

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 Number: 297-033, 034, 035**  
**Interviewee: Clinton R. "Pink" Gutermuth**  
**Interviewer: Gyongyver "Kitty" Beuchert**  
**Date of Interview: October 23, 1980**  
**Project: Boone and Crockett Club Oral History Collection**

Gyongyver Beuchert: This is an oral history interview conducted on behalf of the Boone and Crockett Club with Clinton R. Gutermuth on October 23, 1980 at his home in Arlington, Virginia, by Gyongyver "Kitty" Beuchert, office administrator of the Boone and Crockett Club.

Dr. Gutermuth, I'd like to ask you a little bit about your background—your birth date and place of birth and so forth.

Clinton Gutermuth: Well, Kitty, I was born on a farm nine miles south of Fort Wayne, Indiana, on August 16, 1900. That means that I have just passed my 80th birthday. My father was a farmer and a blacksmith. He had a blacksmith shop on the farm because of a brother-in-law who he helped finance, get started, in the laundry business in Elkhart, Indiana. That's what took my father and his family to Elkhart, which, incidentally, is the band instrument city of the world and the home of Alka-Seltzer and Miles Laboratories.

My formative years were in Elkhart, Indiana, and I, after finishing school, got into the St. Joseph Valley Bank and became the assistant cashier in the bank at which time I was very active in trying to interest people in fish and wildlife conservation. I was very active in going around the country using my motion pictures that I was taking of different hunting and fishing trips to use in forming local conservation clubs.

GB: Excuse me, that was a side interest at that time, that wasn't a career yet? Is that what you're saying?

CG: That was just a hobby. I was the assistant cashier in the bank. Of course, the bank, as an officer when the bank closed and we could get it balanced, I could leave. I spent much of my time organizing local conservation clubs throughout northern Indiana and southern Michigan. It was that activity that, later, when Paul V. McNutt was elected governor in Indiana, he came to Elkhart because of the notoriety that had been developed as a result of my interest in forming clubs. He talked me into leaving the bank and going to become the director, first, of education and later, the director of Fish and Game in the Indiana Department of Conservation. That was in 1934, I think.

I remained in the Indiana department for over eight years and served under three governors: Governor Clifford Townsend and then, later Governor, Henry Schricker—S-c-h-r-i-c-k-e-r. It was Henry Schricker's desire as governor—governors cannot replace themselves in Indiana—so he was interested in forming a political organization.

My activities over the years—at that time we had created nearly 1,200 local conservation clubs in the state of Indiana. We had helped finance the activities of the clubs through a game release—pheasants and quail and fish in local fish hatcheries—and pairing those local organizations for raising and releasing fish and game, but we restricted their money and how they could use it. One of the eligible ways that they could use it was to build a clubhouse. Therefore, in Indiana today, we still have over 600 clubhouses, which have become the meeting places of all those little communities in 600 places throughout the state on Indiana.

Of course, we had built up these local clubs. I had formed a magazine called *Outdoor Indiana* which we—the department—sent each month to all of the club members gratuitously, and this became an exceedingly important conservation program. The plan of organization, incidentally, was subsequently used after I became the Director of Fish and Game. It was subsequently used by Jay N. “Ding” Darling as the plan for the organization of the National Wildlife Federation here in Washington. I have, in my papers, the correspondence between me and “Ding” Darling over that plan of organization, so that’s quite a historic thing in itself. But I started to say that Henry Schricker wanted to form this political organization to run for the United States Senate, and I was as bound and determined that he was not going to use my club organization as he was that he was going to use it. We fought over that for several years, and finally I resigned as the director of Fish and Game and later moved to Washington to become associated with the American Wildlife Institute rather than to yield to him on his political ambition.

One salvation that I had as a result of my move, Henry Schricker never became United States senator, so I felt pretty well compensated for taking such a definite, positive stand against letting him inject my conservation program into politics. So I guess that’s enough for—

GB: Now, I've got two more questions. One—and I'll insert this in the transcript back where you started—I don't believe you gave the names of your mother and father. I think that might be good to have.

CG: My father's name was Henry Christian Gutermuth, and my mother's name was Alice Zion—Z-i-o-n.

GB: I'd also like you to tell me a little bit about your wife, Beth, and maybe a little bit about your wife, Marian, now because after Beth died I know you remarried.

CG: Beth and I were married for nearly 54 years. She was extremely active with me all the time in my conservation work. She traveled with me a great deal and participated in lady functions in connection with meetings and that sort of thing. So she was very active and extremely interested in what I was doing. She was...well, no formal training, she was one of the best botanists that I've ever known. She could identify every wildflower that ever was and every weed and had no trouble in identifying all of the trees. She was very interested in the out-of-doors, and while she never did any hunting and didn't care too much about fishing...She did a little fishing, but she never hunted. I don't think she ever used a gun very much. But she

was the finest companion that ever was.

So I lived alone for about two years after her demise, and then I went back to Elkhart and—I told you I worked in the bank. While I was the assistant cashier in the bank and married at that time, why, one of our savings tellers was a young lady, unmarried, by the name of Marian Schutt—S-c-h-u-t-t—very charming young lady with a pleasing personality. After I left Elkhart, she became married—married an attorney who became very prominent. She raised a family. She had two boys and a daughter, who is deceased now, but the husband, Tom Happer—H-a-p-p-e-r—had passed away many years ago and Marian was living alone. Her two sons both have families. They have two children each, and so she has four grandchildren, which I have now inherited that whole family. We've been getting along famously now for nearly four years. We've traveled everywhere. We've been all over Europe, to the Holy Land, to Egypt. We've been to Russia, to India, to Africa, to all over the United States and Canada, to Alaska and up to Point Barrow, and to a number of the Eskimo villages and on and on. Many places I can't remember, I guess. Now, on November 5, about two weeks from now, we're taking off for New Zealand, Australia, Fiji, and Hawaii for six weeks. So we're enjoying ourselves very much.

GB: Well, I'll tell you, I feel very honored to have shared a very special moment with you, because we were at the same meeting in Atlanta when she accepted your proposal of marriage and I remember how excited you were. (laughs)

Okay. Then the other thing I wanted to ask you about was, when did you become interested in hunting, or did that just go along with your love of outdoors? Could you tell a little bit about a few hunting trips you've taken?

CG: Oh, I've been interested in hunting...My father, I mentioned, he went to Elkhart and was active in the laundry business. In fact, he owned five laundries in that town at one time. At that time, we had a cottage at Christiana Lake in southern Michigan, which Elkhart is only five miles [south] from the Michigan line and this lake is about five miles north of the line. So our cottage was about ten miles from home. I have one brother, and we used to spend the summers at this lake every year and we did this for years and years. We worked up there helping with take care of the boats and yards and doing all kinds of odd jobs around at the Oaks Hotel and things like that. We were very busy, but we spent the whole summers at the lake. We had friends around there who indoctrinated me in all forms of outdoor activities. I've never had any formal training as such, but starting from a kid, I've had that kind of "hard knocks" training. I became interested in hunting and fishing as a small child and have participated in that for a whole lifetime.

I've made many big game hunting trips. Back in 1923, I became a member of the Elkhart Canadian Hunting Club. Eleven members there in our little hometown bought 1,100 acres of land on the south shore of Lake Nipissing in Ontario [Canada]. Lake Nipissing is a large lake, 100 miles long and 50 miles wide, and its north bay is on the north side of the lake. We would go up to this property every year where we had built a large log cabin for a lodge and sleeping quarters and another large log cabin for cooking and eating. We had Canadian guides and cooks

and stuff, so this was a regular thing to go deer hunting up there every year which I did for a number of years. The club's still going, and I still am a member of it. I don't know what the status of the land is now. We still own the land as far as I know. We don't have any mineral rights, but it's still pretty wild. There are no developments around. The map around in that vicinity looks pretty blank even today, and I guess it is. So that was the start of my big game hunting.

Subsequently I went up the Algoma Central Railroad, north of the Sault [Ste. Marie?], moose hunting and got a big moose. I succeeded in getting the whole thing back home and hanging it up in front of the bank to prove my prowess. Almost had to put a mortgage on the house to get that moose crated and brought down here in a refrigeration car and so on. (laughs) But anyway, we hung it up in front of the bank, and that was really something.

Later, I went with this same group of people. We chartered the observation car in the Orient Limited of the Great Northern Railroad out of Chicago so we had the whole car—we 11 people. I think there were 12. We had another person with us. We went to Great Falls, Montana, and there went up the end of the Blackfoot National Forest, up the west side of Glacier National Park, to hunt deer. But while we were there, George Schneider, who owned the Elkhart Foundry, and I went grizzly bear hunting. That's a story that I can't get into because it's too involved. I saw and had a perfect shot at a grizzly but decided against shooting. That's too long a story to go into now.

But I also, then, went sheep hunting on another trip, and while I got a sheep, it fell over the side of a precipice and lodged in a position that we couldn't get at it at all, so I never was able to recover the sheep. So I was quite disappointed about that.

But now while I've traveled all over Africa and all over Canada and up into Alaska, I've never done any hunting in Alaska or in Africa at all. I've been interested in that now in recent years.

I just went bird shooting two weeks ago with Pete Potaski (?) up in Northern Michigan. We got a few grouse and a few woodcock, enough to have a nice dinner. So I'm still interested. I still do quite a bit of target shooting. I've got Marian now interested. I bought her a new Sporter—.22 Sporter rifle—and also a new Smith and Wesson automatic .22 pistol. We go out to the Fairfax Rod and Gun Club target shooting every now and then so we're still pretty active at our age. That's pretty good.

GB: I think that's wonderful. Well, thank you.

The next question that I'm going to ask you is a very general one. I guess, basically, in order not to take the next four hours answering it, what I'd like to do is ask you to tell me which were the most important organizations you've been involved with and in what capacity because I know you've been involved in some way with almost every organization there is. (laughs)

CG: Why, I sound, Kitty, like Major Hoople in my involvement in conservation. I came here, as I mentioned briefly, with the American Wildlife Institute which at that time was putting on the big North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conferences and also was, among other things, the sponsor of the Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit program which is in 18 of the land grant colleges around the country.

GB: Is that now the same thing as the Wildlife Management Institute?

CG: Yes, and I was going to mention that. I came to the first board meeting as the executive secretary of the American Wildlife Institute, and found there that all of the directors—they were called trustees—were the ones who raised the money for the organization and they were all over 70. I could see that the future of that organization was in jeopardy just because of the age of the people. They were all interested, had truly outstanding people. The president was former senator from Connecticut, Frederic C. Walcott. Mr. T. E. Duermes (?) of the DuPont Company was the treasurer. The vice president was Seth Gordan, one of the old-time conservationists who is still alive today at about 92. On the board was a whole string of outstanding people: Rudy Carpenter of the DuPont Company, C. K. Davis of the Remington Arms Company, Fred Davis of the, I think, Goodrich Rubber Company, George Eastman of Eastman-Kodak, Max McGraw of the McGraw Electric Company, and on and on like that. I decided at that time that something had to be done to stabilize that great organization, which was a great organization. It had been going continuously with some little name changes since 1911.

So I proceeded to reorganize that organization. I got Dr. Gabrielson, who was then the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to retire from government and come over and head up a new organization that I was forming, the Wildlife Management Institute. I became the executive vice president, and so we got going with new sponsors, additional sponsors—most of the old ones—and I converted, then, the American Wildlife Institute over to a foundation, which is now called the North American Wildlife Foundation. I continued as the secretary of it for 30 years—30 years from the beginning of time that I came aboard.

During those early days, I was one of the founders and organizers of the Natural Resources Council of America. I served as the voluntary secretary of it for the first 12 years, I think. It now represents 46 of the big, national conservation organizations in this country. Very active in trying to bring the organizations together to better understand issues and problems.

I'm one of the founders and incorporators of the World Wildlife Fund. I later became the president of it, and was on the international board in Europe and on the executive council of the international board for years until I was forced off when I reached my 75th birthday by a limitation in the by-laws. I'm still active, however. I was elected the honorary president of the World Wildlife Fund for life. I'm still going to all their meetings and taking a very active interest in their programs.

I'm on the board—I'm the president now—of the Wildfowl Foundation, which I've incorporated in 1956, primarily to raise money for Sir Peter Scott's wildfowl trust in England. It's still going. The annual meeting of our foundation is going to be on the 30th, just a few days away.

I'm also president of Stronghold Incorporated, which is a private corporation that owns all of Sugarloaf Mountain out here about 35 miles north of Washington. There's a long story connected with this. A wealthy man, Colonel Strong—Gordon Strong—who was educated in Heidelberg and became fascinated with the castles along the Rhine, decided he was going to build a castle like that for himself. He came here around the turn of the century and started to buy all of that mountain. He did buy it, but then he became so fascinated with it that he decided not to desecrate it by building a house up on the top of it. He built a large 40-room mansion on the side of the mountain and kept the top of it in its natural state, and it's open to the public. He created a private corporation to run it after his death. I've been on the board more than 25 years and am now the president. He left us a million and a half dollars with which to run this thing in perpetuity for the general public, and I think we're doing a pretty good job of that.

You asked me, Kitty, which are the most important. Well, as far as I'm concerned, they're all important. I'm still on, I don't know how many, other boards. I'm also the president of the Urban Wildlife Research Center, which is located out here at Columbia, Maryland. It is an institution that is conducting all forms of research on urban wildlife and quite a successful organization. We're very active in trying to build it up to doing a great deal more of the same kind of scientific research in the broad public interest. So, I'm still going at 80. I can't pick out any particular organization. They're all great organizations. The Boone and Crockett Club is, and always has been, one of my great interests going way back to my early days coming to Washington. So, we'll get into that, I guess, later.

GB: Thank you. That's just about what I was going to lead into. How did you get interested in the Boone and Crockett Club, and subsequently, how did you become a member of it?

CG: Well, this is kind of self-evident. As I told you, when I came to Washington, I came to be the executive secretary of an old private organization, the American Wildlife Institute, of which the former Connecticut senator—Senator Frederic C. Walcott—was the president—

[End of Tape 1, Side A]

[Tape 1, Side B]

CG: The president of the Boone and Crockett Club. The senator took a great liking to me and to my wife, Beth. We became, not only close associates in business, but very dear friends. He got me into the Cosmos Club, and he got me into the Boone and Crockett Club. He had brought me up to the annual dinners a number of times, and finally, I looked at the record and I found that—I didn't realize that—but he'd talked another dear friend of mine into proposing me for membership in the club. That was Karl T. Frederick who, incidentally, at that time was on the board of the Institute, was also an active member of the Boone and Crockett Club, and Karl later became president of the club.

My seconder at that meeting, so you see my association and friendship with him goes back a long time, was Dr. Harold J. Coolidge. The endorsers were Richard Borden and Ira Gabrielson. So, I had pretty good backing. I've been in the club since 1948, and I've been a very, very active member in the club. I have only missed one or two meetings over the years, and I think, only one annual dinner up till now. Unfortunately, I am going to have to miss this one this year because I will be in Fiji at the time of the dinner.

But I've been on the Conservation Committee for years—since 1961. I was the vice chairman of the Conservation Committee from 1965 to '67. I was chairman from 1968 to '69. I was on the editorial committee way back in 1958 to '61. The record shows—I've been looking at that—I was the vice president from 1958 to '60 and first vice president from 1965 to '74. I've been on the executive committee starting back in '61 and on it off and on up until the present time, and I'm still on it.

GB: Pretty active still. (laughs)

CG: I'm still pretty active.

GB: Now what prompted you to take such an active interest in the Boone and Crockett Club?

CG: Well, it's my first love. That's my first interest. The aims and purposes of the Club just fit perfectly with my basic fundamental concepts. I'm interested in perpetuating the big game resources of this country, and I'm interested in all forms of conservation. When you look on my walls over there in the next room, Kitty, you'll see that this just isn't there. I've had awards, honorary memberships and bronze plaques from the American Forestry Association, the Soil and Water Conservation districts, and the Soil Conservation Society of America, the American Preservation and Historic Society, the Leopold Medal from the Wildlife Society, which is the highest award that you can get, the gold medal from the Campfire Club of American in New York, and on and on and on. I said, again, I sound like Major Hoople.

GB: No, I was going to ask you—that was one of my next questions—about some of the most important honors that you have won. There's one in particular that I'd like to ask you about

simply because I noted a letter from President Nixon in regard to it in your files. You were made, in 1971, Citizen of the Year by the American Forestry Association.

CG: Yes, that's right. I was made Conservationist of the Year by the National Wildlife Federation way back, too. Then Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands bestowed upon me the Golden Ark, which is a rather significant thing. It's the first thing I've ever secured or obtained having to do with royalty and so on. But the Prince was, and is, a great conservationist. He formed this [Order of the] Golden Ark just to recognize people that are doing outstanding work in conservation, and I'm one of the earliest of his awardees of that title, so I'm very proud of it. Incidentally, Prince Philip of England has now decided to become the president of the World Wildlife Fund International, and that's going to be quite an honor.

But my association with these organizations, I have so many of them I'm so proud of. One is from the American Historic and Preservation Society is the Horace Albright Award from the National Park Services. So to be recognized for my interest in the national parks in quite an honor, too, as I'm very proud of that.

GB: I'd like to mention here, too, that Horace Albright spoke very highly of you. I know the two of you are good friends, aren't you?

CG: Yes, that's right. He's still alive. Unfortunately, his wife just passed away a short time ago. Too bad.

GB: Well, you had just mentioned previously that most of your goals were the same as the goals of the Club. I know you weren't present at the founding of the Club, but you knew some of the really, older members. Could you explain what was in their minds, you think, when they formed the Club? What were their original purposes and goals, and do you think that the Club is still going down those same lines?

CG: Well, that's pretty difficult. Now, quite obviously, at the time that Theodore Roosevelt formed the Boone and Crockett Club, that was in an era when big game animals in this country were becoming pretty low in numbers. The bison were in trouble, the elk were in trouble, the pronghorn antelope was on the verge of extinction. There was a great feeling on the part of many people. Theodore Roosevelt didn't have to look very far to get a group together to form the Boone and Crockett Club, and their main purpose was to begin to do something about conservation.

If you look back in the records of the Club you'll find that practically every pioneer conservationist, any person of any stature at all in this county in the history of conservation, was a member of the Boone and Crockett Club. I knew many of the early ones. T. Gilbert Pearson, who formed the Audubon Society, I knew very well. I know Raymond Ditmars, the herpetologist who was very active in the American Museum of Natural History and elsewhere.

I was trying to think of some of the early people. I knew so many of them. I'd have to put Senator Walcott in that category. George Bird Grinnell.

GB: Did you know him personally?

CG: I didn't know him, but I knew Madison Grant. Of course, Archibald Roosevelt was a very close friend of mine over the years, and Bob Ferguson, another one of the old-timers. I could go on and on and name a lot of the early people, but it would take a little recollection on my part. You just can't reel those names off the tongue.

GB: I'll tell you I think throughout the interview there'll be projects we'll talk about that will make you remember some of these people.

CG: That's right.

GB: So maybe we could just do that as you go through. There is one thing that I wanted to ask you because just to clarify the point. When these North American large animal herds were in trouble, was it ever because of sport hunting that you know of?

CG: No, I don't think that sport hunting itself, in this country at least, ever contributed to the loss of...Well, there's certainly no species—no big game animal in this country or no small game animal as far as that part—has ever become extinct. But the demise or the reduction of the herds of the animals in this country was brought about primarily by their loss of habitat. The bison simply couldn't exist in the tremendous numbers that they did in the early days in this country as a result of the western movement. Same thing applies to the pronghorn antelope. Elk, of course, were greatly reduced.

Deer, on the other hand, particularly the whitetail deer...We have by far more whitetail deer in this country today than we had way back in the pioneer days. Again, this is attributable primarily to habitat. Some, of course, to our sound conservation programs that we have developed in this country and the protection we've provided to animals. But really, the great increase in whitetail deer is due primarily to the fact that they...we have developed in our scheme of living here a satisfactory habitat for deer. The great forests, which were not inhabited by deer, were cut and opened up, and with the opening of the forest lands in this country, we developed and provided ideal habitat for deer. So that brought that about.

It's our sound sensible management program, programs, in this country that brought the pronghorn antelope back from extinction. We now have them in untold numbers throughout the western states. We have an open season on pronghorn antelope now and have had for years in a number of the western states, and it's in good shape. We're still having problems brought about primarily by fences. Fencing the lands and fencing pronghorns away from the water holes is our biggest problem now in this country. Other than that, why, they're getting along very well.

Elk have been brought back under sound management program, and our refuge system that's been developed in this country is tremendously beneficial and extremely valuable. It's going to safeguard our wildlife resources for all time, I would hope. So the Boone and Crockett Club and the Campfire Club in New York and others like it, or like them, have started the sound, sensible management programs that were developed in this country in the early days, and they've built upon that. Now, we have, without a doubt, the most singular situation that you'll find anywhere in the world. Our wildlife resources in North America are under sound, sensible management and control. So, I don't think we have any fear of anything.

Now we have a bunch of ultra-preservationists who have developed in this country. You know, a great American pastime is forming organization, and we've got them of every conceivable kind. You just mention a thought, and we've got an organization by that name. A great many of them have no sound foundation at all, nor no really trained and experienced people in many of the fields that concern us today. Therefore, we're getting a lot of ill-conceived proposals and ideas and efforts generated in this country, many of which are most deplorable and unfortunate. But I guess we'll, as Americans, we'll find a way to overcome that. At least, I hope so. But some of the organizations make me shudder even to think of them.

GB: Okay. I want to ask you, and I don't quite know how to word this question, can you explain what effect the Boone and Crockett Club has had on the conservation history and the policy of this country? Now you just mentioned that most of the great conservationists have been members of the Boone and Crockett Club. Why do you think this is so? Why has it been the one organization that most people want to join?

CG: Well, one of the things is the Club itself. It was formed by one of the greatest conservationists of this country, and he conceived the aims and purposes of it very well. He, at that time, brought around him a whole group of active members. Now, the Club was limited to 100 regular members by T. R. [Roosevelt], and they arranged so you could have up to about half the regular members and associate members who were outstanding people who had been invited to associate membership because of their past work in the various phases of natural resource conservation. So you see, the scheme of the whole thing brought together all of the active, interested, outstanding people. It brought them together automatically into this little club which was limited to 100 members.

We had just enough wealthy members in there that made it possible for the Club to finance those few things that needed to be financed at the right time. Now let me say this, despite what anybody else wants to say, the Boone and Crockett Club as an organized club did comparatively little in this country to actually promote wildlife management program. That is not the way the club functioned. It's not the way in which it made its name. I'm talking now from a conservation standpoint and not from the big game awards program, which is separate. That's got to be dealt with separately. I'm talking now about the activities of the club in the promoting of all of the outstanding things that have been promoted back over the years. The

way in which the Club has functioned and achieved all those things is through its active members.

These members—many of them were...some were in government, some were in state government, some were in private conservation organizations, some were scientists, some were professors in universities, and things of that kind. It was their activities as individuals working in behalf of or in cooperation with the interested people in the Club, who promoted all these things. I could cite myself.

I don't want to digress too much, but when I participated and took an active part in promoting Club activities for example, the establishment of the Key Deer National Wildlife Refuge and the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. Participated in the transplanting of desert sheep in the southwest in Big Bend country of Texas. While I was working with other club members and doing these things primarily in the name of Boone and Crockett Club, I, at the same time, was the vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute and the executive secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation. I was wearing two hats, and the institute and the foundation—well, not the foundation but the institute—was actually paying my salary and paying my expenses when I participated in these various things that I was doing for two purposes—for the Boone and Crockett Club and for the other. Now, the same thing is true of many of the outstanding things. The work in creating McKinley National Park was done by Charles Sheldon, primarily as an individual and at his own expense, but as an extremely active member of the Boone and Crockett Club. Everything he did, he was doing in behalf of the Club.

That same thing is true in so many, many of the other ways. The establishment, later, of the Sheldon Refuge. This was done by the individuals who were working in behalf of the Club in sponsoring and promoting these things. But they were doing it as a kind of a quasi thing, or a joint effort. It was this way in which the Boone and Crockett Club, because of its active members, that it became so prominent in fostering and developing and promoting these various big important things that were achieved in this country in the early days. We're still doing the same thing today.

GB: Can you describe some of the meetings of the Boone and Crockett Club, which you have attended, and some of the social get-togethers. Do you feel that the social functions and close friendships formed among the members have helped to get the work done that the Club has been involved in?

CG: Oh yes, the fact of the matter is the annual dinner of the Boone and Crockett Club is an extremely prestigious affair. During all the early years, and I guess we're now going to be able to back to it again, the dinner was held and catered in the big mammals hall of the Theodore Roosevelt wing of the American Museum of Natural History. All those big moose on one side and the big brown bear, big Alaskan brown bear, standing up looking down over the table at the end and off to the left the most monstrous elk and the pronghorn antelope and so on. This is a most spectacular setting! It's a dress-up affair. Each member is limited to one guest, and not

only is it an honor but it's a real privilege to be able to go to that function and to take a friend.

That friend will be impressed for a long time. That, among other things, is one of the things that has contributed to the prestige of the club. So that it is the association as well. It's a meeting place where good fellows get together and enjoy themselves but always for a purpose, and that is to help determine the ways and means of promoting better management of our renewable natural resources in North America in the broad public interest. So I think that has been tremendously important.

Now the other meetings, I'm a little bit disappointed in recent years, and maybe we are under some efforts that are being made right now by the new president, Jack Parker. Maybe we're going to find some ways and means of overcoming what I'm about to say. But in the earlier days, we had a number of people who could afford to help do what needed to be done. I pay high tribute and praise to people like Childs Frick and to DeForest Grant and Richard King Mellon (?) and John M. Olin. Maybe I'd better quit with that because I could name a lot of others. Robert Ferguson, who had been willing to put up and help finance things that needed to be done urgently. I can well remember luncheon meetings of the executive committee which we had around in different clubs—the Sierra Club and some of them down in the Wall Street area—where we've gotten together and discussed very important issues and took important steps. The one I'm thinking of we raised 35,000 dollars in one meeting to start the study of the Rampart Dam in Alaska. I could tell you all about that.

So now while we've been bringing grand people, very fine people into the Club, we just haven't been getting enough of those people in there who are in a position to take the place of some of these earlier, what I call, "financial sponsors" that we had in the Club. I wish we could find ways of getting back to that a little bit more and a little bit better because this club needs a limited amount, not a lot of money, but a limited amount of money to function as it always has functioned over the years. I'm delighted now that Jack Parker is working on this. I wish him every success.

[End of Tape 1, Side B]

[Tape 2, Side A]

*Note: The following portion of interview was not recorded.*

GB: Dr. Gutermuth, in the minutes of December 12, 1950, of the club's minutes there is a passage about the fact that you and Dr. Derby were starting to write and reconstruct the history of the club. Would this have a finish (?) to your knowledge and what became of it?

*Beginning of audio interview*

CG: Dr. Derby was Ethel Roosevelt's husband, and he was a charming person. At one of the meetings, we were talking about the fact that something ought to be done to record the history of the Club. While, I think, we had some grandiose ideas ourselves of trying to do it, we decided before too long that this wasn't a job for a couple of volunteers or a committee. So we, after due discussion of the real problem and the job that was ahead of us, decided to employ a person. Not actually employ, but to pay the expenses and a little salary of someone who was capable of doing it.

At that time, I was the vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, and on our staff we had a director of publication, James B. Trefethen. At one of the executive committee meetings at Archie Roosevelt's [Archibald Roosevelt] house on Turkey Lane in Cold Spring Harbor on Long Island, we decided that we were going to really go to work on a history. So I offered at that time to permit Jim Trefethen, who worked for me, to take on this job if he was willing to do it. He did. Years passed, and he finally came out with the *Crusade for Wildlife*, which was published in 1961. Then, later, it was revised and broadened a little bit and published again. I don't know when...in the '70s sometime.

GB: That's called the *American Crusade for Wildlife*.

CG: The *American Crusade for Wildlife*. The reason for that was that we broadened it quite a little bit and its activities...the scope, I mean, of the book. That made it more popular, but even so the book is still a classic in its field because it not only deals with the history of the Club, but it depicts and portrays the early pioneer efforts of the conservationism in this country.

GB: I'm hoping you remember about what went on in regarding this next question. Around 1948, the Club was at a very low ebb, which is just about the time you joined it, and I don't know if you remember this but Archie Roosevelt and several other of the prominent members...I must add here, it was apparently because of the war that so many people had sort of drifted apart, and so they felt like they really needed to reorganize and revitalize the Club. I wonder if you remember the others who were involved. I know Archie Roosevelt, who was Theodore Roosevelt's son, was involved, and if you were involved at all or apparently aware of the reorganization that went on?

CG: Well, yes. When I became a member, this was right about that time, you see. The principle troubles were while Senator Walcott was absolutely a charming person, very lovable character, a very intelligent man, a very wealthy man, but when it came to details he left something to be desired. He was the president of the Boone and Crockett Club from, I think, '40 to '47. He traveled a great deal, and he was gone so much and he was so involved in so many things, just like I have been, that he simply neglected calling meetings and he didn't promote the thing. I don't think they abandoned the annual meetings—I think they usually put on the annual meetings—but the other meetings were just simply not there. Consequently when Walcott, when his term expired, a group of us got together and talked to Archie Roosevelt, who was the only living son of Theodore Roosevelt. We talked him into becoming the president of the Club. That just stimulated a whole new ball game. Things got going in a big way, and Archie pushed this and he developed it.

Then following him, came Karl Frederick and then after him, Fairman Dick. During that period, the Club was all revitalized and brought back up to the point where we had a waiting committee...a waiting list for membership. This, I can say, was just attributable to the people who were running the Club at that time and the efforts that they put into it and the way in which we got engaged again in various kinds of conservation activity. I think starting way back then—I don't remember just when—but Dick Borden became the chairman of the conservation committee way back about that time. Of course, he got us involved in all different kinds of things again, like we should be doing. So this, to me, was the answer on that. We're back into another era but not for that reason. We went through another serious set of circumstances in the history of the Club and that ought to be dealt with separately, I guess.

GB: Some of these questions will seem a little disconnected, but they are all about the history of the Club. Therefore, I'll ask them as they come up. Around 1959, there was a committee formed to study firearms regulations, and I believe you were involved with that committee. I wonder if the Boone and Crockett Club ever taken a stand on firearms regulations?

CG: Oh, yes. I think they've taken a stand many times, many different times. Some of their positions more staunch than others and more comprehensive than others, but I think upon several times they have taken a position against unwarranted and unnecessary firearms restrictions and controls. They took a position at the time of the 1968 firearms act [1968 Gun Control Act] and at a few other times as well, so they have taken quite a strong position at different times.

GB: This may be kind of a strange question, but could you explain what type of regulations the Club would condone or support and what types they would like to see not brought about?

CG: Of course, now I'm speaking two ways, I guess. I get my thoughts confused there. I was also, later on, the president of the National Rifle Association of America [NRA], so I have been somewhat in the forefront in these firearms battles that have been going on here. I think that the position of the NRA, in many ways, resembles the position of the individual members of the

Club. I think that the majority of Club members feel that they would support anything that really would help to minimize the crime situation in this country. But the majority of us feel, and I'm one of those, that the foolish firearms regulations that have been imposed on the law-abiding citizens are simply not contributing a thing to the crime situation. A lot of people say that it's the easy availability of guns that commence crime. I contend that the real crime statistics of this country prove these to be a fallacy. If a person is going to commit a crime, they're going to use some form of weapon—whatever is available. If a gun isn't available, then they'll use a knife or they'll use a broken beer bottle or they'll use a tire iron or a club. In other words, sure, as long as the gun is available and somebody is criminally bent, they will use that which is the easiest method to perpetrate the crime that they're trying to commit. I think the majority of people...they're not against registration as such, but they are against the fact that if you impose registration it is always been, in a way, of where the people that are conducting the registration make it prohibitive. In other words, you go and register your automobile, but that's mandatory, that they've got to register your automobile and only for a simple, little fee. But in a case wherever they have given registration authority or permit authority in the hands of the enforcement officers of this country, then you immediately find a great reluctance for them to issue permit or to permit this to be done. This is the reason that they are opposing these things so much.

Of course there are a lot of people who are just unalterably opposed to any kind of restrictions and prohibitions on the law-abiding citizens when they know it's only going to apply to law-abiding citizens and is not going to curtail the crooks. So, I think these feelings are pretty general around.

GB: Okay. Going to a completely different subject. At the annual meeting in 1951, the Sagamore Hill Committee was formed, and the committee actually consisted of Alfred Ely, Archibald Roosevelt and Dr. Derby. I was wondering if you could give any background on it and the reason for the formation of that committee.

CG: Well, yes. I don't know exactly the year now, but Sagamore Hill, which was the birthplace and the home of Theodore Roosevelt and the Roosevelt family, it became a national monument under the direction and control of the National Park Service. At that time, the Club got them to turn over the game room on the third floor of the building to the Club to where we could have some of T.R.'s memorabilia and his other things, particularly a lot of his guns and various trophies and other things. The Club then formed this committee to—incidentally, a lot of his books were there too at that time—formed this committee to look after and watch over. The things that we had to look after there in connection with the preserving of the so-called “gun room” at Sagamore.

This committee has been very active over the years, and they have at periodic intervals helped to rejuvenate and refurbish the place, or clean it up, and oil and take care of the guns, look after books and various things. Some of the heads and skins that were there needed attention. The committee has looked after all of those things, so that was the purpose of that, and as far

as I know, it still functions.

GB: Now, while we're talking about the properties of the Club, the Club has had a very rich history, and many of the files that the Club owns also have a lot to do with the whole conservation history of the country. I know that you helped Art Carhart form the Conservation Library Center in Denver. I was wondering how you feel about...would this maybe be a proper repository for the Club's historical papers and maybe this oral history projects or do you have some other suggestions of how to preserve some of this paper history of the Club.

CG: I was very active, along with Dr. Gabrielson, in trying to help Arthur Carhart get that Denver library established. This took a lot of doing. It was going to be a very comprehensive project and quite a costly project. The head of the library at that time was Dr. [John] Eastlick, and we went out with Carhart and helped him convince them that this was a very fine thing. Now, in the very beginning a lot of the papers of various individuals and various organizations were placed there. Dr. Gabrielson sent a lot of his journals and other records there. I had a tremendous collection of governmental bulletins on various phases of conservation—biology, botany, zoology, and things of that kind—that had been published by the various people, various agencies in the federal government through the government printing office. I sent him boxes of that material and stuff. The American Bison Association, which helped to establish the National Bison Range, all their papers went to this Denver library.

But now, subsequently, as years went by, and Arthur Carhart is gone, this library has in the change of employees in the library, the change of city officials, after all this is the Denver city library, and the lack of funds and so on have brought about a complete change in the status of that library. Therefore, I would not recommend that any real valuable things, like valuable books and so on, would be sent there until you could ascertain these are going to be cared for, properly accepted and cared for there. Now there are a couple of others. There's a university in Wyoming who also is interested in creating such a library. But, of course, the ideal place would be Denver if it proved now that they are functioning as they should be. But I've got my doubts about that.

GB: Do you feel, like right now the Club has possession of its own papers and everything, but in the course of changes of office and everything, it's possible that some of these could get lost. I just thought...that's why I asked the question, that there might be some place that would be more permanent.

CG: It's my understanding now that they've authorized the renting of an office and those negotiations are going on right now. I don't know how voluminous all these things are now, but I would hope that there would be an orderly transfer of this stuff. Then if it's so that they don't have room to handle it, then I agree that a step should be taken to find a proper place for that.

GB: Now, you've basically touched on this next question here already. Big game herds in North America are in better shape now and more numerous than 50 or even 80 years ago, and that's

been because of all of the work of the conservationists. Do you feel that hunting them now, hunting the herds now, is in any way endangering their existence?

CG: No way. No way at all. While maybe some of the state agencies have their shortcomings—some of them still have political interference up to a point—but the fact still remains that all of the states have good fish and game agencies. Most of them are fairly well financed through license fees, through federal aid and wildlife restoration, federal aid and fisheries restoration, and so on. I think that all of our game animals in this country around sound, sensible management and they're properly and adequately protected, and I don't see that hunting has any material effect on them at all except to harvest—what is the normal surplus, which would be dying anyway. So I see no detrimental aspects in our present situation. To me, we've got the finest game management programs in the world, and I think that our wildlife resources in this country are in good hands.

GB: How do you feel about hunting as a game management tool?

CG: Absolute necessity as far as I'm concerned. Now, you get these ultra-preservationists where a lot of them would like to stop all hunting, but they, for the most part, are extremely narrow in their thinking. Most of them are, well, practically all of them, are meat eaters but still they criticize the taking of and harvesting of a surplus game crop. Most of the people are not against hunting as such. They're against killing. But they don't stop to think that their shoes are leather, their briefcases are leather, and the meat that they eat comes from the harvest of domestic animals. As far as I'm concerned, I see no difference in that.

Now of course, I, like all the others, want to see these animals taken in the best manner possible—in fair chase and with a good clean kill and all of that. I think that it's absolutely necessary to harvest the crop. Because if you don't, it's lost anyway, and more than that, if you were to eliminate that...if we now, in this country, were to eliminate our whole scheme of things—eliminate hunting as sport hunting, eliminate licenses, eliminate the taxes that have been assessed on sporting arms and ammunition and all of the things that produce the money upon which the states are operating—I don't know what would happen. So as far as I'm concerned, I see nothing wrong at all with our present program, which means that we are exercising the best knowledge that we have on a scientific basis to determine the normal increase in our game population and permitting that to be harvested.

GB: How do you feel about trophy hunting as it affects game population and wildlife management?

CG: In one of the records books, I wrote a chapter on that subject. I contend that the real trophy hunters in this country are just that. They're trophy hunters. If they are out hunting, they'll pass up animal after animal after animal and won't take any if they can't get one which appears to be a trophy. So while they're engaging in a very keen, interesting sport, I think that when they do take a trophy, for the most part, that animal is an overly mature animal that has

passed the peak of his breeding prowess. Therefore, I think that, despite what a lot of people want to say, that the taking of that animal is really somewhat of a contribution to the improvement of the herd. Because the animals that have the biggest heads, the biggest set of antlers and horns, for the most part, are animals that have already passed their prime in life. I think that the perpetuation of a species ought to be actually be put on the younger, more virile animal. I don't see anything particularly wrong with trophy hunting.

GB: Do you feel that the statistics compiled through the records keeping program can be used as a conservation tool?

CG: Yes. There's no question about in many ways it's beneficial. These records tell you a great deal. Just how much it's utilized depends on circumstances. So you can't generalize on things like that. But we get a very good idea of habitat conditions and the situation in the various parts of the country based upon the number of animals and the size of animals that are bought out of the different parts of the country. So this contributes some to our scientific program.

I think the record book has considerable benefit. The big question comes as to whether or not this is contributing to any violations and things of that kind—improper actions on the part of sportsmen. I suppose maybe there are cases where that is so. But after all, you have that same kind of a situation. There are bad things in practically every aspect of life. You have bad people in the churches, and you have bad people in our best society. So I'm not sure that this can be contributed to the mere fact of keeping records of these things. I don't see anything particularly detrimental to the carrying on of the record program. I'm all for it.

[End of Tape 2, Side A]

[Tape 2, Side B]

GB: What were the purposes that the records keeping program was founded for, and why does the Club feel that it's such an important program?

CG: Well, I've never been too much involved in the record program of the club. I've never measured a head in my life. I personally do not have any particular interest in that, but a great many people do. Starting way back in history, the great halls of Europe and Asia are filled with heads of game animals, and this has been a great thing throughout generations. Even in the West, remote individuals made an effort to preserve heads that appeared to be extremely outstanding. History is replete with that kind of interest in the large, trophy-sized animal, and there's always been a big curiosity about this in the minds of people. So, when the Boone and Crockett Club started this record keeping program and developed a method of measuring these antlers and horns and skulls in the most minute manner to determine rank and size and so on, this became quite a thing. The start of the publishing of the first record book was quite a step in history in this field.

I think that the records program and that books that have been published by the Club have contributed a great deal to the notoriety and publicity and standing of the Boone and Crockett Club. I think that a substantial percentage of people know of the Boone and Crockett Club entirely through the records program, and then again we have a measurer located throughout the United States and throughout North America. Consequently, that again has contributed no small amount to the stature of the Club. All in all, I think it's been one of the outstanding programs, and I hope that they can find a way to not only take it back like they are proposing to do but to continue this program in the same manner that it has been carried on over the years.

GB: Well that leads me into my next question. Recently it was mutually agreed that effective January 1, 1981, the Boone and Crockett Club will once again totally be responsible for the official records keeping of North American big game. But for the last eight years, it has been jointly sponsored by the Club and NRA, and you were very instrumental in helping to bring about that co-sponsorship. I was wondering, could you explain why that came about and in what capacity you acted for the Club and NRA in these arrangements?

CG: I was in a very fortunate or unique position back at the time that this all happened. When the subject was first discussed, I was the first vice president of the National Rifle Association of America, and at that time I think I was also a first vice president of the Boone and Crockett Club. Despite that fact, I really did not have anything to do with this transfer over to the NRA. I'm not too sure who actually conceived the idea and who developed it. I do know that right at that time John Ray, who was a former member, former president of the Club, was then a member of the board of directors of the NRA. At that time General Maxwell E. Rich was the executive vice president of the NRA, and I had just gotten him in as a member of the Boone and Crockett Club.

I am quite confident that, while I don't know all the details, I am quite confident that because of

the cost of carrying on the records keeping program that the Club was having difficulty meeting the expense. I think they also felt that if this could be sold to the NRA and that they would do it right, that the program could be improved and enhanced. I think this was the motivating factor. Number one, to get the club out from under the cost involved in carrying on the program, but number two, the possibility of getting it broadened and expanded and done in a more creditable manner. The NRA, with its magazine at that time, the *American Rifleman*, and then also later the *American Hunter Magazine*, they were in a position to promote things. They had a staff of field men. So, the idea looked good.

They did set this up, and the NRA took on very capable biologists, a very competent man, Harold Nesbitt, to run their side of the program. I think that in the early years that they did this it was tremendously successful. I think the number of measures throughout the country was enlarged. I think they were better trained on how to do it. Measuring demonstrations were carried on at the annual meetings of the NRA. The awards dinners were held in conjunction with the NRA. The one in Atlanta was an outstanding success. A more recent one was equally successful. But, there has been a great upheaval and change in the National Rifle Association. The shooters, target shooters—paper punchers as a lot of people call them—who were the backbone of the early organization, along with those people who are so dedicated to going all out trying to prohibit any further firearms restrictions, those people have taken over in the NRA. The conservation programs of the NRA have gone out the window. They still contend that they are looking after and representing the hunter, but it's pretty difficult to see any real hunter-type programs that they're carrying on.

So, the hunting and conservation end of it seems to be at a pretty low ebb in the NRA, and I don't think that the present people in the organization, the present officers, have any interest at all in the record program, and not very much interest in any other conservation phases of the work except possible for some aspects of hunting. Of course, they're always looking after cutting down on the budget. I think they have manifested a disinterest in the awards program, and the officers of the Boone and Crockett Club have decided apparently to take the program back again completely in the hands of the Club. I would hope that they can find a way to carry it out. That's where it stands now.

GB: Before we leave that subject, I was just wondering, do you know if there was any controversy when the cosponsored program was being formed within the Club, as to whether to do that or not?

CG: Well, yes, there were a number of people who in the first place recognized that the prime interests of the NRA were firearms legislation and competitive shooting. I think they recognized right then and there that the chances of this program being taken over completely was not going to be quite as successful as a lot of people thought. So there was that sentiment in the minds of some people. On the other hand, over in the NRA, there were certain people who had no interest whatsoever in measuring program, so they weren't too happy at this so-called marriage. So you had a lot of feelings on both sides, but this real trouble that came about at

about that time was whether or not there was a great sentiment on the part of a number of the people in the Boone and Crockett Club as to whether or not we should, the Club, should actually be continuing this records program.

Now I'd like to say something in that regard because at the time of our big battle at the annual members meeting in New York at the Rack and Tennis Club (?), I made quite a speech. This is pretty much what I said then and how I feel about this. I want to back up and say again. I never have engaged in any way or participated in any way, shape, or form in the records program. I have never measured an antler in my life. I have no interest in doing it myself; therefore, from the standpoint of an actual participant, I have no interest. But I also recognize, as I've said, that I think this has been a very successful and a very good program for the Boone and Crockett Club. Now under our membership, not only do we have a goodly number of regular members of the Club, who like myself have no interest in the records program, we have by our other action of electing to associate membership a great many of scientists and in many case non-hunters and in some cases ultra-preservationists or at least preservationists, maybe not ultra, to when the time comes that you get down into a serious debate about the merits and demerits of this program, this caused considerable bitterness.

We had people in the Club—he's dead now—but we had a fellow by the name of—

GB: Douglas Burden.

CG: —Douglas Burden, who circulated the membership with a lot of letters, a whole string of letters, denouncing this program and creating a lot of animosity among members, which certainly never should have gone about. As I said in the meeting, Mr. Burden came to that meeting and two others came. Two fellows in their, let me say, later years because I think all three of them are dead now. I do not even remember the names of the other two. I denounced this Mr. Burden and these other two men by saying that I had attended every meeting of the Club during the past 25 years, and I had never seen as single one of those members present at any Club meeting that I had attended over the past quarter of a century. So they obviously had been members of the Club, fact of the matter is when I first got my letter from Mr. Burden I didn't even know he was a member of the Club. I wondered who this kook was that was writing these letters until one day I run into another member who said, "Well gee, he's a member too." I had to look at the book to see and find out that he was a member.

But here are these fellows...Now this Burden let me say, was a great hunter in his early days, and his home was full of heads, but you see he's had a whole new lease on life now as he gets a little bit older and he gets closer to his maker. So he had a whole new change of thinking, and now he wants to save all of his brethren for posterity, I guess. Here he comes out here, you know, and tries to upset the whole Club program. I was very critical of them because I felt it was terrible. These guys were now coming into this club after all these years of inactivity and lack of interest, and now trying to do everything they can do to tear the insides out of that club. Well to make a long story short, these efforts that they did, he and the others, caused

considerable bitterness in the Club, and a number of very, very fine members, as a result of this, resigned. I think it is most unfortunate because now the regular membership presently, I guess, is down to around 75 or 80, when for years and years there was a waiting list. I think now that it's up to us now to get the membership back where it belongs. After all, from the very beginning, this was a club of shooting conservationists, and that is what it should be. If you're not a shooter interested in conservation, well then I do not think you should belong to this club. You should belong to the Defenders of Wildlife or something else. That is the way I look at that.

GB: Well now, this is a perfect bridge to conservation because we are finally getting into the conservation topics and I do have questions prepared, but I thought one of the things that might be interesting is if you would take a list of the conservation projects that the Club has been involved in and maybe go through. Rather than my asking questions, first would you go through that list and explain some of the ones that you were very involved with and explain what exactly the club had to do with them. Whether they just initiated the idea or whether they actually got into funding as so forth.

CG: Well, this list that you hand me here now, well, it goes back into the '30s too. The ones that I can comment on have to do with those that are marked in the '40s. The first one I see on the list here has to do with the contribution to the publication of the Harper Allen report on extinct and vanishing species. Those books—there are three of them—were actually published by the American Committee for International Wildlife Protection. Where the Club fitted into that, in the first place, the Club was one of the instigators or the starters of the American Committee for International Wildlife Protection. At least, that association was formed in the Club, and active members run it. Dr. Harold J. Coolidge was the chairman of that American Committee for years and years. I and many other members of the Boone and Crockett Club were active members of the board and on the executive committee. Charles Frick, for example, was one of the sponsors and promoters of the American committee. He was on the executive committee and I was, and I used to come up regularly and attend these meetings. Starting way back then—and this is long before the days of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and the World Wildlife Fund that have later gotten involved in threatened and endangered species—but here was the American committee way back publishing these fine books.

The first one that the committee published was in 1942. It was *The Extinct and Vanishing Mammals of the Western Hemisphere with the Marine Species of all the Oceans*. It was by Glover L. M. Allen [Glover Morrill Allen]. A very fine bound volume that has become really a classic. Later the committee, in 1945, published another book. These are large volumes now with 850 pages by Francis Harper—*Extinct and Vanishing Mammals of the Old World*. This again is one of my prized volumes in the library. Still later in 1958, the committee published a truly outstanding book, again about the same size, entitled *The Extinct and Vanishing Birds of the World*, by James C. Greenway, Jr. This bound volume is about 517 pages.

My North American Wildlife Foundation established a fund called the Frederic C. Walcott

Memorial Fund in which we used only of the income from the fund to provide illustrations for outstanding books that were going to be published that were not adequately illustrated. The colored frontispiece in this book and some of the other illustrations and things were provided out of this fund. That's is another one of these team-play arrangements that were worked out in the Club. The Boone and Crockett Club, in many ways, was instrumental in that.

I notice you have another item here on the fact that the Club supported the establishment of a reserve for the protection of Roosevelt elk in Northern California. This was named after Madison Grant, one of our early members—a brother of DeForest Grant. When I attended the meeting of the executive committee, DeForest was there, Archie, and all the others. Incidentally, he is dead now, but the director of the National Park Service—

GB: Newton Drury.

CG: —Newton Drury, was there at the meeting, and this is in Humboldt County in Northern California. They set aside that area, and there is a brown plaque down there to the Club and the others who participated in the establishment of this. We provided half of the money, and the state of California...I mean the Club provided half of the money, the state of California the other to acquire the land and establish the property.

There's another item here that says the study of the wolf depredation in Alaska. Well, I can't go into all of it, but in the early days of the Club, we had the big battle in Washington about the wolves killing the sheep in McKinley National Park [Denali National Park and Preserve]. There finally was a book published by Adolph Murie entitled *The Wolves of Mount McKinley*. The club members took an active position in that controversy, and we contended that the National Park Service under its basic laws was mandated and required to protect the wildlife of the national parks, therefore to enact separate legislation calling on the Park Service to do that which it was already required to do would be superfluous and ridiculous. So we took a position against the legislation, but we were all for exercising sound sensible controls, whatever controls were necessary, to protect all of the resources. So the club was very active in that.

On this survey of Big Bend National Park in Texas, I don't know whether that had to do...apparently, that had to do with our study for the transplant of the desert sheep. Well Dick Borden, Dr. Clarence Cottam, Dr. Victor Carlane (?), and myself—all members of the Club—went down to Big Bend National Park and conducted a survey of the habitat of the area, and then went to the Kofa and Cabeza Prieta [National Wildlife Refuge] big game rangers in Arizona. We, as a Club, were in the process of working out a transplant of desert bighorn sheep back into their original habitat in the Big Bend country. When I decided that it was foolish for the Club to spend its money when that kind of a program could very properly be financed under the state's allotment of the Pittman-Robertson program.

[End of Tape 2, Side B]

[Tape 3, Side A]

CG: When we were at Big Bend, we tried to get the National Park Service to agree to exercise some control over the cougars or mountain lions in the park in that place where we wanted to confine these sheep. We wanted to put them in a large enclosure and keep them there until they got acclimated and adjusted to the area, and then we were going to take the fence down and let them go. We could not get that cooperation from the National Park Service, so we got in touch—while we were there—with the Texas Game Commission, and we made arrangements instead of putting these animals in the national park we put them in the adjoining Black Gap (?) area, which was a state game preserve that adjoined the park. They agreed to assure us that they would keep the large predators from preying on these sheep during this period of time. So then we went to Arizona and made arrangements with the game commission between the Texas department and the Arizona department to not only trap the sheep but to handle the transplant with funds out of the Pittman-Robertson program. They actually accomplished our objective for us, and we didn't have to put any Club money into the picture...I mean, into the program. Therefore, we accomplished that principle objective of the Club without any expense or problems on our part. I might say that the last I heard, the sheep are still doing quite well in the Big Bend country.

GB: I wanted to ask you one question here, not about this specific project but in general. Do you feel that the transplanting and starting of new herds is generally a successful wildlife management tool?

CG: Well, yes, if the habitat is...Well, in the first place, if it's a sterile area...I mean, if there are no animals there and the habitat is satisfactory or can be made satisfactory, then I think it's a good thing to introduce or reintroduce resident species into those areas. I had my fingers crossed on bringing exotics in and putting them in like they had done in New Mexico. Sure, they can establish certain exotics under certain circumstances, but you always have a big question as to whether or not this doesn't have some detrimental effect on resident species. You also have the big questions as to whether or not you couldn't accomplish your same objective with, like this, a reintroduction of original species. Generally speaking, when it's done properly, transplants can be very successful and very beneficial.

Next thing I have in the list here is that the Club was one of the founders and financial supporters of the IUCN. Well, that's true. The IUCN was the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. It was formed as a scientific body in Europe in Switzerland, way back 30 years ago. The Boone and Crockett Club, like a number of the other clubs, supported its founding, became a member of it, and have helped to pay dues and in others ways help finance the activities of the IUCN. Many of the members, myself included, have attended practically all the annual meetings of the IUCN over the years, which have been held in different places: in Nairobi, a number of the club members went; others went to New Delhi, India; a number of us went to (unintelligible) Russia; and other places.

GB: At that time you were asked to represent the club, weren't you?

CG: That's right. I have been an official delegate to the IUCN at a number of its meetings, so we've been an active supporter of the IUCN.

Next one you have on here is, "You hired a warden to protect the Key deer of Florida." Well, that is true. The fact of the matter is the Boone and Crockett Club is the starter of the whole thing. Dick Borden was the chairman of the conservation committee, and he and I had the (unintelligible) on the seriousness of the Key deer in Florida at the time of one of the annual meetings of the club. This would be back in the '50s. Both Dick and I made a big effort at the club meeting to convince the members that we should actually hire a warden to go down and protect these tiny deer in the Keys. The Club put up the first 5,000 dollars. At that time, I also contributed 1,000 dollars along with the Club's contribution to help hire this warden.

Subsequently then, acting as the executive secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation, I went down to Florida, and I got appropriation from my foundation to buy some land to get a refuge started. I was representing the Club in many ways, and other club members participated. I actually located the land where the headquarters of the Key Deer National Wildlife Refuge is located—16 and a half acres. I got Mr. Radford Crane and his foundation to actually contribute that land to the North American Wildlife Foundation. Then the Club, Boone and Crockett Club, put up 10,000 dollars. I got money from the Philadelphia conservationists, from a number of other individuals, and some money from one of the Mellon Foundation. We went down and bought some of the land, but we also, later, got Radford Crane to contribute more land and we provided the entire nucleus of the Key deer refuge.

We had a big dedication on Big Pine Key turning this land over to the federal government for a national refuge. The Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall was present for the dedication services. A number of members of the Boone and Crockett Club were present. I was present. We erected a big bronze plaque giving credit to the Boone and Crockett Club and the others who participated is this. Now, we have good protection, an increase in the population, and Key deer are doing all right down there. This was a real tribute to the Boone and Crockett Club and to the North American Wildlife Foundation.

Later, we did virtually the same thing for the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in New Jersey, 25 miles from downtown Manhattan. Again, I was an active member of the Club as the executive secretary of the foundation. We raised money and bought all the land in that case and turned it over to the federal government to create the refuge. Let me say for the record, so people don't forget it, in both cases of the Key deer and in the case of the Great Swamp, I put a revisionary clause in the deed of every piece of property that I bought and was conveyed to the government that the title to the land would revert to the foundation in the event that it ever ceased to be used for game management purposes. So, you have that extra safeguard on there.

I noticed you have a checklist here on the Dinosaur National Monument. Well, members of the

Boone and Crockett Club were very, very active in not only establishment of the monument, but in protecting it against the dams that they were subsequently going to build in the Green River, which would have flooded all of these dinosaur...What do you call them? Skeletons that you find there. I can't think of the word right off, but...All of these dinosaur remains were there and would have been under a couple of hundred feet of water if we'd have let the dam builders build that dam in the Green River.

There's another one here on the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge. Well, the Army, they were insisting upon being permitted to shoot the Honest John rocket from Fort Sill, which adjoined the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, over onto the refuge. We insisted that we would loan them a little land to where they could have the cannon over on our national wildlife refuge and shoot back on Fort Sill, but they weren't interested in that. They were bound and determined that they were going to shoot that big rocket over onto the wildlife refuge land. Well, we in the Boone and Crockett Club and then the Wildlife Management Institute and the North American Wildlife Foundation stopped that.

When I testified before the Senate committee, this is a matter of record too, they tried to refute some of my statements which had been made (unintelligible) conclusively to the Senate committee that they had already been shooting this Honest John rocket despite that fact that they couldn't shoot it because they didn't have room. They had already been shooting it on their property. I proved that conclusively, and they had no real need for this refuge land. When they came out and renounced my statement in the newspapers, I sent a telegram to the Secretary of Defense and to the Secretary of the Army and gave them 24 hours to withdraw those statements or I was going to sue them for defamation of character. Senator Wayne Morse, who is dead now, took a great deal of delight of getting up on the Senate floor and saying that Gutermuth was right and they better retract their statement, and they did. This became the end of the Wichita Mountain National Wildlife Refuge problem. Ever since, they've left us alone. (laughs)

I could go on here and on and on. There are a number of studies that they've financed. I was member of the conservation committee and was able to help get the Club to endorse many of these projects. The wild burro and sheep study by Lyle Salls (?) and the grizzly bear study by the Craigheads—

GB: Excuse me. Before you go further, the wild burro and desert sheep study reminded me of a question I wanted to ask you. The problem of wild burro and sheep still exist today, and the Club came out publicly last year and made a statement on it. Could you explain something about that problem?

CG: [talking at same time] We had a (unintelligible) in New York on that. What?

GB: Could you explain something about that problem?

CG: Well, these wild burro were animals that the early prospectors just turned loose, or they got loose, and they had just...the deserts of the West are just perfect habitat for them. They had been multiplying until, like the guy says, we've got wild burros sticking out of our ears all over. Grand Canyon National Park and the Bandelier National Monument. Some of them are just overrun, and these burros are feisty little animals. They'll get around a water hole and just prevent the desert sheep from coming up and getting a drink. In other ways, they've contaminated the water holes. Overgrazing a lot of the range to the detriment of the sheep and so on. The Club and others have been insisting that they exercise some control on this overabundance of feral domestic animals that are in our national parks and monuments.

The Club held a press conference in New York last year at the Theodore Roosevelt birth place and called attention to the deplorable situation and have been insisting that steps be taken to control these animals. Now, one of the ultra-preservationist groups headed up by this Cleveland Amory and some other individuals who...I've got to leave off the adjective, but they're out there now in a fool-hearted manner taking money that they have raised from innocent people and trying to capture these boars and lift them out of Grand Canyon, for example, and trying to find places for them elsewhere. Well, the whole thing is ridiculous and absurd. It is an impossibility. There is no way under the sun that they could ever get those animals out of there. They'll always miss some, and as long as they miss two or three the whole thing will start right over again. All I can say is that this Cleveland Amory is perpetrating another one of his damn fool tactics that common sense ought to tell him is wrong. Time's going to have to prove him foolish, and then maybe we can get down to truly exercising proper controls in the elimination of those animals.

One big project that I'd like to mention that goes together in many ways with the achievements of the club, and that's the Rampart Dam case. I was the vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute at the time, and the Army [Corps of] Engineers had conceived one of the greatest boondoggles of all time. They had proposed and were planning to build a dam at Rampart in the Yukon River just below Arctic village. I went to an executive meeting of the Boone and Crockett Club, a luncheon at the Yale Club and called attention to this monstrosity that had been conceived by the dam builders. It was easy with the facts and details and charts that I had with me to convince those members that this really was a boondoggle and a serious one because it was going to destroy a lot of big game habitat, seriously impair a lot of the breeding grounds of the water fowl on the North American continent, and so on.

The Club, at that meeting, which was attended by Richard King Melon and John Olin and Fairfield Osmond of the New York Geological Society. I am quite sure that DeForest Grant was there. Anyway, at that meeting, we contributed 5,000 dollars then to the Natural Resources Council of America to originate a study of this by a crew of outstanding scientists, engineers, biologists, zoologists, geologists, and so on from the University of Michigan to go up there and conduct this study to prove conclusively that this was the boondoggle that everybody thought that it was. As a result of that, we raised 35,000 dollars originally and another 5,000 or 6,000 dollars afterward to conduct this study and publish a report and circulate it widely. The whole

thing conceded in defeating once and for all this proposed Rampart Dam that would have created a lake north of the Arctic Circle bigger than Lake Erie, which I contend would have been frozen most of the year. I always have felt that the instigation of that study was by the Boone and Crockett Club, which was a tremendous contribution to the overall program at that time.

GB: One of the things before you get off this, I just wanted to mention one person's name who I believed you left off, and he was involved in this and talked about it also, was Bob Reeve.

CG: Oh, Bob Reeve. Of course, Bob Reeve lived in Alaska and he knew it was wrong. Flown over the country many times. Well, he made a contribution himself of 1,000 dollars or more and was always a very active opponent of the whole thing. Bob was very active in many other things, and he just passed away recently. I ought to say, I suppose, for the record that way back Bob contributed 100,000 dollars to the Club, which established quite a fund for the carrying on of some of the work that they wanted to undertake.

This whole list of sponsorships here have been a great credit to the Boone and Crockett Club because the Club, through the conservation committee, have financed and promoted a great deal of tremendously important research on problem areas throughout North America. It's something that all of the members can take great pride in.

GB: One of the questions I'd like to ask you is, do you feel that the conservation committee today is as active and effective as it was in years past? Of the Club, I mean.

CG: Well, I think so. The conservation committee has been meeting...Fred Pullman (?) has been quite an active and quite a dynamic chairman over the years, but he, I guess, has given up now and I don't know actually who the present chairman is, but—

GB: Tim Hixson.

CG: Who?

GB: Tim Hixson.

CG: Oh. So I think that they've been...Fred was a very good chairman over the years and had a deep interest and an excellent understanding of not only the problems but the type of things that we were trying to engage in. Consequently, I thought Fred was a very good chairman.

[End of Tape 3, Side A]

[Tape 3, Side B]

CG: Well, I have been going up there for long before statehood. Forty years.

GB: Because of your involvement and vast knowledge of wildlife management and environmental issues in Alaska going back even prior to its statehood, and you can state how long back, would you address the problem of the "d2" lands bill and give your opinion on the most reasonable solution?

CG: Well, this is a terribly involved piece of legislation. I've been going to Alaska for at least 30 years. I have made many trips up there and I have flown over and been over at practically every part of Alaska and to most of the principle areas and I know a great many people out there. I have flown around with not only the (unintelligible) Fish and Wildlife Service people but the Bureau of Land Management people, the state fish and game people, and also, somewhat, with the National Park Service representatives. This legislation that is pending before the Congress is so involved that there is really no way that you can come to any single or simple solution. I have been advocating that in their settlement that they should be keeping as much land as is possible, under the whole scheme of things, open to hunting. They have not determined the vast resources that are locked up in Alaska, and more than that they are never going be able to make a solution that's going to be satisfactory to everyone.

The Alaska natives under statehood were given, or the Alaskan people under statehood, were given their choice of selecting 105 million acres of land that the state could use for its purposes and for development of the state, but that leaves a tremendous amount of land still in federal ownership. Of course, this present legislation is trying to determine how this should be allocated. I personally think it's a little premature for them to do that because of the extenuating circumstances involved, but in doing what they are doing, I've simple been advocating that they go not to national park that closes off everything, but to go to some kind of national park reserve and also to create a substantial amount of game management land and also an adequate amount of national forest land and hope that they can do this without penalizing to many of the various interests involved, which are assets of the entire nation. So just what they'll do, I don't know, but this seems to be about what Congress is willing to do in the way of legislation at this present time so I'm inclined to think that this pending bill will eventually pass.

GB: You are one of the few present members of the Club who actually met Theodore Roosevelt. What do you remember about him because you must have been quite young?

CG: Really nothing at all. I saw him twice...He was on a so-called whistle stop on the railroad going through Indiana. We had to go about 30 miles, but my father had automobiles way back almost to the beginning of time I guess. So we drove down to see this stop at, I think it was Warsaw, Indiana, and that was the highlight of my life at that time. (laughs) Later then when I saw him again, he was quite feeble, and so I don't remember much about it.

GB: Since the Club is small in numbers and the membership dues are very modest, where do you feel the Club should seek funding and or what methods of fundraising should it implement in order to remain financially stable?

CG: Well in the first place, I have been advocating for a long time that the Club should have, with the tremendous membership that we had of influential and wealthy people, that we should have been way back encouraging bequests, but there has been a great reluctance on the part of a number of the more prominent and leading members that we just didn't have any right to ask for money. Well, I think this is ridiculous because all of those people were interested in the aims and purposes of the Club, and the aims and purposes were to do things and this takes money. If these members were willing to contribute money when they were there and were active, then why shouldn't we be willing to go to them and ask for consideration when they are making their wills?

I asked, specifically, for permission to go and talk to Richard King Mellon, who I knew very well. He was one of the finest men you ever met, and he was dedicated to the Club. We used to have our meetings over at Rolling Rock and he was a great host and he contributed money regularly—substantial amounts to carrying on the records program. I wanted to go to him and ask for a large enough endowment from him that the income would take care of that program. Well Bob Waters who lived over near Pittsburg and was a past president, he was just adamant about that. He did not want me to go. I told him that I thought that Dick was...We were about the same age, or at least I was old enough to be able to talk to him in the right way I thought, but he simple refused. I think Bob Ferguson felt the same way, so I never did and I have kicked myself ever since because he died leaving millions upon millions of dollars and he could have established the endowment that I wanted without ever knowing it. I think was a serious mistake. So now I am perfectly willing at the present time to go back to the Richard King Mellon Foundation and see if we can't, now, talk them into doing what we should have asked Dick to do. We'll just have to wait and see how that turns out.

GB: How do you think that the Boone and Crockett Club can best continue to carry out its original purposes, and what do you think are the most important current conservation issues that the Club maybe should be involved in?

CG: Well, I think that the...I don't see any change—no significant change—in either our aims and purposes or our methods of operation. The thing that I think we ought to be doing here now, number one is I think we should be much more selective in filling the present vacancies in our membership. I think we ought to be getting people, who from our discussion and investigation, should be able to determine that they do have a real interest in a conservation program, number one, and then if they have that interest that they are of sufficient means to be able to actually help us financially for doing some of these. I am talking now about making annual contributions when and if it is needed. I don't see any reason why we should have a large bank account. That is not so important or necessary. What is necessary is that we have

the amount of money that's needed to do the things that we determined to do. When and if these things need to be done. Now in the past, this has been achieved mostly by calling a meeting and letting this be known to people who were in a position to help and they had helped.

But, actually, I think that the real bulk of the things that have been achieved by the Club have not necessarily been based on money. I think that the real accomplishments of the Club have come about by the members themselves being interested enough to work and to help to get the things done through the channels through which they normally operate. So, it isn't just money alone that's going to continue to do the things that the Club wants to do. On certain things, yes. If we are talking about issuing grants, well, we need a limited amount of money each year to do that. I do think that the Club should continue to issue a limited number of grants each year to just keep our orient and keep ourselves involved in all of the various and important things. Doing other types of work, in many cases, money is not the actual necessity. It takes somebody to actually work or someone to actually promote and help to achieve the goals through the established methods. I don't see anything particularly wrong with where we are. I'd like to have us get a few more wealthy people into that club so that we can just take care of those things that we actually need to finance.

GB: Well, basically that finishes up my questions, but I wonder if there's anything you feel I left out that you may like to speak on.

CG: No, I don't think so, not in particular. I'm tremendously impressed by Jack Parker. His interests and his enthusiasm and his persuasive methods of doing things are very good for the Club, and I know that the Club became much less active back during the days when we didn't have a president that was quite as energetic as Jack Parker is. I look forward to considerable accomplishments and achievements here during his period, so we will have to wait and see. He suggested one thing I might just comment on. He's proposed that we have those who can in the club contribute maybe as much as 1,000 dollars a year. Well, I don't know how many of the members will do this, but I'm a little fearful that this kind of a membership type of thing might act adversely because this tends to create a class then that might be more influential or more effective than the operations of the Club. I think that this maybe is a little detrimental or it could be, but time will tell that whether that's so. On the other hand, the people that I know, that I would suspect might be making these 1,000 dollar contributions I wouldn't think that this would have any material effect on them and their attitude one way or the other. Maybe this is just a little, oh, unnecessary concern that I might have, but I sure don't want to see anything done that's going to classify or characterize the members, so I'll hope for the best. I guess that is about it.

GB: Thank you very much. Thank you.

[End of Interview]