one. The Wilderness Society was working very diligently to get the North Cascades to reside as a wilderness. The Forest Service said no way. This was at a time when we lost our great leader: McArdle retired. Lo and behold, we ended with Ed Cliff as the administrator.

DS: As the new Chief.

TT: As the new Chief. As the head guy.

DS: As the Chief who lost the land to the Park Service for the last big time.

TT: He was the guy. I could see this coming. I would sit there in my little bailiwick and you'd have these proposals come through, like for Waldo Lake. Waldo Lake was a beautiful area over in Oregon with limited access. The Forest Service came up with a plan . Waldo Lake is kind of up on a plateau . A big plan and all there was in it was a small area for recreation development around Waldo Lake and the rest of it is how are they going to cut the timber all around this basin. I wrote a response: if you want to lose Waldo Lake, implement this plan because this would become a national park in a very, very short period of time. They never implemented the plan. On a number of occasions, I would read plans like this. The Forest Service didn't have the breadth of capacity to understand that they had to consider what was happening politically, first of all, and to understand that they had to be a lot broader in trying to serve the public rather than just the timber industry, the grazing industry, or some other small sector of the public. A good example of that is the North Cascades. The Park Service [Forest Service?], under Ed Cliff and Ed Crafts, they were adamant in not designating one acre of the North Cascades as wilderness.

DS: That was the Forest Service under Cliff and Crafts that had not done any of this.

TT: Right. They refused to consider any wilderness for the North Cascades.

DS: The net result was that Congress passed the Northern Cascades Park Bill. That's 1964. That established the last gigantic national park with a major highway bisecting it.

TT: That cut the heart right out of the national forest. It was created out of national forest.

As an aside, Ed Crafts met with congressman, our Speaker of the House, Foley. Foley was from Spokane. Foley was, of course, listening to the drumbeat of his constituents. The drumbeat that he caught was that we want to protect this area as a wilderness, national park, or whatever. He met personally with Crafts and Cliff and the quote that I got was that the two of them, Crafts and Cliff, said we are not going to give up any land for wilderness at all. This is going to be national forest straightaway.

Foley said, "Is that your last word Dr. Crafts?"

Dr Crafts said, "Yes, that's my last word."

He said, "Good. Then, I'm going to go create a national park."

DS: That goes back to something else you mentioned earlier, Thurman, that I want to comment on. That is that we ended up with a definition of multiple use. It's about three inches of legal type and then a definition of sustained yield which is about an inch.

TT: About two sentences.

DS: Right. For a person who's taught administration, the significant thing of those two definitions is that it is not difficult - it is impossible - to derive a management standard from either one.

TT: Absolutely.

DS: This is one of the things that the Forest Service has as a major achievement: it's got definitions for its guidance, but you cannot translate it into a management standard whether you are the President of the United States, managing the budget, congress, or someone else. From 1960 to the present time, we have a long literature of, "what does multiple use really mean?" As you commented, Bob Wolf has a recent article out pointing out that he can't find an example of multiple use in practice anywhere. I might also mention that in the lawsuit with the Dorothy Thompson Foundation back in 1970, a federal judge said that multiple use in a given area means, at law, whatever the Forest Service is doing.

TT: Absolutely correct.

DS: That was 21 years ago and the law has not been altered. I might also mention before I let you come back into this that, since 1960, time after time, Congress has refused to modify the definition and keeps sticking the phrase into other laws and in many places. For example, in the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the dominant phraseology throughout the principal part of the law is multiple use, multiple use, multiple use. Secondly, the Bureau of Land Management also has a multiple use mandate, but their definition of multiple use is different from the definition from the Forest Service. We end up with two national definitions of multiple - of what multiple use management is - neither one of which can be really analyzed in management terms.

TT: That's correct.

DS: Where do you want to do go from here?

TT: If you go back to the original premise, the reason for the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act, on the part of the Forest Service, was not necessarily to give the Forest Service clear-cut authority for managing all of the resources from the national forests; it was primarily a political vehicle to stop the Wilderness Society, to stop the Park Service from making inroads on the national forests. Ultimately, the reason that you have that very general and broad definition for multiple use was by intent. The intent was to leave all of the discretion of decision making on the national forests, from then on, in the hands of the Forest Service. This was the intent and this is the way it has worked out. This is why you do not have a clear-cut definition or mandate - where you can't demonstrate it on the ground - of what multiple use really is. Multiple use is a good catch phrase for managing land. From a professional or scientific standpoint, it is meaningless. It's a political arrangement; it's a political gamut. It has to be understood in that context. Like the judge said, multiple use is anything that the Forest Service says it is at any particular point in time.

DS: And on any location.

TT: And on any location.

DS: One other item that I think we ought to stick in here is that by passing the Multiple Use Act and having the words "outdoor recreation" in the definition of what the uses were, you provided the legal basis for the agency to request appropriations for a people related purpose as opposed to a resource related purpose. One of the outbursts of that was then the development of the 1/4 inch maps by national forest ranger district, the 1/2 inch maps, and the long-term policy at the end of about 1976 of giving these away free to recreational users on public land. Then we began the process of selling them.

TT: I would recommend to anybody that is interested in going into this in more detail is to get a hold of the publication ... I don't think it's been published yet. Just last fall, I got a copy of Bob Wolfs article and analysis of multiple use. When I was working on multiple use within the Forest Service, Bob was over on the hill working on definitions of multiple use, working on

wilderness, with the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He was very close to this whole process. I think you'll find a very excellent analysis of multiple use and, really, the mix-ups: sometimes, with multiple use, they're talking about resource management, sometimes they're talking about people management, whether it's an activity, whether it's a resource activity, or just what it is. I would highly recommend that to anybody that's interested in getting involved in looking at the genesis of multiple use.

I want to make this aside that's kind of interesting. I mentioned that the congressman from Colorado, Aspinall, stood in the way of the Wilderness Act. He kept the door closed. All of a sudden, Mr. Aspinall decided that he wanted to have a Land Law Review Commission established. This was going to be his swan song and his contribution to Congress. Bob Wolf came from Aspinall's office and said, "We have a proposal for a Land Law Review Commission."

Anderson pulled his hands back behind his head and laid back in his chair. He said, "Well, we've got the Wilderness Act."

DS: That's Clinton Anderson.

TT: Clinton Anderson from New Mexico. [He was] a very, very fine individual, dedicated conservationist, and a person with his heart in the right place. From then on, it was easy going to get the Wilderness Act because the trade off between Anderson ... Anderson was in charge of the House Agricultural Committee and Aspinall's bill would have to go through Anderson to get passed. That was the trade-off.

DS: There are four things there that I would like to mention for the record before we turn this tape over. There were three bills and a fourth occurrence all in 1964 that were all tied together. One was the passage of the Public Land Law Review Commission Act, the second was the passage of the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Classification Act for the BLM [Bureau of Land Management] that had a 5 year life, the third was the passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964, and the fourth that made all the others possible was the agreement that Wayne Aspinall .

[End of Side A]

Side B is blank.