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Natural resources have been the bone and fiber of American affluence since the days of the colonies. Many of the resources are finite in quantity, and mining them subsequently reduces their supply. But forest resources—timber, forage, wildlife, etc.—are renewable, and can sustain a perpetual harvest without diminution.

The forest acres that support renewable resources are therefore production factors, and they are finite, even if the resources they produce are not.

We have been in the habit of allocating some forest acres or factors exclusively to the production of timber, others to forage, still others to the satisfaction of a demand for recreation. This extensive use of factors is proper so long as the factors are abundant.

But current demands for forest resources are pressing our production capacity. Our factors—the forest acres—are consequently becoming relatively scarce. Demands are expected to increase, and if we are to meet them, the factors must be used intensively.

The concept of multiple use is a foundation for intensive management. I am convinced it is the best one. But there has been very little precise investigation of the concept, in spite of the numerous and nebulous discussions and
definitions of it.

A pioneering and strenuous effort is being made currently in just such a precise investigation by the Cooperative North Fork Multiple Use Study. The Harvard University Seminar in Land Use and Conservation conceived the project. Montana State University is acting as coordinator for the study, and the following agencies are participating: the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Office of the Montana State Forester, the Montana State Fish and Game Department, the Bureau of Public Roads, and several local agencies.

I have shaped this paper to add whatever it may to the North Fork Study, hoping to contribute thereby to a better understanding of multiple use and its place in the disposition and management of our forest resources.
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INTRODUCTION

The concept of multiple use of forest resources has had a lengthy and sometimes stormy evolution. It has been shaped by social forces of economics and politics and today is a basic policy of the U.S. Forest Service.

In a Forest Service frame-of-reference multiple use is a political entity, and its administration represents a rough and microcosmic analogue to the broader conception of the governmental process as a whole. The common ingredient is the resolution of conflicts through compromise, and the concurrent tendency toward equilibrium—though in neither case can we expect a total equilibrium to be finally achieved.

Pressure groups affect the administration of multiple use just as they make claims on legislatures, courts, and other governmental units. The maximum long run public benefit is attained through a succession of governmental reactions to group actions, both in legislative and judicial areas as well as the administrative function of realizing the policy of multiple use.

Instead of a total and long run equilibrium, what we get is a continuum of short run and partial equilibria resulting from the governmental process in general and the administration of multiple use in particular.
This is the essence of American democracy and the rationale of this thesis. I have sought to clarify the real political context of the multiple use policy and to explain the currently held theories of group politics that affect its administration. The emphasis necessarily leans toward the Forest Service practices and policies, but the principles and ideas are applicable to private forestry organizations as well as other public agencies.

Part I traces the evolution of the multiple use concept and lightly touches on some of its implications—and ambiguities.

Part II is a summary of the American political process that submits the group as the basic unit of government-governed relationships.

And Part III brings groups and multiple use together against a background of Forest Service policies.

I have implied throughout the paper that forestry is part of a social framework, a means to the end of maximized human benefits, and not an entity set apart or a science working in a vacuum.

Private and industrial forestry enterprises have long realized the necessity of considering the social framework in regard to production economics and such mundane ideas as profit-and-loss relationships. Public forestry has not, as yet, placed such critical emphasis on costs and returns but has instead concentrated more on social benefits and
long run "greatest good for the greatest number".

Neither private nor public forestry has yet been intensively pressed to satisfy conflicting demands for the various--and sometimes immiscible--uses of forest resources. Demands have been met largely by allocating certain areas to certain uses, but the end of this practice is imminent.

Demands for timber, for wilderness areas, for hydro-electric dams and good water, for forage and wildlife and national parks have increased to or beyond the ability of a fixed number of forest acres to satisfy them all on the obsolescent basis of exclusive allocation.

Multiple use is proposed as a solution to the problem, but its administration must be further refined and developed.

To assure a perpetuity of renewable forest resources their disposition must be based on a process of deliberate planning that recognizes forces of demand as well as the sources of supply.

This recognition of demand is an area in which multiple use needs further development, and this is the primary problem with which this paper is concerned.
PART I

THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLICATIONS OF MULTIPLE USE
CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTIPLE USE

The concept of multiple use of forest resources rests on the assumption that forest land produces or supports a variety of resources. Timber, water, forage, recreation, and wildlife are recognized as the primary ones. Mineral deposits can be considered a coincidental resource, but circumstantially a very significant one.

Multiple use implies the simultaneous use of two or more of these resources, and includes a classic proviso that such use shall minimize conflict. A definition of multiple use in the traditional theme is the "harmonizing of forest uses to secure optimum values to meet the needs of people".¹

This harmonious integration of uses, then, is the currently held meaning of the multiple use concept. It is an idea generally endorsed by the forestry profession, by private forest owners, and by forestry agencies of the federal and state governments.

Foreword

The policy of multiple use was inevitable.

It is a distillate, a sophistication of ancient patterns of behavior, of man's historic struggle for existence, of actions and reactions, of conflict and compromise. It is inexorably linked, in this country, to the formation and development of American economic, cultural, and political patterns.

The clear delineation of multiple use is a recent development. In such a form its basis can be traced to certain documents and correspondence. Beyond this its genealogy becomes diffused in broader concepts, obscured in many of the profound influences that shaped the traditional American format of a democratic government, a private enterprise economy, and a cultural atmosphere of freedom.

Where the policy of multiple use originated is an academic question open to arbitrary answer. We can trace it to the initial primitive use by man of the abundant resources at his disposal, somewhere in the dawn of intellect. Certainly use per se antedated such a refined concept as multiple use, and to see the development of the modern policy we must regard the history of man's use of resources.

To do so in detail is unnecessary if we make an assumption: that man had formed, prior to the colonization
of America, habits and patterns of resource use to satisfy his wants. We can further assume that within these patterns were the generative influences of a multiple use policy.

Thus we will enter the developmental flow where the Colonists encountered, unconsciously, the raw materials of our modern policy. With its vague prehistoric beginnings, multiple use was forged in the furnace of conflict and revolution, hammered on the anvil of controversy and compromise, and ground to shape with the abrasive of actions and reactions.

Conflict and Revolution

The Colonists beheld an unexampled abundance of natural resources. They had come from lands of relative scarcity. A vast change in collective attitude occurred: exploitation, a disregard for the land and its resources replaced the established European concepts of conservative use and a reverent stewardship of the soil.

This change has been justified on the basis of production economics—scarce factors are used intensively, abundant factors extensively.

The Colonists left countries where labor and capital were relatively (to resources) abundant and settled a country where resources were relatively (to labor and capital) abundant. The shift in behavior was inevitable; extensive use of resources and intensive use of labor and capital replaced the converse situation in the old country. All this
was economics.

The forests were reservoirs of raw material, and they were also a menace, a hindrance, and an obstacle. Space was needed for homes and churches and schools, and to raise crops.

The ground cannot be tilled, nor can the inhabitants support themselves, ’til [the trees] are removed, they are looked upon as a nuisance, and the man that can cut down the largest number...is looked upon as the most industrious citizen, and one that is making the greatest improvements in the country.¹

The forests seemed boundless, inexhaustible; a living was to be gained at the price of hard work, initiative, energy, "rugged individualism". Small, private, free, and self-reliant landowners settled the country, establishing what Jefferson later called "an agrarian polity". All this was culture.

The exploitation did not fail to arouse the British Crown. Beginning in 1691 and extending to the Revolution, the "Broad Arrow" policy was in effect, which forbade the cutting of pine trees on land not privately owned. This policy clashed violently with the colonial attitude of free use, and trespassers were regarded, in the colonies, more as heroes than as thieves. The Broad Arrow policy made a significant contribution to the irritation and unrest that led to the Revolution. And all this was politics.

Controversy and Compromise

Following the Revolution, Crown lands ceased to exist. The original states ceded their land claims to the new federal government. The Louisiana Purchase, the Florida Purchase, the Oregon Compromise, the Mexican cession, the Texas Purchase, and the Gadsden Purchase subsequently filled out the continental area of the United States. All this land, some 1,442 million acres, was the "original public domain" and its disposition rested squarely with Congress. Article 4, Section 3, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution: "...the Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

Congress soon adopted as a policy of disposal that the land should be "passed to states and private owners as rapidly as was consistent with their orderly development".1

Practice lagged behind policy, however, and Americans were anxious to settle the public domain. In 1838 between twenty and thirty thousand settlers were occupying public land in Iowa that had never gone through a legal process of disposal.2 Not only land, but timber, wildlife, and forage were available, as in colonial times, for the taking, and the collective attitudes toward exploitation, inexhaustibility, and individualism lingered strongly and pervasively.

---

1Dana, op. cit., p. 21.

2Ibid., p.25.
The government reacted to provide the legal means by which these forces could work. Legislation throughout the 1800's provided for disposal of lands through outright sales, preemption sales, homestead grants and commutation privileges, desert-land sales, grants to states for schools and construction of railroads, canals, and wagon roads, grants to the railroad companies themselves, timber and stone sales, and several other minor methods of transferring ownership of the public domain.

Just as there was "illegal" exploitation (only in the eyes of the government—the people condoned it) prior to the disposal laws, so were there violent abuses after their enactment.

The Northern Pacific Railroad was involved in a typical case. It contracted with the Montana Improvement Company for the latter (which was in fact controlled by the Northern Pacific—and run by Marcus Daly) to log the timber along the unsurveyed right-of-way. There was obviously no way of knowing which alternate sections of land had been granted to the railroad and which were owned by the United States. Nor, in this case, did it much matter. The Montana Supreme Court ruled, when the U.S. brought suit for an injunction to prevent more cutting, that the value of the timber lay in its utilization, and if the U.S. could enjoin the railroad, the railroad could enjoin the U.S. and the timber would therefore have no value. With that, presumably, the Court dismissed
the case. Such judicial juggling indicated, if nothing else, the grass-roots feeling toward exploitation!

Through its efforts to control timber trespass, the government became aware of what in retrospect was a startling situation. Prior to 1878 there was no legal means of obtaining public timber or timberland. With settlement and development creating an intense demand for timber, there is little question why trespass-enforcement was difficult.

On June 3, 1878 the Free Timber Act was passed, providing free public timber for building, agriculture, mining, or other domestic purposes to settlers of nine western states. On the same date the Timber And Stone Act was signed into law. This Act provided for the sale of up to 160 acres of land, at $2.50 per acre, chiefly valuable for the timber and stone thereon.

As well meant as these laws probably were, both—particularly the Timber And Stone Act—were flagrantly violated. Western timber companies hired platoons of "settlers" to file claims, then promptly bought them out, consolidating in the process vast areas of prime timber. The Timber And Stone Act disposed of some 15 million acres of public timber land.

Patterns of free use, abuse, and trespass were similarly evident in regard to forage resources. Just as there was no legal means of obtaining timber, so was there no provision for either the use or the acquisition of public range lands. And so too were the range lands used in spite of this.
Free grazing had been so long established a custom that it was scarcely questioned, and it was not until the stockmen of the West had fenced in literally millions of acres of public domain that the government took action. In 1885 Congress forbade enclosures of public lands and authorized destruction of those in existence.¹

Thus we see the government reacted to control as well as encourage settlement and development. The reactions were necessarily concurrent, for abuse, trespass, and exploitation dated from the Revolution. Legislative stimulation began shortly thereafter, and so did the legislative controls.

As early as 1807, through the Act of March 3 (2 Stat. 445), Congress forbade settlement or occupancy of public lands prior to legal authorization. In 1821 the Attorney General interpreted this act to be applicable to timber trespass, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office ruled that "those lawless persons who are guilty of intruding on lands of the United States and of committing waste of public timber" would be "prosecuted to the utmost rigor of the law".²

Legislation, departmental regulations, Supreme Court decisions during the 1800's, and the creation of the Department of the Interior in 1849 indicated the government's concern and opposition to trespass and abuse.

²Dana, op. cit., p.51.
But the populace was traditionally antagonistic toward governmental controls. An 1835 editorial in the Chicago Democrat stated that "'Public opinion' is stronger than law, it has been well said, and we trust it will be so...long custom has given the force of law..."\(^1\)

Here then was the controversy. Popular unawareness, acquiescence, and attitudes condoned exploitation, trespass, and abuse; governmental controls prohibited them, insisting on orderly—and legal—development. A reconciliation depended on a shift in position of one or the other. Or both, and such was ultimately the case.

Popular opinion obviously was not unanimously in favor of violations and probably even a smaller majority condoned sheer exploitation. But apathy served as well as consent, and no doubt much of the population cared little for the actions of timber barons and cattle kings as long as it was not directly affected.

The rumblings of discontent were heard, however, early in the 19th century. Francois Andre Michaux wrote in 1819:

> In America, neither the Federal government nor the several states have [sic] reserved forests. An alarming destruction of the trees proper for building has been the consequence, an evil which in increasing and which will continue to increase with the increase of population. The effect is already very sensibly felt in the large cities, where the complaint is every year becoming more serious, not only of the excessive dearness of fuel, but of the scarcity of timber. Even now inferior wood is being substituted for the White Oak; and the Live Oak so highly esteemed in ship building, will soon

\(^1\)Ibid., p.26.
become extinct upon the islands of Georgia.¹

*Sylva Americana*, a book written in 1832 by J.D. Brown, has this to say:

Though vast tracts of our soil are still veiled from the light of day by primeval forests, the best materials for building are nearly exhausted. And this devastation is now become so universal...that...one of the most glorious and considerable bulwarks of this nation will within a few centuries be nearly extinct.²

In 1864 George P. Marsh published a book called *Man and Nature* that gained wide attention when republished with a new title, *The Earth as Modified by Human Action*. The book's theme concerning the sins of forest devastation had a profound influence on the attitudes of the people.

These works were spearheads of rising public concern. State governments became aroused. Professional societies took notice. Arbor Day was initiated in 1872, signalling a wave of tree planting that forecast things to come. And in 1876, by virtue of a rider on the Appropriations Act of August 15, the Commissioner of Agriculture appointed Franklin E. Hough to investigate "forest conditions" and report to Congress.

Hough and his successor, Nathaniel H. Eggleston, contributed much to the knowledge of forest conditions, but both seemed inclined to propose forest "culture"—not much more than tree planting—to remedy the situation. They spoke for

¹Quoted in John Ise, *United States Forest Policy*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924), pp. 74-75

²*ibid.*, p. 75.
the segment of the public that was opposed to exploitation but had no really adequate alternative to offer.

One man who did offer a rigid alternative was Carl Schurz, who was appointed Secretary of the Interior in 1877. Much of the reckless exploitation, we have seen, was prohibited by law, but lax and sometimes nonexistent enforcement encouraged abuse.

Schurz was a man of courage and conviction, and he resisted emphatically the established patterns of loose administration of the land laws. His alternative was strict enforcement, and he made his philosophy known with unequivocal clarity in his first annual report:

That the law prohibits the taking of timber by unauthorized persons from the public lands of the United States is a universally known fact. That the laws are made to be executed, ought to be a universally accepted doctrine. There may be circumstances under which the rigorous execution of a law may be difficult or inconvenient, or obnoxious to public sentiment, or working particular hardship; in such cases it is the business of the legislative power to adapt the law to such circumstances. It is the business of the Executive to enforce the law as it stands.

Schurz' integrity and aggressive law enforcement highlighted the shifting public sentiment, and concurrently there occurred a significant succession in the government's "forest conditions" research activities.

In 1886 scientific forestry entered the picture when Bernard E. Fernow succeeded Eggleston, and the facility he took over became the Division of Forestry in the Department

1Quoted in Dana, op. cit., p. 59.
of Agriculture, now with full statutory recognition. Fernow was a professional forester, trained in Europe, and under his guidance several important policies were shaped that had been latently developing for several years. One was the idea of federal forest reserves. Another was his insistence on protection, harvesting, and regeneration of the forests—forestry—instead of a perennial Arbor Day and "sparing that tree". Reserves and use can attributed largely to Fernow.

At this point we can see planned and controlled resource use becoming a policy.

And also during this period a multiplicity can be discerned—multiple use is beginning to acquire an identity. Timber and forage have been established. Watershed protection was touched upon in 1876 when Representative Fort of Illinois introduced a bill "for the preservation of forests of the national domain adjacent to the sources of navigable rivers and other streams of the United States". Recreation use was recognized by the Act of March 1, 1872 (17 Stat. 32) which established Yellowstone National Park as "a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people."

The multiple use policy is nearing a milestone in its development. To clarify the implications of the discussion so far, and to define the forces that will soon be felt in the formulation of a delineated multiple use policy, let us resort to oversimplification.

We have seen that large scale exploitation centered,
in the later 1800's, in the West and have proposed as justification for it a basis of economics. And we can add as a reason the popular sentiment in the West that either condoned or ignored it. The Western Position, then, will represent exploitation, economics, and opinion that did not oppose.

We can also recognize that the rise of anti-exploitation feeling occurred largely in the East. The federal actions, the creation of the Division of Forestry substantiate this position. So do the professional societies and early state actions which did in fact originate in the East. This movement—Conservation as it was later termed—was cultural, rather than economic. Thus we will let the Eastern Position represent conservation, culture, and opinion that did oppose exploitation, recognizing the illegitimacy involved—the East had exploited, too, in previous years.

For a multiple use policy to function, there needs to be a matrix of forest land for use and an agency to administer the policy. Both were on the horizon as Fernow served his term of office.

Because Congress was nearing the end of its session and because the bill was a long involved one that had been worked out in conference—thus avoiding the careful scrutiny of the entire Congress—the Act of March 3, 1891 whisked through both houses with scarcely an opposing voice. The opposition to the creation of forest reserves was abundant and powerful, but it had failed to notice the obscure and
now famous Section 24:

That the President of the United States may, from time to time, set apart and reserve, in any State or Territory having public lands wholly or in part covered with timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not, as public reservations, and the President shall, by public proclamation, declare the establishment of such reservations and the limits thereof.

Though its syntax submerged correct grammar, it was law, and on March 30, 1891, President Harrison created the first reserve, the Yellowstone Timberland Reserve, an area of 1,239,040 acres. Several months later he withdrew the White River Plateau Timberland Reserve in Colorado, an additional 1,198,080 acres. During his term of office, Harrison withdrew about 13,000,000 acres.

President Cleveland set aside about 5,000,000 acres more in 1893, but declined to act further because no provisions had yet been made for the protection or administration of the reserves. Nor for their use—the reservations were virtually "lock-ups".

Congress had considered such provisions, but the issue was bitterly debated. Several bills were submitted and defeated.

Several other bills were introduced to abolish the reserves altogether. Western sentiment—particularly the grazing and mining interests—was violently opposed to the lock-up and effectual prohibition of use.

Acting rather suddenly on the recommendation of the National Academy of Sciences, President Cleveland on Febru-
ary 22, 1897 proclaimed as reservations some 21,000,000 acres in South Dakota, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Washington, California, and Utah.

Congress nearly had a seizure.

Utah's Senator Rawlins spoke the sentiment of the Western Position when he declared of Cleveland's proclamation:

...as gross an outrage...as was committed by William the Conqueror, who for the purpose of making a hunting reserve, drove out and destroyed...the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of people.1

He pointed directly at the Western-Eastern controversy:

Whence come the objections? They come from some Senator away off in Massachusetts....The speech of the Senator from Delaware...he had great concern for the preservation of the forests in the distant state of Washington, 5,000 miles away.2

And Montana's Representative Hartman said: "I do not think there is a man on this earth who is such a blunderhead that he can make even a thousandth part of the mistakes President Cleveland made."3

The Eastern Position was summed up by Iowa's Senator Lacey:

It is somewhat of a surprise...that...a great corporation should be allowed to cut timber on four sections of land free of charge....This accounts for some of the hostility which this order of President Cleveland has met....Nothing is so sacred as an abuse.4

1 quoted in Ise, op. cit., pp. 134-135
2 ibid.
3 quoted in Dana, op. cit., p. 107
4 ibid.
The controversy was ultimately compromised in the Congressional conference rooms. Simplifying an exceedingly complex process, economics and culture were compromised by politics.

The result was a rider on the Sundry Civil Appropriations Bill of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 34). The rider, far from sundry, provided among other things:

1. That "no public forest reservation shall be established except to improve and protect the forest...for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States."

2. for the Secretary of the Interior "to regulate their occupancy and use [italics added] and to preserve the forests thereon from destruction."

3. for sale of so much timber [italics added] "as may be compatible with the forest" after advertisement at not less than its appraised value.

4. for free use of timber and stone for firewood, fencing, building, mining, and other domestic purposes.

5. for free entry and exit, including the construction of wagon roads, for actual settlers of the agricultural lands within the reserves.

6. for prospecting, locating, and developing of mineral
7. for settlers within the reserves to occupy 2 acres of land for each school and 1 acre for each church.

8. for all waters on the reserves to be used for domestic, mining, or irrigation purposes. [Italics added.]

This act is the documentary basis of our modern policy of multiple use. It reconciled two widely divergent viewpoints and has withstood well the pressures of progress and change. It was a good piece of legislation and it is still in effect.

Thus we see, in a midway summary, that the patterns and habits in the colonies and the conflict and compromise of the developing nation shaped—through economic, cultural, and political forces—the forests, the agency, and the policy.

But we can recognize the policy as multiple use only in retrospect. It was rather crude, a rough combination of uses and provisions that called for further development.

**Actions and Reactions**

About a year later, Gifford Pinchot succeeded Fernow as head of the Division of Forestry. Pinchot was also a professional forester, and having been trained in Europe, had gained a basic practical experience practicing forestry in this country. He began building a nucleus of trained and energetic foresters, but they had no forests of their own. The reserves were administered by the Department of the
Interior, and the Division of Forestry was in the Department of Agriculture.

But Pinchot preached forestry, and his views were expressed in Theodore Roosevelt's first presidential message to Congress. This message cemented the famous alliance between Roosevelt and Pinchot and in part read:

The fundamental idea of forestry is the perpetuation of forests by use. Forest protection is not an end in itself; it is a means to increase and sustain the resources of our country and the industries which depend on them....The forest reserves will...be of...greater use in the future than in the past. Additions should be made to them...their usefulness should be increased by a thoroughly businesslike management.¹

But the reserves already proclaimed were by no means guaranteed permanence. Pinchot later wrote:

At that time [1901] the whole Forest Reserve [sic] policy was still in jeopardy. That year, and for several years to follow, it was in fact less a question of securing good legislation than of preventing bad. The danger was so acute that the Reserves were saved only by the skin of their teeth. Over and over again, their escape seemed almost miraculous.²

Largely through Pinchot’s and Roosevelt's actions the reserves were transferred to the Department of Agriculture in 1905, (Act of February 1, 33 Stat. 628) uniting the foresters and the forests in the same agency. On March 3, 1905 the agency was renamed the Forest Service, and in 1907 the reserves became known as national forests.


²Ibid., pp. 201-203.
Pinchot was well aware of hostile actions and likewise sensitive to the appropriate reactions: "What was needed above all things was local approval and support of the Reserves, and use was the key to that." \[\text{Italics added}\]

When Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson outlined the basic Forest Service policy, Pinchot's expertise was evident. Wilson signed the policy letter, but Pinchot had written it. The instructions (to Pinchot):

In the administration of the forest reserves it must be clearly borne in mind that all the land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people....All the resources of the forest reserves are for use \[\text{Italics not added}\]....The permanence of the resources of the reserves is...indispensable.

You will see to it that the water, wood, and forage of the reserves are conserved and wisely used....The continued prosperity of the agricultural, lumbering, mining, and livestock interests is directly dependent upon a permanent and accessible supply of water, wood, and forage....In the management of each reserve, local questions will be decided upon local grounds; the dominant industry will be considered first, but with as little restriction to minor industries as may be possible;...when conflicting interests must be reconciled the question will always be decided from the standpoint of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

These general principles will govern in the protection and use of the water supply, in the disposal of timber and wood, in the use of the range, and in all other matters connected with the management of the reserves.\[^2\]

The Act of 1897 was the document and this was the correspondence that established the modern policy of multiple use.

\[^1\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 118.}\]

\[^2\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 261.}\]
The formation of the Society of American Foresters at the turn of the century symbolized a development that related significantly to the further refinement of multiple use policy. It represented the professionalizing of forestry.

The furor that led to an awareness and reform of resource abuse was created and carried largely by a group of laymen we will call Conservationists. They performed a priceless service. Michaux, Brown, Marsh, Hough, Eggleston, Schurz were among their number, and there were many more like them; each made his worthwhile contribution to the solution of a grave and critical problem.

But their initiative in sustaining the movement gradually shifted more and more to professional, technically competent foresters as an American forestry profession was virtually created to meet the new situation. Forestry schools were begun, European forestry was modified to meet American conditions, science began to replace sentiment, and the Society was founded to "...further the cause of forestry...creating opportunities for a free interchange of views...disseminating a knowledge of the purpose and achievements of forestry."¹

The direct effects and influences of professional forestry on multiple use are not readily traceable, but are nevertheless profound. First through publication of the Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters and The Forestry Quarterly and later the Journal of Forestry, the Society provided the free interchange and dissemination of knowledge proposed in

¹Dana, op. cit., p. 138
its Constitution. Multiple use would be so treated in years to come.

The next legislative contribution to multiple use occurred in 1915 with the passage of the Agricultural Appropriations Act of March 4 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101). This act became known as the Term Lease Law, and authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to lease sites for summer homes, hotels, stores, or other structures needed for recreation or public convenience. The leases were limited to thirty years, the sites to five acres. This act marked the first Congressional verification of recreation use on the national forests. Congress had reacted to a felt need.

Summer homes and hotels had received cursory recognition as legitimate uses in The Use of the National Forest Reserves, a manual of instructions and information published July 1, 1905 by the Forest Service. This book subsequently evolved in the Forest Service Manual which we will investigate in more detail in Chapter VI.

In 1921 the Manual considerably widened the scope of recreation emphasis: "No plan of...administration would be complete which did not...make them [the mountains, cliffs, natural formations, etc.] freely available for public use."\(^1\) The tone of this section of the Manual implied an equation of recreation with the other forest resources.

Chief Forester Robert Y. Stuart removed the limits of "implication" in 1928:

The importance of recreational use as a social force and influence must be recognized and its requirements must be met. Its potentialities as a service...are definite and beyond question. Its rank in National Forest activities will in large degree be a major one and in a limited degree a superior one...as a recognized form of use of natural resources it...should receive the same relative degree of...attention...and planning that is now given other forms of utilization.¹

The wildlife resource, largely subordinated or overlooked previously, was officially acknowledged by the act of June 23, 1933. This legislation authorized the President to establish a game refuge in the Ouachita National Forest. Later the act was extended to provide the creation of fish and game sanctuaries in any of the national forests.

The five traditional forest resources have been recognized. What is the status of multiple use at this point?

The first publication of the term "multiple use" in the Journal of Forestry occurred in October, 1938.² In his article, Regional Forester (U.S.F.S.) R.M. Evans said:

"Multiple use forest management sounds a bit formidable...As a principle, or statement of purpose, it is susceptible of definition in simple terms...It is a conception of management...that envisions the trees, the soil, the water, the forage, the fish, game, and birds, the scenic and aesthetic values, and...the people...all as elements which must have their proper place and weight in the management pattern and plan."

¹Dana, op. cit., p. 228

Evans relates the basis of multiple use to Secretary Wilson's letter, but there is an obvious tone of introduction here, a tone of something new. While we can't, from his article alone, credit Evans with coining the phrase, we can presume the concept of multiple use—the integration of uses—probably coagulated some time in the mid-thirties.

If we can accept the *Journal of Forestry* as a reflection of contemporary thought in forestry, an interesting pattern of multiple use policy development is discernable. Prior to 1938, the phrase had not yet appeared. After Evans' article, several years elapsed before it was mentioned again.¹

In 1943, no less than five articles dealing with multiple use appeared in the *Journal*. Probably the most significant is an editorial published in September of that year that said in part: "The program for that meeting [the postponed 1942 Convention] indicates that...members of the Society [of American Foresters] need information, and perhaps education, on the subject of multiple use..."² The publication of this editorial was followed, in 1943, by articles concerning multiple

---

¹In an article by R.P. Holdenworth of Massachusetts State College, "Multiple Use Management Applied to Timberlands". *Journal of Forestry* 39:9, (September, 1941)

use in relation to wild lands,¹ water yields,² and summer grazing.³

This flurry of interest, I think, was caused by the novelty of the concept, by the academic or professional attraction that invited investigation and exposition.

The novelty apparently wore thin. From 1944 (when two more articles were printed) until 1953 there was not a single paper concerning multiple use. This nine year span was the longest lapse since the initial attention in 1938.

Major articles appeared in 1953, 1954, and 1955. In this year, Chief Forester Richard E. McArdle said:

"Millions of people will continue to insist on having these products and services [grazing, timber, recreation, water] of the national forests. They can get them best through a system of multiple use management...We are rapidly leaving behind the custodial stage in management..."⁴

The obsolescence of custodianship probably explains the lapse in the literature. Since World War II the use of all the forest resources has skyrocketed. Chain saws and logging trucks, replacing hand tools and railroads, have revolutionized timber harvesting. More leisure and more and

---

¹D.S. Jeffers, "Multiple Use of Wild Lands in the Rocky Mts. and Inter Mountain Region", Journal of Forestry, 41:9, (September, 1943), pp. 627-632.
²C.A. Connaughton, "Yield of Water as an Element of Multiple Use in Wild Land", Journal of Forestry, 41:9, (September, 1943), pp. 641-644.
better automobiles and roads have fantastically intensified recreation use.

The population growth has been incredible. In 1951 Gulick wrote: "The most recent estimate of the maximum United States population, assuming high fertility and immigration, places the top figure at 185 million in 1995."¹ During the first week of December, 1959, U.S. population reached 179 million.² Assuming a straight-line projection of this latest data, the figure of 185 million will be reached before mid-1961. We are running ahead of schedule.

The undercurrents here are several. First, in the prewar era of custodianship, the demand for forest resources was so low, relatively, as to cause little conflict between the various uses. Multiple use was as novelty, an interesting concept, and a policy only because of the necessary political, cultural, and economic compromises that created forests and forestry at the turn of the century. Second, the exploding demand for resources now defines the relative scarcity of production factors--the acres of forest land. With the scarcity have come conflicts, and multiple use has come of age. It is a necessity, the only means by which the various demands can be satisfied.

¹Luther M. Gulick, American Forest Policy, (New York, Duell, Sloane, and Dearee, 1951), p. 122.

²See Newsweek, December 7, 1959, p. 31.
Ancient habits and powerful forces shaped the basis, the ideas, the concept, and the policy of multiple use. The pressures of demand have made it a necessity and will assure its permanence. It was, as we have said, inevitable.
CHAPTER II

THE IMPLICATIONS OF MULTIPLE USE

So we see that multiple use has become defined in principle and has acquired a name. We have seen it forged, hammered, and ground to shape. To complete the analogy, the policy must be polished. We must examine its present implications and propose some further refinements.

The present definitions of multiple use are broad, sweeping generalizations, subject to diverse interpretation. Multiple use has as many meanings as it has proponents. The common meaning implies static conditions—timber production and grazing occurring simultaneously at a given moment of time.

This concept is simple enough to grasp. We have uses that supplement or complement each other, and we have uses that conflict. Recognizing degrees of use (e.g., clearcutting or selective cutting), we can draw a chart of compatibility, assuming "optimum degrees" of use; such a diagram is reproduced on the following page.

But this is not the whole picture.

Suppose we have \( x \) acres devoted to timber exclusively, \( y \) acres to recreation exclusively, and \( z \) acres to water production exclusively, and the area of \( x \neq y \neq z \) is under the administration of a single manager. As a corollary of con-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timber</th>
<th>XX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Supp. Comp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>Supp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Supp. Comp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USES</td>
<td>Timber Water Grazing Recreation Wildlife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compatibility Chart

Considering the total acreage we can say he is practicing multiple use within his unit.

In one case we have integrated uses, supposedly on a single area; in another case we have exclusive uses on adjacent areas but under a single administrative authority. The ambiguity rests here on the supposition in the *xyz* example of exclusive uses—but perhaps the manager deemed impossible the integration of uses on the three areas.

This raises a question of administration: how were the acres allocated to the various uses? In our hypothetical situation it doesn't matter, but there is generated another question that does. How should acres be allocated?

Probably the soundest answer lies in land-capability classification—determining which acres are best suited for providing what uses or combination of uses. This is an initial
step in the administration of multiple use, a necessary biological basis for supplying the multiple resources of forest land. It is an inventory of supply facilities.

But supply is only half of the economic picture. We have not yet considered demand. The biological capabilities of the land limit the resources which can be supplied, but the limitations are rather wide. The forces of demand can and do indicate the precise combination of resources most properly provided, and ignoring these forces can lead to severe mismanagement. There is no value in developing campgrounds if the demand is for polo games, and building polo fields in a Class I Douglas fir site may be a poor choice if there is a concurrent demand for Douglas fir.

Multiple use then evolves from the biological capabilities of the land and the demands made upon it. When we consider the current residual resources of an area satisfying current demands for them, whether the uses are integrated on the area or singly administered on adjacent parts of the area, we establish what I choose to call static multiple use.

All of which is well and good and a necessary starting point. But land managers, be they private entrepreneurs or employees of public land-management agencies, must be concerned with long run considerations if they wish to perpetuate the supply of forest resources. Short run or static multiple use per se may involve no more than "mining" the resources; management can provide for renewal and sustained
The principle of sustained yield is well known in its application to timber resources—cutting no more than annual growth each year ensures a sustained yield in perpetuity. The principle is applicable to the other renewable forest resources of forage, wildlife, water, and recreation.

Dynamic multiple use then must consider supply and demand over long run time periods. Timber management plans do this to some extent, determining an allowable annual cut that can be realized over an indefinite time span. Thus the long run supply is identified, but few if any timber management plans attempt to identify long run demand.

Similar long run supply plans can be developed for the other renewable resources, once again realizing the biological limits of production.

But the biological limits can be changed, given sufficient time. Witness city parks created from refuse dumps. Trees, range grasses, wildlife browse vegetation can be planted. Watersheds can be reclaimed from heavily used recreation areas, and recreation areas can be developed in watersheds.

None of these modifications can be accomplished in limited time spans—the "market period" and "short-run" of economic theory. Forage production may take three or four years. Recreation developments may take longer. Timber rotations run to a hundred years or more.

And sequential considerations enter the picture.
Timber harvest may well follow recreational use of a given area, but the converse sequence would be unsuitable. Boating and water-skiing can only follow the construction of a dam—they cannot well precede it. And wilderness recreation excludes any prior use, at least in the mind of the "Wilderness Purist".

What is implied here is the possibility of sequential multiple use. On a given area water production and recreation, timber harvest, browse production as the cutover land returns first to brush species, and finally timber production again, may follow in a chain of uses--multiplicity over time.

Thus the element of time must be added to the biological capabilities as another limiting factor to the long run supply of multiple resources.

Up to this point we have identified several types or definitions of multiple use: (1) integrated uses on a given piece of land, (2) exclusive uses of adjacent areas under a single jurisdiction, and (3) sequential exclusive (or integrated) uses over time.

To avoid hopeless confusion, it is well to consider multiple use as it applies to an operating unit, i.e., an area of land under the responsibility of a single decision-maker or unit manager. Considering the concept of multiple use in such a "real" application removes it from the vague and ambiguous context of lofty rhetoric in which it is so often encountered.
All these types of multiple use can be regarded as legitimate definitions with regard to an operating unit. If multiple use attempts to maximize the benefits of the operating unit's resources (the "greatest good"), we must ask what benefits are wanted, and this brings us back again to the question of demand.

Static multiple use is rather easily realized. If the operating unit supports the resources in demand it can supply them. If it does not, it can't. This applies both to integrated and exclusive-but-adjacent uses.

The problems arise again when the time element is injected. The resources can be supplied—any resource can be supplied given sufficient time and sufficient demand, and it is the responsibility of the unit manager, particularly managers of public lands, to do so.

The problem is similar to one of logistics: supplying a certain resource at a certain place at a certain time and in adequate quantity and quality to satisfy a certain demand.

The keystone here is that "certain demand". If the demand can be identified, the problem becomes one of production, and forestry research has been concentrating on that aspect for years.

The obvious place to begin the identification of demand is with the immediate and short run time periods. Here we will find short run demand, and it is most often recognized in the objectives and activities of pressure groups.
There are groups of lumbermen, of stock raisers, of recreationists; there are Water User's Associations and wildlife clubs; they all make demands for the resources of forest lands. Their demands are frequently short run in nature, and identifying them is vital to the administration of multiple use.

If we can establish a short run pattern of use to satisfy the various demands we have successfully administered the policy on a short run basis. If we alter the configuration in successive short run periods to satisfy the successive and changing demands, and continue the process ad infinitum, have we not arrived at long run multiple use?

In other words, a tentative equilibrium between supply and demand is attained in each successive short run period, until the balance is upset by demands for a new configuration of uses. Once again the necessary compromises are made to attain a new (and always tentative) equilibrium. The aggregate of these partial-equilibria, over an infinite time span, may be considered long run multiple use.

At this point we can define multiple use more explicitly than we did at the beginning of Chapter I: the concept of multiple use recognizes a variety of resources available on forest land and seeks, ideally, to maximize the benefits of them through a process that strikes a long run succession of partial equilibria between short run demands for the various resources and the short run supplies.
This is quite true, with a critical proviso we will consider in Chapter VIII.

But now we will turn to our starting point--short run demands as expressed by pressure groups.

If we restrict our consideration of multiple use to that policy of the U.S. Forest Service we must realize that its administration is within the scope of political processes. We will see in the following chapters that such processes are in fact simply manifestations of group processes. The principles of group behavior are identical in regard to non-political groups as well as to those groups directly concerned with governmental policies, and we can suppose the effects of pressure groups on the administration of multiple use would be the same for a private forest owner as they are in respect to Forest Service administration.

Our emphasis here, however, is upon the Forest Service policy primarily, and hence we will use the political process as a vehicle for our study of pressure groups.
PART II

PRESSURE GROUP POLITICS
INTRODUCTION

The task of government, and hence of democracy as a form of government, is not to express an imaginary popular will, but to effect adjustments among the various special wills and purposes which at any given time are pressing for realization....every governmental act can be viewed as favoring in some degree some particular and partial will, or special interest.1

This indicates that pressure groups today dictate governmental actions to the exclusion of popular recourse. It sounds heretical, anti-American, and intolerable in a free democracy based on individual liberties and rights.

The quotation has been removed from context, true, but its implications remain unslanted.

If these implications are true, how has this result come about? Is it a threat to our traditional institutions? Does public opinion no longer carry any value at all?

According to current interpretations and definitions, it never has, because "public opinion" cannot in reality exist. "Public opinion" presupposes an issue--something to have an opinion about--and to imagine 180,000,000 souls entertaining a common opinion about this issue staggers, to say the least, one's better judgment. It helps not at all even to reduce this figure to a traditional majority, say 90,000,001.

The underlying rationale of the quotation inheres in the following definition of "public opinion":

...the attitudes toward a particular issue held by a particular public that may not be directly involved in the issue but that is aware of it.\footnote{An idea of John Dewey's related in a lecture by Dr. Thomas Payne delivered to the School of Public Administration at Montana State University, Missoula, Montana, February 4, 1960.}

Granting a quibble here over definitions, there is immediately recognizable a clash between traditional notions and apparent realities—a clash well worth investigating.
CHAPTER III

THE TRADITIONS AND MYTHS

The Myth of the Unitary Polity

This involves the atomistic approach to social sciences. Dating from the interpretations (and misinterpretations) of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* single individuals, operating in the aggregate in a *laissez-faire* environment, have determined the policies of governments and the prices of goods. While the single individual has no discernable effect on either policy or price, he is the basic unit in the discipline, be it economics or political science. In these terms we view a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—one by one.

The Myth of the Separation of Powers

To protects individuals from governmental oppression, the Constitution of the United States deliberately created three distinct branches of federal government: the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. To effect a system of checks and balances, each of these was assigned a distinct function: creation of laws, execution of laws, and testing of laws. One agency was to be concerned with policy, one with administration, and one with adjudication. Each was to function independently of and separately
from the other.

The Myth of the Insidious Pressure Group

Pressure groups today have infiltrated Washington in a Gresham's Law of representation. The honest taxpayer is shouldered aside by a slick lobbyist en route to Congress, there to cajole, threaten, bargain with, or buy a legislator to promote some special interest. In his struggle to be heard, the lone voter encounters an overwhelming adversary, the Pressure Group; armed with batteries of legal talent, staffs of lobbyists, and nearly limitless finances, it has terrifying power to squash the interests on the single "little man".

Pressure groups dominate the direction of government, inevitably advocating private gain over public good and inevitably achieving it.

The employ insidious means. Washing machines, mink coats, and 5% rake-offs are only manifestations of more devious, sub rosa, and probably more spectacular tactics.

And their methods are effective. In making an appropriation for the Veteran's Administration, Congress specified that "no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes except for cooking purposes."¹ This is clearly the result of pressure

group activity, and more likely the rule than the exception.

Individual recourse is passe'; what we have, essentially, is government of the pressure groups, by the pressure groups, and emphatically for the pressure groups.
CHAPTER IV

THE APPARENT REALITIES

Conceptual institutions undergo slow and steady but finally radical change. Analysis of the institutions must constantly change, too, if it is to produce sound principles and reliable generalizations. The distinction between myth and reality, in the first two cases—the Unitary Polity and the Separation of Powers—is largely a matter of obsolescence. More searching analysis of these conceptions provides a pattern that more nearly fits the present-day situations. The third case—pressure groups—suffers from hasty generalization, oversimplification, and incomplete analysis.

The apparent realities differ more in degree than in kind from the traditional myths. They do not contradict or replace but serve to clarify and supplement them.

The Group Polity

The Group Theory of Politics

This theory is the conclusion of the entire analysis of the Group Polity. A brief prior summary at this point should clarify the analysis as it progresses, providing a framework to accommodate the parts, and defining the context of the investigation.
The group theory of politics rests on the premise that man is a social animal. This assumption is paramount. Each man has a spectrum of values, judgments, wants, opinions, likes, dislikes, etc., that precisely coincides with no other man's. But in his interactions with other men he seeks agreement or corroboration of at least one or some of his views, and in doing so creates the nucleus of group vitality.

The group is based then on a set of common beliefs or value judgments or shared attitudes, and thereby exerts a demand on its members. A conformity to the group viewpoint is necessary for affiliation with the group. A reciprocity is evident: the group owes its existence to the common viewpoint, and demands acceptance of the viewpoint as the price of admission. Thus a static balance is achieved within the group and would obtain but for another facet of group theory.

That involves the dynamics of different viewpoints— it brings in another group based on another set of common beliefs. When the two opinions concern the same issue, there inevitably will be a conflict, and each group will make a claim on the other, each will exert its collective power.

Depending on the magnitude of the issue, the group may formalize, organize, and pressurize, sometimes involving government, sometimes not.

Conflicts range from friendly arguments to formal warfare, but the significant idea of group theory is that
only through groups does man exert his individual values. An important distinction is implicit here. Group theory does not state that man can exert his values only through groups. It merely holds that he does. It is not just a voluntary process, but well-nigh inescapable if we hold valid the assumption of innate social tendencies.

The group theory of politics is an explanation of the functioning of the political process that is based on this social-tendency assumption. It was first proposed and developed by Arthur F. Bentley in his book *The Process of Government*, initially published in 1908.

The rationale of Bentley's thesis considers the political process as the actions, interactions, and reactions of various groups through, upon, and by the government in efforts to impose their wills, wishes, or claims on other groups. In Bentley's words:

> We shall always find that the political interests and activities of any given group—and there are no political phenomena except group phenomena—are directed against other activities of men, who appear in other groups, political or other. The phenomena of political life...will always divide the society in which they occur, along lines which are very real, though of varying degrees of definiteness. The society itself is nothing other than the complex of groups that compose it.\(^1\)

We must recognize here that the scope of Bentley's analysis could well include government agencies themselves in the aggregation of pressure groups. We will see in Chapter VIII that the inclusion is in fact valid.

---


\(^2\) Ibid., p.206 ff.
David B. Truman drew heavily on Bentley's idea in writing *The Governmental Process*, a profoundly competent and penetrating development of group-politics theory. It is this work that I have depended upon most consistently in the exposition to follow.

The group theory of politics, then, is based on man's group orientation, rather than on each individual. It is not necessarily the groups as viewed by government or the government as viewed by the groups. Instead the group theory of politics is a descriptive observation and explanation of the functioning of both in a single social complex of political processes.

Adam Smith recognized both participants:

People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices. It is impossible indeed to prevent such meetings, by any law which either could be executed, or would be consistent with liberty and justice.\(^2\)

Having exonerated Smith of the entire and exclusive responsibility for the Myth of the Unitary Polity, and having surveyed the group theory of politics, we can turn now with a purity of conscience and a clarity of idea to our detailed analysis.

The Physiology of Groups

The origin of groups, as we have seen, is based on the latent similarities of viewpoints and values that exist be-

between men, and is manifested in his tendencies to "socialize" or segregate into common-viewpoint divisions. This tendency, we are told by the social psychologists, derives from a childhood association with "primary groups"—first the family then the kids next door, then school-mates, sand-lot ball teams, etc.

This group-orientation from infancy leads to group associations and experiences that become for each individual the means of understanding, interpreting, evaluating, acting and reacting, and adjusting to the social complex.

Each social association or experience produces in each individual either a positive or a negative result. He accepts something or rejects something, but in any case he is influenced. The sum of the influences becomes the individual's views on the sum of the issues to which he has been exposed (i.e., the issues of which he is aware). And the aggregate of views—the Aggregate Opinion—is the raw material from which groups are built.

Withdrawing a particular view from the Aggregate Opinion forms the basis of a group, and automatically each individual who holds this view becomes a member.

To clarify the analysis at this point, we must recognize the difference between two bases of classifying groups. First there are groups based on overt similarities that classify wives, fishermen, thesis writers, smokers, or Californians into groups. Such classifications are of little interest in understanding pressure group politics with one exception: Californians, New Yorkers, and Oklahomans are classified on an
overt similarity, geographical location, and this is the basis for Congressional representation. It causes problems which will be dealt with later.

The second type of classification is based on similarities of attitude or belief or viewpoint, and this basis is of direct concern.

It is the shared attitude, more than the shared occupation, marital status, or geographical location, that vitalizes groups, that crystallizes for the group the norms and values and defines the necessary conformity. This is important. A shared attitude within the group is the muscle, the source of activity, and the basis of conflict.

To avoid muddying the analysis, we must again resort to segregating types of groups.

The concept of the potential group has already been touched upon. The Aggregate Opinion mentioned above contains, we reasoned, the raw materials for the creation of groups. The Aggregate is a pervasive entity, embracing every opinion on every matter held by every individual. (Perhaps Aggregate Opinion is a better term than "public opinion". We can realize that the aggregate contains not just the "pro's" to every question, but the "con's" too, and how illogical it is to say, for example, "Public opinion demands subsidized breweries." Perhaps the brewers, the barkeeps, and the beer-drinkers do, but what of the W.C.T.U., the clergy, and the whiskey-drinkers? Each group is part of the public.)
The aggregate obviously contains opinions regarding morality, education, religion, prize fighting, science, music, literature, and politics to mention a few. Truman generalizes very well and calls the aggregate the "rules of the game"\(^1\), defining it as something akin to a national collective conscience, the "moral codes of a people". The Aggregate Opinion, an infinity of attitudes to be shared, likewise embraces an infinity of potential groups.

A "realized group", on the other hand has redeemed its potential, and its members are in fact actively sharing an attitude. In Truman's terms the members are "interacting": "If the members of any aggregation of blondes begin to interact as blondes, alcoholics as alcoholics...they constitute groups."\(^2\) They are interacting, sharing attitudes toward, presumably, blondeness and alcoholism. The transition from potential group to "realized group", however, depends more on the interactions than on the shared attitude.

To recapitulate: a collection of individuals with only a shared attitude is a potential group. When these individuals interact they become a "realized group."

As interactions become frequent and intensified, so does group organization tend to develop. As the organization develops so does the vigor of the group's norms, values, and demands for conformity. And as conformity develops, so does the group's equilibrium, the static balance that the group endeavors to maintain. The desired equilibrium is both in-

\(^1\)Truman, op. cit., pp. 159-535, passim. \(^2\)ibid., p. 24.
ternal and external, but it is seldom if ever obtained.

Disequilibrium has an important effect on both types of groups. It is the force that causes potential groups to activate, that causes members of potential groups to interact. And it causes "realized groups" to take action. Once the group attains perfect equilibrium it will lapse back into the potential group category. In effect, when a group attains its objective, it disbands.

The sources of disequilibria are many and varied. One group may make a claim on another to begin a chain reaction--group norms can and do clash--this is a common source. Legislation may hinder one group to the advantage of another, upsetting the balance of each. Natural disasters, court decisions, stock market activity, scientific breakthroughs--nearly any event in the course of social or political or economic processes can activate a potential group or stimulate a "realized group" to action.

This micro-theory of disequilibrium may explain both the continual rise in the number of groups and the increased group activity we have witnessed since the Constitution. The vast push of industrialization created imbalances, differentiated and specialized American labor in particular and the population in general. As our society has become more and more complex, the Aggregate Opinion has, too. And as prosperity, wars, depressions and earthquakes, monopolies, market crashes, assassinations, and atomic energy have entered
and exited or remained on the American scene groups and group activities have flourished.

The analysis so far has traced the development of groups through its four preliminary steps or prerequisites: the Aggregate Opinion, the force of disequilibria, the interactions, and the organization.

The organization of the group, its formal structure, presents some interesting diagnostic features. Truman maintains "...formal organization is usually a consequence, and therefore an index, of a fairly high degree of interaction within a group".\(^1\) Furthermore organization indicates an expectation of permanence within the group, a set of formalized values and norms, and a certain degree of cohesion.

This last item is particularly significant in analyzing pressure groups, since cohesion and effectiveness bear a direct relation to each other. As a principle of group analysis Truman's statement serves well: "The degree of a group's cohesion [and hence effectiveness] is frequently indicated in [the degree of] its formal organization."\(^2\)

It would seem that a pressure group needs nothing more than an intricate organizational pattern to solidify its cohesion and guarantee its effectiveness. But such is not the case. There remains the devastating problem, from the group's standpoint, of the phenomenon called multiple membership and its inherent property of overlapping loyalties. This notion

\(^1\)ibid., p. 112. \(^2\)ibid.
is deceptively simple in theory and profound in its effects.

The theory could be called the Conservation of the Aggregate Opinion. Although an individual joins or subscribes to the conformity of the group norms, he still retains his private sum of opinion. He may in fact actively participate in groups with antithetical norms, thus dividing his loyalty. But the more profound reality, I think, is that he retains his "membership" in countless potential groups. He has not destroyed his latent opinions—the Aggregate Opinion is conserved. The "rules of the game" are preserved, and woe be to the organized group that violates them.

Overlapping loyalty appears to be the great leavener in pressure group politics. It is a safety valve providing checks and balances that no legislation could very well supply. (This ultimate dependence on the individual member retains the sympathy of the Unitary Polity. But as we said, our analysis would supplement, not contradict.) Political scientists have long noted that each pressure group in Washington almost invariably confronts an antipathy—a group with diametrically opposing norms. The people are free to join (and evidently have) one or the other. Or both.

Multiple membership and overlapping loyalties thus function to dilute a group's cohesion and hence its effectiveness.

There are other deterrents, too. Truman mentions geographical dispersion and size as significant, but em-
phasizes multiple membership.

Group organization produces another feature that affects cohesion, but this time on the plus side. Organization creates a division of labor within the group, and leadership is evolved. Able leadership coagulates cohesion, usually if not exclusively via the concept of the "active minority".

Donald C. Blaisdell explains it:

...all groups of individuals...develop undemocratic tendencies, particularly as regards control. Although in the United States they owe their existence to the individual's right to associate freely with his fellows, the corresponding opportunity to participate in the group's decisions is used only by a small minority of its members. This is the active minority, or, in other words, the oligarchy which controls the group's affairs.¹

The apathy of the rank and file in neglecting its opportunities contributes to what Blaisdell calls "government by acquiescence".² Such government seems to prevail in the microcosm of the group, with leadership vested in the active minority, as well as the macrocosm of society, with groups themselves assuming the role of the active minority. (This apathy or inertia might derive from overlapping loyalties. If so, the concept of multiple membership would seem to function both to dilute and to concentrate cohesion. But the quiescence, I would argue, is equal to equilibrium—the potential of cohesion-dilution remains, and the efficacy of multiple membership rests as much or more in the potential as in the actual.)

To conclude this discussion of group physiology and to place groups in their social—and hence political—context,

²Ibid., p. 9
a quote from Truman:

The group's strategic position among other groups, the character of the overlapping attachments of its members at a particular point in time, and the skills of the leadership largely determine the group's cohesion. Its cohesion will in the long run profoundly effect the extent to which the group is successful in exerting its claims upon other groups in the society.\(^1\)

The Definition of Pressure Groups

Truman prefers the term "interest group" and defines it as "...any group that, on the basis of one or more shared attitudes, makes certain claims upon other groups in the society for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of forms of behavior that are implied by the shared attitudes".\(^2\)

The term "pressure group" carries with it a number of nasty connotations. I prefer the term, however, not only because it meets this stigma dead-on, but because it likewise connotes an active entity.

"Pressure group", Blaisdell relates, is a new name, unmentioned in political dictionaries of 1924. He quotes a recent *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* defining a pressure group as "any aggregate, organized or unorganized, which applies pressure tactics".\(^3\) This definition, employing a classic fallacy, tells us nothing. But Blaisdell equates pressure groups with interest groups, and by defining pressure groups in Truman's words we arrive at a workable understanding. At


\(^3\)Blaisdell, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
any rate a recondite quibble over nomenclature is pointless. To proceed...

The Place and Role of Pressure Groups in Politics

Pressure groups inevitably turn to government in their efforts to achieve equilibria, either to re-establish an old equilibrium or to attain a new one. The reasons for this lie in the progressive complexity of our society.

Transportation and communication have magnified the problems which pressure groups encounter, and as these two commodities have expanded groups have federated, nationalized, and internationalized. They have created groups of groups. They have expanded their "publics" in Deweyian terms. These are efforts to recruit as much social power as possible.

And quoting Truman again: "Governments since the Renaissance, especially national governments, have become the most inclusive power concentrations in Western society, virtually unrivalled by any others."¹

Governmental power then is recruited as a potent supplement to the powers of the individual pressure groups. And the groups have found an amenable atmosphere in the framework of our political institutions. Briefly stated, our customs, our Constitution, and our party system all contribute to encourage pressure group politics.

Democracy presumes that power-succession is not hereditary, but regularly elective, that government and governed

¹Truman, op. cit., p. 106.
freely communicate, that criticism and contradiction are basic rights, not privileges, and that popular consent (or at least acquiescence) is the foundation of government. These are customs.

The Constitution provides for the separation of powers, allowing no single branch of government a power advantage over another. Thus no single branch can dictate, none can repel pressure arbitrarily, nor can any promise privilege. The Constitution further provides for popular representation on the basis of geographical location.

In the discussion of group classifications we saw a weakness in such a geographical basis, at least for political purposes. The underlying postulate here requires some further development.

In the first place it is generally agreed that the most common basis for pressure group viability—the most common shared attitude—concerns economic matters. Clearly recognizing that pressure groups clamor for objectives over the whole range of social values, economics usually places first. (And the ghost of Adam Smith smiles.)

Secondly, a simple assumption: people are more directly and actively concerned with their economic welfare than they are with where they live. In other words, regional and sectional attitudes aren't so susceptible to disequilibria as are attitudes on economic matters.

This seems to imply that the representation system of the Constitution in fact represents apathy, and that pressure
groups have a role of representation (of spirited economic interests) to fulfill. Which indeed they have and indeed they do, under the auspices of our insipid party system.

The party system is an intricate complexity about which books are written. To avoid a digression and lengthy analysis, a simplification: parties cannot guarantee results because, among other things, of the Constitutional separation of powers. The executive and the legislative elections are separate (particularly in mid-term elections); hence the party platform is handicapped by an uncertainty of platform-inspired legislation. This is probably the basic weakness in the party system, but the weakness is overwhelming: candidates can have no assurance from the party, and hence recruit supplemental support where they find it—not infrequently in pressure groups. And the platform itself must become a sugar-coated promise of everything-for-everybody to realize its true function: to aid in electing the party's candidate and to appeal, in the process, to as many people—and groups—as possible. The groups capitalize on this situation, bargaining with each party for the rosiest promises, and remaining traditionally (ostensibly) non-partisan.

The parties too suffer from their geographical division, their attempts to represent on that basis, and their own intra-party geographical representation. In short, the parties viewed as groups, lack cohesion.

The "shortcoming" of the Constitution and the weakness
of the party system lies in the function of representation, and this is the hole in our political system that pressure groups have plugged. They have done so in a social climate ameliorated by our customs.

The view that pressure groups are pathological growths in the body politic is likewise more picturesque than accurate. It is a safer assumption that the group system developed to fill gaps in the political system.¹

Pressure Group Activity

Pressure groups may indulge in inter-group activity, but we will emphasize group activity in relation to government. Assuming a shared attitude, interaction, organization, cohesion, and disequilibrium, we have by definition an active pressure group.

But in the following examination it will be well to consider the group's activity as it relates to the conflict with other groups, rather than picturing a single group in direct and exclusive conflict with the government.

The latter case is unrealistic. Groups resort to pressures on government to gain advantage over other groups or to achieve what the group feels is an equitable equilibrium. True, groups both oppose and support government, but the premise here is that they do so as a means, not an end. In other words pressures on government are not so much ad hoc pressures on ad hoc agencies, but rather an indirect pressure inflicted on an opposing group.

¹Key, op. cit., p. 144.
The Battleground

The arena of pressure group conflict is politics and government, among the interstices of which pressures are exerted and through the processes of which the pressures become effective.

Paul H. Appleby has listed eight political processes, the modus operandi of government:¹

1. the legislative process
2. the judicial process
3. the administrative process
4. the agitational process
5. the voting process
6. the Presidential nominating process
7. the general nominating process
8. the party maintenance and operation process
(exclusive of nominating functions)

Investigating these eight processes and how pressure groups are involved in them would result in an interesting study, but is beyond the scope of the analysis at hand. Initially we will eliminate the last four processes, but may touch on them peripherally from time to time, recognizing the involvement in each of them by pressure groups. The list of eight serves to illuminate the context of pressure group activity, to wit, the totality of government. The first three processes, then, designate the areas of investigation, and the fourth process is the method.

The **Primary Objective**

The first objective to be won by a pressure group is an avenue or avenues of **access**. Without it, pressures are clearly sterile, and the battle is often decided by the advantage of access one group enjoys in relation to another. When sympathetic Congressmen can effect a "butter-only" clause in an appropriation bill, we wonder about the access-status of the oleo group.

Access must be selective, it must afford a certain quality of efficacy. The point or points where decisions are made are the goals—these are the points at which policy is made, and the points to which groups attempt to establish their routes of access. It is pointless, of course, to woo the policeman when the judge makes the decision. But if the policeman can fix the ticket, the judge does not make the decision. In this case we forget the judge.

Specifically, access to decisions on policy-making is the objective. Policy is made in a variety of ways; it is made in a "policy-making cycle", according to Blaisdell, of four stages: pre-legislative, Congressional, administrative, and judicial. A particular bill is introduced, referred to a committee, passed by Congress, signed by the President into law. An administrative agency executes the provisions of the law, and the Supreme Court reserves its right of judicial review to test the Constitutional validity of the law.

---

1Blaisdell, *op. cit.*, p. 268.
At any point in the policy-making cycle exerted pressures can and do alter the configuration of the policy.

We might mention here the almost parenthetical effect on policy of party platforms and groups' access to this source. We have recognized the marginal value of platforms as policy-originating instruments, but through the functioning of the party's resolution committee, groups are heard and may substantially influence the character of the platform.

Pressure groups spearhead, then, toward susceptible points in the policy-making cycle. What they do when they get there, when access is secured, is the activity that attains (or fails to) the group's equilibrium and the activity that sometimes makes headlines.

The Tactics

The most well-known and conspicuous tactical activities of pressure groups are aimed directly at legislatures, traditionally the origin of policy and traditionally the focus of pressures. The term "lobbying" originates here, conjuring up the picture of an informal rapport between a legislator and a pressure group representative, hashing it out in the halls and cloak-rooms of Congress.

Blaisdell in fact recognizes what he calls the "old lobby", characterized by "...gaining office by whatever means it took to win,...bigotry,...political mudslinging,...personal vituperation." He dates these conditions as existing in the
1880's and 1890's, the era that produced the Pendleton Act and the merit system of civil service.

Key relates "old lobby" tactics with respect to legislation: "One of the approaches was to furnish sumptuous free meals...and great quantities of intoxicating liquor to legislators." Another was to 'let the persons to be influenced actually win large sums of money' in poker games.\(^1\)

We cannot whitewash the tactics of the "new lobby"--there remain questionable practices beyond doubt--but pressure groups have become sophisticated, and their methods have become refined.

The most powerful weapon in the modern pressure group's arsenal is propaganda. It might even be considered the only weapon (aside from threats, bribery, blackmail, etc.), the varying tactics being only manifestations of its application or threat of application.

Truman explains propaganda as a tripartite process of "(1) ensuring perception of the words and symbols presented by the propagandist; (2) stimulation of pre-existing attitudes appropriate to the propagandist's aims; (3) production of a resulting new or modified attitude that will lead to the act the propagandist desires."\(^2\)

The specific purposes of propaganda have many variations, but one general purpose is basic: to expand the group's sympathetic public. Turning again to Truman, his definition:

\(^1\)Key, op. cit., p. 152.
\(^2\)Truman, op. cit., p. 226.
"Propaganda is to be regarded as a morally neutral process of influencing attitudes and behavior."¹

The desired attitudes and behavior may be acquiescence, acceptance, or it may be something more dynamic.

Key cites an example of the American Medical Association's battle against government-sponsored health insurance—"socialized medicine" to the A.M.A., and as such a very effective propaganda symbol. "At its beginning [the A.M.A.'s propaganda campaign] Congressional mail—in the offices of 100 Representatives studied—was running 2½ to 1 in favor of health insurance; nine months later it ran 4 to 1 against it."² Propaganda can be a devastating weapon when brought to bear on Congress.

The recourse to propaganda has resulted from our revolution in the media of mass communication. Newspapers, magazines, movies, radio, and television have likewise revolutionized propaganda tactics.

Vance Packard's book, The Hidden Persuaders, analyzes modern propaganda techniques with rather ominous implications. "MR"—motivational research—has explored the subconscious motives that cause people to react the way they do. Although the technique is far from perfection, Packard relates the success of an MR-oriented team of political press agents,

¹Ibid., p. 260.

²Key, op. cit., p. 146.
Clem Whitaker and Leone Baxter who have waged seventy five campaigns in California and have lost only five.

Quoting from Packard:

A reporter once asked them if they would have had their record of seventy successful campaigns if they had worked for the other side. Baxter said: "I think we could have won almost every one of them..."

Propaganda, particularly intensified modern techniques, is beyond question potent stuff.

When it is aimed at Congress' constituencies it may be termed "grass roots" lobbying, and falls generally into two categories. "Shotgun" techniques aim to influence a wide segment of the constituency, while "rifle" tactics concentrate on the influential members.

A lengthy digression into the intricacies of propaganda, a fascinating area of study, is again beyond the scope of this paper. It must be sufficient here to illuminate propaganda per se and return to tactics of influencing legislatures.

Standing committees of both houses of Congress have long been a target of pressure groups, because of the committees' abilities to kill legislation. Groups attempt, and often successfully in spite of seniority appointments, to have the "proper" membership maintained, and are vitally active in committee hearings on pending bills.

Conference committees, public hearings, and Congressional investigations also offer opportunities to the pressure groups, and it is the insensitive group indeed that fails to capitalize the propaganda values inherent in press coverage of such activities.

Special bills, usually affecting a relatively small public, can be and have been negotiated between committees and pressure groups. More often the pressure group will draft legislation for a sympathetic legislator to introduce—this is the case when larger issues are involved.

"Log rolling" and alliances are common techniques in which pressure groups recruit the aid of either sympathetic groups in the first instance or other actively involved or concerned groups in the second.

The so-called "social lobby" should not be overlooked. While legislators may not still participate in Epicurean revelries sponsored by pressure groups, there is unquestionably a lot of business accomplished at cocktail parties.

Social-lobby techniques may serve in influencing the judicial branch of government as well as the legislative, but one might expect judges to be less susceptible to suggestion.

Pressure group tactics lose almost entirely and "circus" attributes when the judiciary is involved. A much more common, cautious, and effective approach is legalistically oriented. The amicus curiae is a tool often employed. "Friend of the Court" briefs filed by pressure groups are doubtlessly con-
sidered and may weigh heavily in court decisions.

Initiating litigation, a costly process, is undertaken by pressure groups. The NAACP is the classic example of the use of this tactic, and it has been so successful that Congress has questioned the propriety of the Supreme Court in usurping, according to some Congressmen, legislative duties.

Administrative policy-making is subjected to pressure group tactics as well as the legislative and judicial forms. Many of the same tactics are used indirectly when groups seek to influence administration through legislation or litigation. Administration is authorized and empowered by laws and administrative decisions can be appealed to the courts—it is in these areas that legislatively- and judicially-focussed pressures are applied. And administration is pressured directly, too.

The President holds, in his veto power, a powerful trump card in the policy-making process, and he and his administrative structure frequently initiate legislation, requesting general policies in the State of the Union Message or drafting specific bills in the administrative departments. Herein are prime targets for pressure tactics—appropriate areas for propagandizing, vicuna coats, and social lobbying.

The technique of advisory board pressure is sometimes effective. The Taylor Grazing Act\(^1\) provided for advisory

boards of local stockmen to actually participate in the administration of Bureau of Land Management grazing leases. This particular case illustrates the principle of delegated official authority—sometimes a separate tactic. But even without such official capacity the opportunities inherent in advisory boards are obvious.

Administrative agencies frequently need expert technical advice. A consultant is called in, and the consultant market is fair ground for pressure group activity—the supply of expertise is infrequently short.

The administrative branch of government exhibits a unique property in its hierarchical system of organization. From the top to the bottom of the hierarchy policy descends from the general to the increasingly more specific. And at each successively lower level the administrator exercises less and less discretion in dealing with a more specific question.

Conversely, at each successively higher level discretion and responsibility widen to accommodate a successively larger "public" and successively more generalized questions.

There are two implications here. One deals with discretion and the other with the specifics and generalizations.

The greater its discretion, the more susceptible that hierarchical level is to pressure tactics. But on the other hand, the greater the specificity involved, the more effective, probably, will be the application of pressure.

There is thereby presented to the pressure group a
series of specialized (not necessarily specific) compartments, one of which is best suited—considering the optimum combination of susceptibility and effectiveness—for applying pressure. The group may not make the correct choice of compartments and there ensues a vertical shifting of activities up and down the hierarchical ladder as the group seeks to effect its equilibrium.

Appleby lists the factors involved in determining the proper level, or the level at which the group will come to rest and initiate its activities. These factors are:

1. the relative controversy or importance of the issue
2. its novelty
3. the prerogatives involved
4. the dimensions or scope of the issue
5. the weight or impact on the public

Inherent here is a reflection of the saturation of pressure group activity. A tightly organized, highly articulate and animated group in Washington might prevail on the President to instigate some particular action in his State of the Union Message. Or, away down at the other end of the hierarchy, out in the woods, maybe, a loosely-interpreted potential group may flex its biceps when a wool-shirted citizen complains to a Forest Service official about a messy campground.

The principles of group physiology and the tactics of pressure groups encompass the whole range of our political processes and institutions. This is the Group Polity in essence and in action.

\(^{1}\)Appleby, op. cit., p. 13.
The Fuzzy Separation of Powers

We have seen that the Constitutional separation of powers is at the root of party weakness and the inability of the parties to adequately represent the citizenry. There are few issues on which parties take strong advocacies, and few real challenges hurled between the parties. Loyalty to a party is more a nostalgic, hereditary, or temporal acceptance of emotional imagery than it is a decisive rejection of the contradistinct viewpoints of the opposing party.

We have seen also that groups—pressure groups—have arisen to assume the function of representation necessarily neglected by the parties. It may seem strange, at first glance, that pressure groups can succeed where party-groups are at most only partially effective.

But the objectives of each are not the same. Parties exist primarily to nominate candidates and to seek their subsequent election. Pressure groups exist primarily to achieve material goals. One is concerned with personnel, the other with policy.

Parties are reduced to the status of nominating bodies by the separation of powers.

And pressure groups are elevated to the function of economic representation by a separation of powers that really isn't a separation.

The separation of powers must be viewed as a spectrum. We have a blue Congress, an indigo executive, and a violé
judiciary; at the center of each exists the Constitutional separation, but at the edges of each the separation becomes obscure—fuzzy.

The legislative, administrative, and judicial functions of the government—all three—are frequently executed by each "separate" branch. There are countlessly more decisions made by administrators than by judges: this, in a sense, is adjudication. Congress decides that butter is preferable to oleo in the kitchen of a V.A. hospital; this is the business of administration. The Supreme Court rules unconstitutional segregation in public schools; has it interpreted a law or legislated one?

The common element here is decision, and the common results are policies. Where decisions are made policy is made, and policy is the concern of pressure groups.

The Pressure Group—Insidious or Virtuous?
Probably neither and probably both.

There have been and still are some mighty shady hijinks in Washington. They make juicy news, they figure in elections, and everybody knows about them. The insidious nature of pressure groups lies in the tactics that don't make the newspapers.

Congress has recognized this. In 1946 it passed the Regulation of Lobbying Act, presumably to illuminate and publicize the innerworkings of lobbying and to educate the public. The right to petition, though, is also in the Con-

1see Blaisdell, op. cit., chapter 6.
stitution, ergo, a dilemma: how to regulate the lobbyists without violating Constitutional rights?

The answer, I think, is awareness, and it works, albeit sluggishly at times. When one pressure group achieves a resounding success, another, now at a disadvantage, swings into action, or some potential group is realized.

The awareness must be deep and penetrating. Government by acquiescence is expeditious, morally acceptable, and proves to be effective so long as those governed are aware of the issues and aware of the alternatives. But acquiescence via ignorance is tragic, and in this potentiality lies the insidiousness of pressure groups.

The chief virtue of pressure groups we have implied as being their representative function. From a slightly different interpretation of this function, we can see that groups provide, for individuals, routes of access to participation in government. These routes supplement the traditional practices of voting and writing to one's Congressman. Such virtues of the group offer profound opportunities that depend, after all, on each of us as individuals.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND CAVEATS

The traditions and myths have not been superseded; they have been developed and refined. Dalton's atomic theory has not been superseded, either, though Dalton would be surprised to see what we've done with it. So it is with pressure group politics; it is the advancement of our social institutions, and of our conceptions of them, keeping pace with our technology.

We can now recall the quotation at the beginning of Part II:

The task of government...is not to express an imaginary popular will, but to effect adjustments among the various special wills....every governmental act can be viewed as favoring...some particular and partial will, or special interest.\(^1\)

and re-examine its implications, having traced the analysis of political processes as based on group phenomena.

The "imaginary popular will" we can equate with our arbitrarily named Aggregate Opinion, and we can now understand how impossible it is indeed for government to express the Aggregate's wishes, in any particular action. The "various special wills", on the other hand, are the results of shared

\(^{1}\) Dickinson, quoted in Key, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 10.
attitudes having been affected by disequilibria, and govern-
ment's task rationally becomes one of adjusting and compro-
mising these wills to achieve a new equilibrium. (But a
tenuous one: disequilibrium lurks always just beneath the
surface.)

These adjustments and compromises are clearly short
run in nature; they satisfy short run demands of groups with
limited (shared-attitude) interests. But the Aggregate Opinion
also realizes its wishes, after all:

Thus, as a policy making body, Congress acts as an
adjuster of interests, promoting the general interest
(or the general welfare, as the Constitution terms it),
[or the Aggregate Opinion, as we have termed it], not
so much in each individual piece of legislation as
in the aggregate of its output over the years. [All
italics added.]

Thus the Aggregate Opinion is satisfied over the long
run through a succession of short run partial-equilibria. Here
we can recognize a strong similarity with our definition of
long run multiple use.

I think we can properly expand this function of ad-
justing beyond the jurisdiction of Congress to include ad-
ministrative agencies as well.

In a microcosmic analogy, this is the essence of mul-
tiple use administration. Various groups express their wills
for the use of the various forest resources, and the concept
of multiple use is the means to "effect adjustments among
the various special wills". We will see in the following

1Blaisdell, op. cit., p. 224.
chapters how groups express their wills and how administrators adjust them, how multiple use is realized today in a system of pressure group politics.

We have seen that pressure group politics has both its virtues and its failings. Perhaps we should conclude this chapter by realizing that the system has developed in a democracy of freedom, a freedom that is as vigorous and unrestrained today as it was in '76. The responsibility of the citizen, the judge, the legislator, and the administrator is not so much to do violence to the groups (though he is certainly free to do so!), but to be aware of them, to understand their behavior, their motives, and their tactics, and to evaluate as best he can the effects of the disequilibrium that will result from his decisions.
PART III

PRESSURE GROUPS AND MULTIPLE USE ADMINISTRATION
INTRODUCTION

Multiple use, we have seen in Part I, recognizes a variety of resources produced on forest land, and lists the primary ones as timber, water, recreation, forage, and wildlife.

Part II has dealt with groups, proposing that shared attitudes form the bases of groups, and that groups are the basis of political action.

The basic assumption of Part III is that lumbermen hold a shared attitude toward the timber resource; boaters, hikers, campers, and skiers hold shared attitudes toward a recreation resource; stockmen share attitudes toward a forage resource; and nearly everyone is concerned in some manner with water and wildlife.

In other words, the multiple resources have their counterparts in shared-attitude groups. Some, we will see, activate as pressure groups and some remain as potential groups, but all of them, in relation to the multiple forest resources, hold certain uses in higher esteem than others.

In simple terms, each group advocates its preferred use to at least the subordination, at most the exclusion, of all other uses.

Now this creates a problem for the administrator of
multiple use. This is the problem with which Part III will be concerned.

An obvious bias in Chapter I gave the U.S. Forest Service the major credit for developing the concept of multiple use. The bias rests in fact, I think, without slighting those people and organizations outside the Forest Service who made vital contributions along the way.

At any rate the administration, not the creation, of multiple use is our topic of interest here. Though various timber companies, State forestry departments, and other federal agencies adhere to the principle of multiple use, once again the Forest Service can be fairly regarded as the principal exponent.

The Forest Service is a bureau-type agency within the Department of Agriculture. Its organizational structure is a typical hierarchy: the Chief Forester presides over the Washington Office where policies, regulations, instructions, and procedures are promulgated and sent to the field. The field organization is divided into ten regions, each headed by a Regional Forester and his centralized staff. Each Region is further broken down into a number of national forests, each with a Forest Supervisor and his staff. The subdivisions of the forests are the ranger districts, singly under the direction of a District Ranger. The Ranger is the man on the ground responsible for the administration of all the resources on his district. His position is analogous to that of a
farmer: within the policy limitations of the hierarchical superstructure the Ranger makes the decisions that show up in the land. He is the boss of his district, the "unit manager". Here on the ranger district we will see how pressure groups affect the administration of the multiple use policy.

I have chosen for a case study the Glacier View District of the Flathead National Forest, within Forest Service Region I. I have done so not because the district is typical—no district is—but to supplement as best I can the Cooperative North Fork Multiple Use Study mentioned in the preface.

The Glacier View District occupies roughly half the drainage area of the North Fork of the Flathead River. (See map, Appendix I.) Within its boundaries are to be found all the resources traditionally encompassed by the concept of multiple use, and within or adjacent to the district are the groups that share attitudes toward these resources.

The other half of the drainage area lies within Glacier National Park. Fortunately for the legislative purposes of the Park, but unfortunately from the standpoint of this study, multiple use is not a part of Glacier's administration:

In the National Parks there is no harvesting of timber. There is at present no hunting of wild animals. There is no mining of minerals. There is, or should be, no grazing of domestic animals.¹

Glacier National Park is rightfully devoted exclusively to use of the recreation resources. The 1932 Annual Report of

the Director of the National Park Service stated the following policy: "A national park is an area maintained by the Federal Government [sic] and 'dedicated and set apart for the benefit and enjoyment of the people'."¹ We will therefore be concerned with Glacier Park only marginally, as it influences multiple use administration on the adjacent Forest Service area.

CHAPTER VI

FOREST SERVICE MULTIPLE USE POLICY

In the North Fork area, then, the U.S. Forest Service is the primary proponent and practitioner of multiple use. Chapter I traced the early history and development of the multiple use concept in a broad context of human behavior and national politics, culture, and economics. In dealing presently with the Forest Service policy of multiple use, it would be well to elaborate on the policy development of that agency.

We have seen in Chapter I that Gifford Pinchot's influence on multiple use was profound. His letter of instructions from Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson was in fact drafted by Pinchot himself. This letter we assumed to be the basis of Forest Service multiple use, at least implicitly so. It provided for a variety of uses.

But to ascribe to Pinchot the implications of multiple use as we know it today would be to apotheosize him beyond reality. For Pinchot was also largely responsible for writing the first volume of Forest Service policy in which multiple use is scarcely, if at all, even recognized.
The Use Book

The Use Book, Regulations and Instructions for the Use of the National Forests outlined detailed instructions for the administration of timber and grazing resources and the issuing of permits for "special uses": residences, farms, summer resorts, windmills, dipping vats, aerial tramways, etc., "and the purchase of sand, stone, clay, gravel, hay, and other National Forest products except timber."^1

There are inferential recognitions of conflicting uses:

The prime object of the National Forest is use. While the forest and its dependent interest must be made permanent and safe by preventing overcutting, or injuring young growth, every reasonable effort will be made to satisfy legitimate demands."^2

And one that is more explicit:

The Forest Service aims to improve and protect the forest cover of watersheds within National Forests on which adjacent cities and towns are dependent for their water supply. If the authorities of any such town have determined by investigation that the decrease of the water supply is caused by overgrazing, overcutting, or fire, they are invited to apply to the Forest Service for assistance after consulting with the Supervisor."^3

The Supervisor was instructed to report to the Forester (now Chief Forester) his recommendations for planting, trail building, extra fire patrol, closing to stock, or prohibiting timber sales. Such proposed actions resolved conflicts by resorting to exclusive use, but at least recognized that conflicts might arise.


^2Ibid., p. 61.

^3Ibid., p. 31.
The Use Book also reprints Secretary Wilson's letter, but its separate emphasis on timber, grazing, and special uses and its failure to realize the interdependence of resources and uses indicates that multiple use as such had not yet evolved. And probably with good reason, if we hold valid the thesis of Chapter I that it is conflict of uses that makes multiple use necessary.

In 1907 "Officers of the Forest Service, especially rangers, have no duty more important than protecting the Forests from fire."¹ This statement, lifted from its context, unintentionally describes the status of the Forest Service in those days. There was no need for multiple use.

The Use Book served a bilateral purpose of instructing Forest Service officials of their duties and also of informing the general public of its privileges regarding the forests. It outlined procedures for obtaining timber, grazing benefits, and special use permits.

The dual functions were split in 1911-1913. The Use Book assumed a new subtitle, A Manual for National Forest Users. In his letter of transmittal dated June 12, 1913, Forester Henry S. Graves described the shift of emphasis: "...In this edition [the fourth] which has been prepared especially for Forest users, those regulations affecting only Forest officers. . .have been omitted."²

¹Ibid., p. 127
Those regulations that did affect Forest officers were put forth in the first of a series of policy-declarations progressively known as "The Manual". Initially it was called the National Forest Manual, the first paper-backed volume of which was published in 1911 and covered such subjects as "Forest Plans", "Forest Extension", "Forest Investigations", "Libraries", "Cooperation", and "Dendrology". A second volume appeared in 1912 covering "General Administration" and "Protection".

The schism between uses was perhaps, becoming wider. In discussing the preparation of working plans, the Manual had this to say: "Working plans will be prepared first on Forests where the demand for timber is great as compared with the supply....Special grazing working plans may be prepared for Forests where the use of forage resources is of importance."\(^1\) This might imply that whole forests were being dedicated to one use or another, but fortunately such an interpretation is incorrect.

We have been dealing with policies as outlined in publications prepared in Washington for Service-wide use. Obviously, informal attitudes of Forest Service personnel could hold more intricate ideas of more specific application than those which could be set forth in the Manual.

---

\(^1\) The National Forest Manual, USDA Forest Service, (Wash: GPO, 1911), p. 10. Issued by Sec. Ag. to take effect November 1, 1911.
There were held ideas both disconcerting and visionary, depending on what we read into them today.

Speaking "in behalf of the Forest Service" in 1908, William B. Greeley said:

I take it that you all understand that Forestry, as a broad term, includes every method of logging timbered lands under which some adequate provision is made for a future growth of trees. Forestry is therefore simply a specialized form of lumbering.

We submit today, of course, that forestry (and we no longer capitalize the word) is something more than that.

In another speech shortly thereafter, Greeley explained that the Government practiced "Forestry" for two reasons: "The first is the vital relationship that exists between the forests... and an even flow of water..." and he relates the dependent interests of irrigation, hydroelectric power, and navigation. Speaking along these lines, D.T. Mason recognized a potential conflict between forest uses: "There must be enough timber left on the area to protect the watershed satisfactorily, since irrigation interests are largely dependent on the forests which act as reservoirs... of the streams furnishing the water supply."

1"The Development of Forestry in the United States", a speech by Wm. B. Greeley delivered in December, 1908, pp. 1-2. A copy of this speech is available in the Historical File of the Regional Forester's Office, Federal Bldg., Missoula, Montana. (U.S.F.S. Region I.)

2"The Administration of the National Forests", an address by Greeley given in February, 1909. Here Greeley states the U.S. population of 85 million and lumber prices at the mill of $15-$18/M. This speech is also in the Region I Historical File.

Greeley's second reason for Forest Service "Forestry" was the preservation of the timber supply itself. So stabilizing stream flow and maintaining a supply of timber were the reasons for this "specialized form of lumbering". That may or may not be construed as multiple use, but it is interesting to note an inferential reference to multiple use Greeley made later in the same speech:

Outside of the actual Forestry work, the men employed by 'Uncle Sam' on the National Forest [sic] have many varied and interesting duties. There are trails to be built through the mountains in order to make them accessible to the people for recreation [and to the Forest Service for fire control purposes].

The format of Forest Service organization may well indicate the status of multiple use. Once again Greeley's speeches give us an insight:

The members of the force which administers [italics added] each National Forest, with the single exception of the Forest Assistant [a technically trained forester usually working exclusively with timber--"Forestry"] are general [italics added] administrative officers. [Who handle timber, grazing, and special uses] In the central office of the District [now Region] this rule is reversed. The force is composed of specialists...Several Offices...Office of Silviculture...A separate Office directs the administration of stock ranges...a third office...Operation...handles appointment and promotion...allotment of funds...records...a branch of this office handles all matters relating to... lands...special uses...2

---


2 "The Organization of the Forest Service; Its Requirements and Opportunities", a speech by Wm. B. Greeley, District Forester, delivered in March, 1909. Region I Historical File.
This poses an interesting problem. The administrative foresters are generalists, well oriented, supposedly, to advocating multiple use. The specialized staff men, on the other hand, indicate a commitment to separate and possibly exclusive uses. We have seen that shared attitudes form the basis of the group, and the question arises both as to intra-Forest Service friction between the various specialties and to conflict between the staff specialists and the administrative generalists. We will return to this problem later.

The "Buckskin Manual"

The Forest Service organizational pattern persisted, and so did the configuration of the Manual when the old paper-bound books were replaced about 1918 by the "Buckskin Manual". This edition of three volumes was bound in buff-colored canvas—hence the nick-name—and contributed nothing to the evolution of multiple use. It served to amplify and elaborate previous instructions and retained the functional breakdowns of timber, grazing, and special uses. Each resource was treated separately, and protective measures were designed for logging operations only to perpetuate the timber supply, and for grazing permits to perpetuate the forage resource.

The "Buckskin Manual" was a loose-leaf affair and with its adoption I am assuming was born the unique property that still persists in National Forest Manuals; they are nearly immortal. As new legislation, Secretary's regulations, and
Service policies are promulgated, indexed insert- and/or replacement-sheets are sent to the field offices to supplement or supersede old pages, which are then discarded. The administrative advantage is apparent, but the practice is no small deterrent to research—long chronological gaps appear in the Manuals.

An amendment dated July, 1928, appeared in the "Buckskin Manual" that recognized another sort of conflict:

Protected areas may be established by the district forester within the national forest by the exclusion of livestock from limited areas which are the natural feeding or breeding grounds of game animals or birds.\(^1\) Another conflict has been recognized, but again it is resolved by excluding one of the conflicting uses.

Parenthetically it is significant to recall at this point that it was also in 1928 that Chief Forester Stuart officially recognized recreation as a coordinate use of the national forests. (See page 26.)

And modern multiple use was imminent. On May 24, 1935, Major Evan W. Kelly, the District Forester at Missoula, spoke at Wallace, Idaho:\(^2\)

Popularly conceived, the national forests are wild lands, the primary use of which is to grow trees for the production of lumber....This conception is altogether a narrow one....Forests also have significance in providing food and shelter for wildlife and domestic animals. ..regulating stream flow, furnishing recreation in various


\(^2\)An un-titled speech on file in the Region I Historical File.
Federal foresters are engaged in the intricate technical business of managing such properties for all these purposes. One of the greatest difficulties inherent in this undertaking is the proper correlation of the multiple uses to which forest land can be put in order to accomplish the prime objective of their management. This objective is to produce the maximum of products and services, including wood products, animal products, recreation, preservation of scenic values. It is a proposition of general farming, involving the grand-scale production of perennial crops on a sustained-yield basis over an unlimited amount of time, rather than one of single crop farming on an annual cropping basis with little or no thought of the morrow.

Major Kelly repeated this address to the Ronan, Montana, Rod and Gun Club on February 6, 1936.

We can suppose such thinking was evident throughout the Forest Service at the time. An article by Professor Frank A. Waugh of Massachusetts State College entitled "Reconciliation of Land Uses" was reprinted in the (Forest) Service Bulletin\(^1\) in 1936. The article presaged formal multiple use almost to the letter. Offering farming as an example (a persistent analogy), Waugh explained that a farmer maximizes the benefits from his farm as a unit, allocating acres to pasture, orchard, and woodlot, and "intercropping" corn, beans, and pumpkins on the same area. Waugh commends the Forest Service, albeit with subsequent modifications:

Somewhat oddly, however, the most vigorous study of this principle of reconciliation seems to have been made in that department of agriculture which is least intensive of all, viz., in forestry. The capital illustration in this country is probably the National Forests.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\)Ibid.
Waugh relates not only the popular conception of national forests as perpetual wood-boxes but also the Forest Service's recognition of additional uses. Watershed and grazing values, he says, were early realized. He continues:

Finally, it was tardily discovered that the National Forests...are adapted to recreation on a large scale. Recreation has thus become a major land use coordinate with timber production, watershed protection, and grazing. These, in fact, constitute the four major branches of forestry practiced on a national scale. 1

This is a rather more sophisticated notion than "a specialized form of lumbering".

The article specifies that reconciliation has often meant allocation of specific areas to exclusive uses and proposes that uses can, indeed, be integrated. Waugh points to European practices where "Timber growing, game farming, water protection, and recreation are carried on side by side, often very intensively." 2

But he continues:

All this is far from saying that multiple uses must be maintained on every acre of land. Coordination is administrative, rather than wholly geographic. In a typical national forest of a million acres...some small units will be used exclusively for recreation, others for the protection of domestic water. Grazing and timber cutting will be largely segregated. On the larger areas recreation and wildlife as incidental uses will go along with grazing or timber or both. 3

Waugh supposes this principle--reconciliation of land uses as he calls it--is only implicit in Forest Service policy: "...the frank recognition of this principle and its gen-

1ibid. 2ibid. 3ibid.
eral adoption would bring about some important changes in the national administration of forests. We might suppose that "frank recognition" was near at hand when Waugh's article was reprinted in the Service Bulletin.

The "Old" Manual

Given the immortality property of the national forest Manuals, the supposition is valid. In about 1935 the "Buckskin Manual" was replaced by a new edition called The Forest Service Manual. (Today it is referred to as the "old" Manual.)

The revised Manual once again retained the functional divisions at staff levels and reflected the categorization in its pages. Sections were devoted, as before, to timber, grazing, special uses, and now to recreation. There occurs a regrettable gap in the sequential development of multiple use policy, however. The pages of the thirties have long ago become obsolete, and it is during this decade that modern or formal multiple use gained its official status. (See the reference to Regional Forester R.M. Evans' 1938 article on multiple use on page 26.)

By 1950 "multiple use" had become a household term in the Forest Service; "Timber management plans must be coordinated with recreation plans so as to further the

\[1\] Ibid.

multiple use concept and to insure highest use for specific areas.\textsuperscript{1} And there were guidelines for its administration:

On areas developed or planned for future development as recreation areas...timber cutting or sale activities will be subordinated to recreation use, and all harvesting of timber will be based on esthetics and recreation needs.\textsuperscript{2}

Volume III of the revised Manual was "National Forest Protection and Management". Title 7 was "Timber Management". Chapter 1 was "Timber Use Policies", and Part 6 was "Guidelines for Correlation with Other Land Uses".

These guidelines apparently were developed to correlate uses for an optimum production of resources. In this section, Part 6, timber was correlated with grazing, recreation, water resources, and wildlife. The correlative guidelines were on the order of proposed gimmicks to minimize conflicts between competing uses: care should be used to prevent poisoning cattle when applying brush-control sprays (timber correlated with grazing); exclusion of logging from unstable watersheds and prevention of stream pollution from logging camps (timber correlated with water resources); increasing cover and forage through small openings in the forest canopy and contractual prohibitions against poaching by loggers (timber correlated with wildlife).

Each functional division contained its references to multiple use. In the recreation section under the subheading

\textsuperscript{1}U.S.F.S., Forest Service Manual, Vol. III, National Forest Protection and Management, Title 7, Chap. 1, Part 6, p. 58. (amended April, 1950)

\textsuperscript{2}ibid.
of "Coordination" we find this:

The recreation resources of the national forest will be managed in conjunction with all the other forest resources under the principles of multiple use. This does not mean that limited areas may not be devoted exclusively to recreation. In general, however, over any area large enough to be classified as an administrative unit, such as a ranger district, recreation use will take its place with other uses such as timber production, grazing, mining, and water storage.¹

The basic purpose of multiple use is implicit under the subheading "General Objectives and Policies" (of and regarding recreation):

The general objective will be to make the recreation resources available to the greatest extent practicable consistent with an overall plan and policy of coordinated development and use of all the resources to furnish the maximum public benefit.²

Multiple use was thus given a berth in the Forest Service bunkhouse. But it was a berth a long way from the stove. The Manual was still organized on a strictly functional basis (as was still the organization of personnel, for that matter), and multiple use was mentioned only in the "Coordination" sections of each functional chapter.

References to the "principle of multiple use" abounded in the "old" Manual, but nowhere was there an explicit definition of multiple use, its objectives, or the policies regarding its application.

¹Ibid., NF-G1, p. 1, amended May, 1946. Under a nearly incomprehensible four-way system of classification, recreation had no neat designation as to Title, Chapter, and Part; hence the NF-G1 reference.

²Ibid.
The "New" Manual

Not until, that is, the Manual was revised and reissued in toto once again. In a well directed and admirably successful "crash program" the old Manual was updated, re-written in parts, and stripped of its quadrilateral system of classification. From 1956 through 1958 a task-force of Washington Office and field personnel reworked the old Manual and in 1959 the new edition was sent to the field and implemented.

There remain the functional divisions—timber, grazing, recreation, etc.—each classified under a separate "Title". But Title 2100 is a new one: "Multiple Use Management". It grants multiple use at least an ostensibly equal stature with the other functions.

The new Manual clearly realizes that intensive multiple use policy and practice are in embryonic stages. The preface to Title 2100 states precisely that its contents are provisional and tentative, subject to drastic revision and development as experience is gained, that its contents are not at all firm Forest Service policy, and that the Title is for "in-Service use and distribution only".¹ With such qualifications, there are no justifiable grounds on which to condemn Forest Service multiple use.

Nor is there reason to. Even construed as a foundation

¹Forest Service Manual, Title 2100, (Washington: August, 1958), Preface, p. 1. I quote from this Title with permission from the Forest Service, having agreed to make clear the provisionality of Title 2100. I trust that I have done so.
for future development, Title 2100 is a rousing-good climax to a long trail of evolution. To quote at length:

Multiple use is a principle of management rather than a system or method of land use. As a principle it is not subject to precise and universal interpretation when applied area by area.

The multiple use principle is generally applied to a large area such as a ranger district, national forest, or watershed. It is a misconception to think of multiple use as being applied acre by acre. There is no conflict with the principle when, as usually happens, more than one resource or use is obtained on an individual acre. Also, the dedication of an individual acre to a single resource or use is a perfectly logical multiple use procedure.

In applying multiple use, the first step is to decide upon land management objectives.... On private land objectives may be most strongly and properly influenced by profit considerations. On public land, full use designed to meet overall public needs may or may not be tangible in terms of income. As land use becomes more intensive, management objectives must be clearly set forth in order to make multiple use management successful...

If all resources can be used to a maximum without conflict, the ultimate in multiple use is obtained. However, such full use is rarely possible under intensive management. A harmonious combination of resources and uses to arrive at maximum overall benefits from the land usually requires some modification in individual uses.

In applying the multiple use principle, the land manager is faced, therefore, with reconciling conflicts in such a manner that overall objectives are reached... Objectives are best accomplished by securing the highest degree of multiple use management that the characteristics of the land will permit.¹

We are no longer forced to read multiple use into Secretary Wilson's letter to Pinchot, to inferential suppositions inherent in The Use Book and the "Buckskin Manual", or to exhume it in bits and parts from the functional and separate sections of the "old" Manual.

The foregoing quotation prefaces Title 2100. Sub-

¹ibid., p. 3.
Multiple use management is the skillful adjustment of land resources and uses into a pattern of harmonious action to achieve overall objectives for the area being managed.

Resources and uses may complement one another. Frequently they are in conflict. When conflicts occur they must be resolved by prescribed action to secure agreed-upon subordination of one use to another.¹

Part 2102 states the objective:

The objective of multiple use management is to make the national forests serve "the permanent good of the whole people" and to resolve conflicting interests to best serve "the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run".² [Never underestimate the powers of a Pinchot.]

And Part 2103 is the policy:

Multiple use management will be applied on the national forests by:
1. Application of multiple use coordination requirements in all resource management, protection, and development activities.
2. Preparation of regional guides for multiple use planning based on analysis and evaluation of resources and uses.
3. Preparation of ranger district multiple use plans based on regional guides.
4. Preparation of resource management [functional] plans and project plans based on ranger district multiple use plans. [Italics added.]³

The meat of the matter lies in resolving conflicting interests and this is provided for in the first method of application listed above. Chapter 2110 is entitled "Multiple Use Coordination Requirements" and states the objective of the Chapter as follows:

The objective of multiple use coordination requirements is to resolve or prevent conflicts between two or more

¹ibid., p. 4. ²ibid. ³ibid.
competitive resources, uses, or activities in the same area.\footnote{ibid., Chapter 2110, p. 15.}

The Washington Office has sent to the field an inch-thick wad of such coordination requirements, most of which have been lifted directly from the other functional Titles, to eventually constitute the bulk of Chapter 2110. The field men are currently making suggestions for revising these requirements, and are doing so with a dedicated brutality. We may expect a well-edited section to be added to the permanent Manual. (Only in contrast to these tentative requirements, that is: the new Manual is still in a loose-leaf binder.)

Particularly appropriate to our study of pressure groups and multiple use administration is this excerpt:

Forest officers should maintain good working relations with organized groups in their locality and keep them informed of multiple-use-management objectives. Typical examples of such groups are:

1. General interest groups such as service clubs, P.T.A., and women's organizations have broad interests that may be local, State, or national in scope.

2. Special interest groups, such as permittees, lumbermen, sportsmen are chiefly concerned with policies affecting their own activities. The groups are directly affected by multiple-use-management programs in their areas. Such groups often have affiliation with national associations or organizations.\footnote{ibid.}

The single dissonant note so far has been that the whole policy and program assumes static conditions. This is the static multiple use that we defined in Chapter II. (See page 33.)

But the Forest Service Manual recognizes this drawback,
if feebly, in Chapter 2120, "Regional Guides for Multiple
Use Planning". Part 2121.3 reads:

One of the most important steps in developing a regional
guide for multiple use planning is the job of arriving
at realistic estimates of future demands and needs.¹

Realizing again the admitted provisionality of the entire
Title regarding multiple use, this recognition is admirable
indeed; it in itself is something of a projection of multiple
use evolution. We will do some projecting of our own later.

But our purpose at hand—elaborating on the develop­
ment of Forest Service policy—has been fulfilled. We have
brought the policy, in a rather more lengthy digression than
initially intended, from Gifford Pinchot to Title 2100.

Our objective has been to provide a background of
Forest Service policy against which we can view the admin­
istration of the multiple use concept, and how that admin­
istration is affected by the activities of pressure groups.

¹Ibid., Chapter 2120, p. 21.
CHAPTER VII

PRESSURE GROUPS AND MULTIPLE USE ADMINISTRATION
ON THE GLACIER VIEW DISTRICT, FLATHEAD NATIONAL FOREST

The Era of Wilderness

The first white man to see the North Fork Valley was probably David Thompson during his explorations in 1800 for the Hudson's Bay Company. Some ninety years later the first settlers came to this wild and untouched valley. These were prospectors and miners who soon failed to find their fortunes in the back-country hills and turned their efforts to the bottomlands. Clearing homesteads, these early pioneers attempted to raise cattle, but the bitter cold winters of heavy snows and the lack of suitable winter forage forced them out into the main valley of the North Fork. With the arrival and permanent residence of these settlers the Era of Wilderness came to an end.

The Custodial Era

On February 22, 1897 President Cleveland made his eleventh-hour proclamation that created 21,000,000 acres of new forest reserves. Among this total was the Flathead Forest Reserve, and within its boundaries was included the area drained by the North Fork of the Flathead River.
At about this time a now-nameless but then-excited old sourdough came roaring down from the wilds and reported his sighting of a grizzly bear that had been thoroughly soaked in oil. The incident gave Oil Lake its name. The discovery of coal in the North Fork area gave Coal Creek its name, and the dual discovery stimulated more prospectors, settlers, and speculators to take interest in the valley. The Great Northern Railway surveyed a route down the North Fork during this time, planning to cross the Continental Divide in Canada and continue westward down the main Flathead.

With the creation of the Forest Service in 1905 the area was allocated to the Blackfeet Forest Reserve which encompassed the entire drainage of the North Fork west of the Continental Divide, including the western half of what is now Glacier National Park.

The first Use Book listed Forest Service policy at that time, and the ranger who had "no duty more important than protecting the forest from fire" faced a staggering task. The first ranger was Frank Liebig whose sole responsibility it was to administer and protect hundreds of square miles of trackless desolation. He was the first custodian of the North Fork valley, and his first efforts went toward establishing a trail system: an astute recognition of primary need, but a hopeless task for one man.

Additional activity was spurred by the passage of the Forest Homestead Act on June 11, 1906. The hopes for oil and
coal development still held, and the North Fork enjoyed a hopeful potential.

The year 1910 brought two significant events. On May 11 Glacier National Park was created by an act of Congress. Its western border was the North Fork and the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, and subsequent to that date multiple use was confined to the western half of the North Fork drainage. The pressures for the creation of the Park would be an interesting subject for research, and it might well be that 1910 marked the first impact of pressure groups on North Fork multiple use administration.

The other event was the Great Idaho Fire of August, 1910, which burned thousands of acres in the North Fork watershed. This fire burned out many of the settlers, and was the first of several disastrous and discouraging fires that retarded development of the country.

Agriculture was proving difficult in the valley. Nothing seemed to happen to the promise of rich coal and oil development, and by the time of World War I the influx of settlers had essentially ceased.

1919 was another catastrophic fire year. During the 20 years from 1900 to 1920, 37,837 acres burned in the North Fork, and the 1919 fires drove more residents from the valley. "Only a few trappers and four or five homesteaders were left."^^

\^2ibid., p. 40
But a new attraction drew attention in the early 1920's. The legendary Jim Girard spent several years (1922-24?) in an extensive timber cruise, and a substantial amount of engineering work was done in the anticipation of a pulp industry. The plans called for chute-logging and stream-driving pulpwood to a mill at Columbia Falls. The mill was to be built on a siding of the Great Northern which had since run its right-of-way over the Divide at Marias Pass.

The Use Book by this time had been replaced by the "Buckskin Manual" and in 1926 the first timber management plan was written by Chief Lumberman J. Bosworth and approved by Forest Supervisor Ryan, District Forester Koch, and Forester E.H. Sherman.

But the pulp market did not materialize, and only an insignificant cut was realized under the 1926 plan which provided for an annual allowable cut of 16.7 MM bf. "The cut recommended in the 1926 plan was not met primarily because of more accessible and available timber elsewhere on both national forest and private land."\(^1\)

Inaccessibility still plagued the district from the standpoints of both timber development and fire control. 1926 and 1929 were again critical fire years, and during the 20 years from 1920 to 1940 46,718 acres were lost to fires.\(^2\)


\(^2\)Castles, op. cit., p. 31.
In 1933 the Blackfeet Forest was terminated as an administrative unit and the North Fork area was assigned to the Flathead National Forest as the Glacier View District.

Partial development of the District occurred in the 1930's. A rough, low standard road was built up the main valley to the Canadian border. This road was described in 1949 as "...badly in need of reconstruction... Only about 7 miles of this road [of more than 60 miles total] is usable for heavy hauling."¹ The CCC program constructed low-grade fire-access roads into the Big Creek, Coal Creek, Red Meadow Creek, and Yakinikak Creek drainages.

Ranger Frank Foltz took over the District in 1935 (?) when the "old" Forest Service Manual was initiated. Multiple use by then had become well established in principle. In fact, however, on the Glacier View District it was no more than a Manual reference, for until World War II there was very little use of any sort at all. Fire control--custodianship--was the basic objective of administration.

The War Housing Act of World War II stimulated the construction of six miles of access road in Canyon Creek and 23 timber sales were made there. This marked the first significant use of the timber resource on the District and the end of the Custodial Era.

The Era of Development

In 1947 Ranger Foltz was succeeded by Ranger John R. Castles. The war was over, reconversion to a peacetime economy was nearly complete, and with it came a demand for long-postponed civilian construction. Ranger Castles was instructed to develop the timber resources of the Glacier View District and the era of development in the valley was underway.

The first step was to revise and modernize the District's timber management plan. Fires of disastrous proportions subsequent to the original plan had altered the configuration of age-class distribution and total volume data on the District. More refined cruising and inventory techniques were available. And power saws and logging trucks had radically changed the old patterns of railroad and "misery whip" logging.

Also in 1947 the North Fork Improvement Association was formed. Its members were the residents of the valley, about 40 in all, and its objective was to "improve the valley and the services rendered to the residents". The two primary interests of the Association were better roads and better mail service.

The valley residents were a rough and hardy lot. The North Fork area has recorded temperatures to 50° below zero and to 104° above. The winters are long and cold with heavy snowfall. The topography is precipitous and rugged.

1 Interview with Mr. John R. Castles, now in charge of all timber management activities for Region I of the Forest Service.
upper reaches of the valley support a substantial population of grizzly bears. It is a wild and remote country where the "violence of Nature can catch up to you in a hurry". The North Fork people reflected these conditions: they were rugged themselves, and not to be ignored.

The Association asked Ranger Castles to be its first president, but Castles declined the invitation, presumably preferring to remain neutral in ensuing issues. The issues were not long in coming. Meeting monthly during the summer, the Association held its business meeting until midnight, discussing the two objectives of roads and mail service. The latter was particularly important in view of the isolation of these people—mail delivery was a warmly anticipated event.

In the summer, however, the delivery was made only twice each week, and just once every two weeks in the winter. The delivery route covered 60 miles from Columbia Falls to the Canadian line. The road issue, though not so critical, was also debated and discussed during the business meeting.

But promptly at midnight the business meeting was terminated, and the membership of the North Fork Improvement Association turned to lighter matters. A square dance was the usual respite, and it lasted until dawn. The host

\textit{ibid.}
and hostess then served breakfast, after which the meeting formally adjourned until the following month.

In time the Association drew the attention of a Postal Inspector from Seattle. The Inspector told the meeting that delivery costs in the North Fork averaged $10 per letter. The Post Office Department had calculated, he said, that it would be cheaper to buy out the North Fork residents and relocate them on more economical mail routes. This raised the issue of violated personal liberties and also the dander of the NFIA and the Postal Inspector emerged with his hide barely intact. The mail-delivery issue thenceforth was an impasse.

Not so the road-improvement issue.

By early 1949 Ranger Castles had completed his timber management plan. It was a comprehensive outline of volume and growth data, allowable cut calculations, and recommendations for the development of the timber resource. In accordance with the "old" Manual policies regarding multiple use, the plan incorporated requirements for coordinating timber use with recreation, wildlife, water, grazing, and mining values. It also established, as a basic assumption, a priority of land use on the commercial forest lands within the working circle: "...(1) watershed, (2) timber production, (3) recreation, (4) wildlife, (5) grazing, (6) other uses not apparent at this time."  

The coordination requirements and priority-listing clearly implied multiple use and specifically dealt with commercial forest land. The plan was reviewed and approved by the Flathead Forest Supervisor, the Regional Forester in Missoula, and the Washington office of the Forest Service. We will see subsequently how certain pressure groups radically altered the administration of this multiple use policy and its established commercial-forest-land priority sequence.

In the autumn of 1949 winds of hurricane force swept the Glacier View District and resulted in heavy blowdown damage. In many areas the loss was complete, in others it was scattered and spotty. The damage was confined to spruce stands, mostly in the drainages of Werner Creek, Coal Creek, Moose Creek, Yakinikak Creek, Hallowat Creek, and Red Meadow Creek.

A salvage program was begun almost immediately. The blowdown areas were identified, mapped, and inventoried, and salvage sales were made in six areas the following spring and summer.

The problem of the substandard main-line road was neatly solved. Financed through reduced stumpage prices, the road was improved in sections on a cooperative basis, each logging contractor reconstructing an appropriate segment of the road for the benefit of all.

This well-conceived and executed program salvaged millions of board feet of timber that otherwise would have
been wasted, but it could not reach all the blowdown areas in time to prevent a further catastrophe.

The spruce bark beetle (Dendroctonus engelmanni) had always been endemic in the vigorous natural stands. The blowdown of course drastically weakened the resistance of the spruce stands to this insect, and by 1952 the infestations reached epidemic proportions. Having bred in the dead and dying spruce timber in the blowdown areas, the beetles now invaded the stands of healthy green timber.

The Glacier View District had a distinct advantage over adjacent areas, in that logging capacity was already in place—salvaging blown-down spruce—to combat the new threat.

But access roads remained a critical factor. In cooperation with the local timber industry, the Forest Service initiated a road development program that ultimately cost about one million dollars.

Infestation of green timber mounted steadily ahead of the crucial road-construction job. In 1952 13 MMbf of spruce was infested. The following year 29 MMbf. In 1954 the peak had been passed and 25 MMbf was attacked. The figures for 1955, 1956, and 1957 were 18 MMbf, 4.8 MMbf, and 3.8 MMbf.

During the salvage program more than 50 MMbf of windthrown spruce was recovered and more than 60 MMbf of beetle-infested timber was removed. The beetle-control program was ultimately successful, and by 1958 spruce bark
beetle populations had returned to endemic conditions.

93 miles of main haul road and 44 miles of secondary roads had been constructed into practically all of the main spruce drainages on the Glacier View District. 53 miles of original sub-standard fire-control road had been reconstructed to satisfactory standards for timber operations. The North Fork Improvement Association now had its better road facilities.

And the Era of Development came to an end.

The Era of Conflict—and Multiple Use—and Pressure Groups

This phase cannot be so neatly segregated on a chronological basis, but until access to the various resources of the District was available, little conflict was possible. The main road along the North Fork and fire-control roads into some of the side drainages had been built, albeit to minimum standards, in the 1930's. But it was the one-two punch of the blowdown and beetle epidemic that built the more comprehensive road network and brought the concommitant rise in resource use, pressures, and conflicts.

The streams tributary to the North Fork provided fine fishing, particularly for the Dolly Varden or bull trout, and the improved logging roads provided access to it. But the streams are also the spawning areas, and the runs of Dolly Varden migrate from the headwaters down the North Fork to the main Flathead River and thence to Flathead Lake. At spawning time, the fish return to spawn in the North Fork
area, and the spawners—the big lunkers—are the attraction that drew fishermen to the small tributary streams.

The Flathead Lake Wildlife Association is an organization whose home is Bigfork, Montana, and whose aim is to maintain the virtues of Flathead Lake—including the fine lake-fishing for Dolly Varden trout. This group supposed that fishing the creeks in the North Fork area seriously depleted the subsequent runs to and from Flathead Lake. It approached the Montana Fish and Game Commission and succeeded in closing several creeks in the Glacier View District to all fishing. The closed streams are Big Creek, Coal Creek, Whale Creek, and Yakinikak Creek, and they remain closed to this day.

The efforts to maintain the runs to Flathead Lake have been successful, but at the expense of another program. The Creston Fish Hatchery is responsible for stocking Glacier Park streams with cutthroat trout, a fine game species, for the pleasure of anglers visiting the Park streams east of the North Fork. The big Dolly Vardens, however, are voracious feeders, and young hatchery cutthroat fingerlings are favorite fare. As a result the cutthroat fishing in Glacier Park suffers from a relative overpopulation of Dolly Varden trout.

Thus the interests of the Flathead Lake Wildlife Association are realized to the detriment of fishing in Glacier Park and to the exclusion of fishing in four streams of the Glacier View District. But no countervailing pressures have yet arisen to realign the situation—an equilibrium has been
attained.

Other sportsman's groups have intervened from time to time in the multiple use management of the District. The Whitefish Sportsman's Club once advocated that the upper one-third of the North Fork valley be closed to all uses and maintained as a grizzly bear sanctuary. This advocacy never progressed beyond the proposal stage, but it indicates the intensity of feelings encountered by the multiple use manager.

One proposal by sportsman's groups did indeed reach the proportions of a full-blown controversy. This came to be known as "The Battle of Bunker Creek" and began with the initiation of the bark beetle control program.

Although Bunker Creek lies outside the Glacier View District, the controversy is precisely appropriate to our study. The groups involved in the conflict were the same ones encountered by Glacier View District, and the Spotted Bear District, in which Bunker Creek lies, is an administrative "cousin" of Glacier View, both districts being subdivisions of the Flathead National Forest. And the controversy at one point directly threatened the North Fork area.

We have seen the established priority of uses for commercial forest land--watershed, timber, recreation, wildlife, and grazing--set forth and approved for the Glacier View District. We can presumably transpose this priority sequence to the Spotted Bear District, supposing the Flathead Forest Supervisor would approve a similar sequence for this
The bark beetle epidemic was born in the wind-slashed areas of dead and dying spruce, and through the momentum of numbers spread to stands of healthy green timber, normally resistant to endemic numbers of beetles.

The new infestations followed no logical pattern. They appeared often in isolated spruce stands, wherever the flight of newly emerged insects happened to light. One such isolated stand was in the Bunker Creek drainage, far up the South Fork of the Flathead River, and adjacent to the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area. (See map, Appendix I. Bunker Creek is encircled.) Bunker Creek's proximity to the Wilderness Area was the crucial factor in the dispute.

The Bob Marshall Wilderness Area had been set aside and designated as such by a regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture in 1940. Approximately one million acres in size, it is maintained in its original natural state except for the construction of trails. No commercial use of the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area is permissible, except for dude-packer and hunting-guide services. Its purpose is to protect and maintain the spiritual and recreational values of a large and inaccessible mountainous area.

The essence if not the fact of the proclaimed Wilderness Area extended far beyond its borders. Much of the Flathead Forest was still "wilderness area", such as the North Fork area had been, and had been used as such by a substantial
commercial recreation industry in Columbia Falls, Kalispell, Whitefish, and Big Fork.

The Wilderness Area itself and the "wilderness area" of the Flathead Forest were likewise used, enjoyed, and revered by a considerable portion of the private citizens of Flathead County. There was an undercurrent of opposition to the Forest Service multiple use policy and its development of other resources among these people. Many wished to see no development at all and few recognized the vital difference between Wilderness Area and an area of wilderness planned for potential multiple use development. There was a clear basis for the activation of a potential group.

Plans had been made to develop all the Flathead Forest Districts, including Spotted Bear, and had been accelerated—particularly on the Glacier View District—by the spruce situation. This acceleration was deemed necessary on the Spotted Bear District to control the serious beetle infestation in the Bunker Creek drainage.

In January of 1954 the Forest Service made public its plans to control the beetle epidemic in Bunker Creek through the means of a large timber sale of infested spruce, pending a field examination of the engineering problems, the volume of spruce, and the intensity of the infestation. The sale would probably involve 23 MMbf of timber and to reach it 30 miles of new road would be needed.

Late in January an article appeared in the Kalispell,
Montana, Daily Interlake criticizing the Forest Service plans. The article had been written by the owner of a dude-packing outfit whose interests would be injured by the proposed development of this area of wilderness.

The Forest Service countered with a hastily prepared news release, but soon the Supervisor's Office began receiving inquiries from various interested parties. On February 22 it received a written request for a complete report and a statement justifying the development of Bunker Creek. The request came from the Flathead Lake Wildlife Association.

Five days later the Association met in full and adopted two resolutions. One vigorously opposed logging the Bunker Creek area and building the necessary road into it. The other proposed extending the boundaries of the Bob Marshall to include not only the Bunker Creek drainage, but also the rest of the national forest area, northward to Glacier Park. Some time during this meeting, or close to it, a proposal was made to concurrently extend the boundaries of Glacier National Park to include the entire drainage of the North Fork; this would have eliminated Glacier View District from the Flathead National Forest, but nothing more seems to have been accomplished beyond the informal proposal.

The dual resolution was written up as a petition to the Secretary of Agriculture who alone could modify the Wilderness Area boundaries (but only subsequent to public hearings) and to Forest Service officials. The directors
of the Flathead Lake Wildlife Association were authorized to plan and execute a campaign to obtain signatures for the petition and support of its resolutions.

The campaign began immediately and accelerated rapidly. There were talks throughout the Flathead Valley before business, labor, farm, civic, and sportsman's groups. There were radio addresses and station-break plugs, and there were mass meetings and many person-to-person contacts made.

The petition movement soon outgrew the capabilities of the Flathead Lake Wildlife Association. An executive secretary was hired and an organization called the Flathead Conservationists was created to further the specific objectives. The creation of such a specialized group is not at all unusual (see "The Physiology of Groups", Chapter IV.) Nor is the fact that the vigorous activities of the Flathead Conservationists were carried on by just a few men.

The active minority of the group consisted of about five men. Two were older and well-respected lawyers in the valley. Another lawyer was a younger man, and he was a member of the Montana State Legislature. A fourth was the manager of the local office of the State Employment Service. And the fifth was a retired Forest Service officer, who had been a custodial ranger on the Spotted Bear District, and who was strongly opposed to the development and multiple use management of forest resources.

The confusion of "wilderness area" with the Wilderness
Area was fairly well clarified by the Flathead Conservationists themselves early in the controversy, but the reverence of the wilderness aspect itself seems to have been at the bottom of the opposition to Bunker Creek development. Many viewed the proposal as a "selling out" by the Forest Service to the lumber industry which, having gained a toe-hold, would eventually slash the Bob Marshall in spite of administrative (and hence vulnerable) obstacles.

The Conservationists feared that building the road would eventually eliminate the excellent hunting and fishing in the area. This, they argued, was of infinitely higher value to both commercial and resident recreationists than was the timber resource which would only benefit a few wealthy lumbermen. Of particular and popular interest was the grizzly bear that seemed to face certain extinction if Bunker Creek was logged.

One big objection then was the seemingly potential damage to wildlife and recreation values. Another related to the ravages and subsequent damages from logging. The Conservationists feared that stripping Bunker Creek would muddy the South Fork and ultimately render Hungry Horse Dam useless when its reservoir filled with silt.

The Flathead Conservationists carried the battle outside the Flathead Valley. They wrote to wealthy clients of local hunting guides and dude-wranglers, asking them to write or cable the Secretary of Agriculture and Forest Service of-
ficials in protest to the Bunker Creek proposal. (This, we recall, is the "rifle approach" to propagandizing. The "shotgun approach" was being effectively used back home in the Flathead Valley.)

Aligned with the Flathead Conservationists in support of the petition were three Flathead sportsman's groups, one saddle club, the Montana State Fish and Game Commission, one farm group, and several other Montana sportsman's groups from outside the valley.

The Forest Service position rested squarely on the logic of the beetle-control program. Chemical spraying or other individual-tree control methods were either ineffective or prohibitively expensive and in either case there was no provision for recovering any of the salvable timber. Control via logging had proven profitable and effective—hauling infested logs to the mill, beetles and all, removed the insects from the forest and contributed to the local economy as well.

The Forest Supervisor recommended, and had approved by the Regional Forester, an education program to counter the opposition to what was felt to be a vitally necessary control measure. Ignoring the situation in Bunker Creek invited a total loss of all the spruce, whereas a vigorous—and timely—control program could save the bulk of it and utilize the rest.

Concurrently two projects were undertaken by the Forest Service. The first was the field work in Bunker Creek
to determine whether or not the control program was feasible. There were several considerations. One was the intensity of the epidemic. Though the Forest Service was reasonably convinced the epidemic warranted control action, it had to be certain. Another was road construction—the practical engineering problems to be encountered. And the last was the quantity and quality of timber to be salvaged—it had to be sufficiently valuable to amortize the road costs, since appropriations to subsidize the road were not available. Forest Service cruisers and engineers battled deep snows and spring floods to obtain the necessary data.

The second project was the education program. The Supervisor and his staff toured the valley speaking before meetings, talking to influential people in the opposing groups, and pleading for understanding. He had made his position clear in March that he intended to advertise the Bunker Creek sale as soon as possible, if the field check proved it to be feasible, and now he sought support for his decision. He found it in the valley newspapers, one sportsman's group, two Chambers of Commerce, the valley banks, a few civic organizations, some farm groups, and of course the lumber industry.

By the end of March the signed petitions were sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Forest Service, the Regional Forester, and the Flathead Forest Supervisor. The controversy raged through April and into May, but by the
end of May all active campaigning had stopped. Some people were going back to seasonal jobs, more were returning to jobs at the aluminum plant that had been closed during strike-negotiations. The Forest Service was frantically busy with the Bunker Creek field evaluation and control work in other areas. For the time being, the controversy was stalemated, and any new actions or reactions would depend on the outcome of the field examination.

By the end of June a fairly accurate picture was available, but it presented a dilemma. The volume of timber was somewhat less than the original estimates, but the infestation was more than twice as heavy as had been anticipated. These two findings worked in somewhat opposite directions, and it was not until the August emergence of overwintering beetles was observed that a final decision was rather more clear. The entomologists found evidence of heavy winter-mortality of the beetles and an increase in beetle parasites and predators, and the August emergence—much lighter than expected—indicated that the epidemic had passed its peak. Control-logging probably would not be necessary.

But the conflict was not finally resolved until January 1, 1955 when the Regional Forester announced that plans for Bunker Creek had been cancelled. Although the infestation in Bunker Creek was serious, he said in a press release, the economics of control-logging appeared to be sub-marginal, and control efforts would be concentrated instead on infested areas
of higher priority.

And, of course, the conflict is not completely solved yet, if indeed at all. A partial-equilibrium has been attained, but the final decision on Bunker Creek development has been postponed. At present the advocates of a wilderness aspect seem to have won the "Battle of Bunker Creek", but the development plans for the area are still in the files. The acceleration of them appeared not to be feasible, after all, on January 1, 1955, but what will happen when the normally-paced development approaches Bunker Creek once again?

Some people felt at the time, and some still do, that the Forest Service side-stepped the issue and back-tracked, saving face via the "sub-marginal-operation" route. On the contrary, the decision may have been technically and unquestionably sound, or it might have been a brilliant piece of public administration. But aside from the implications of administrative theory, the "Battle of Bunker Creek" provides a valuable example of the potential of pressure group effects on multiple use administration.

The Glacier View District itself has been the center of another controversy that has stretched over 12 years and it too is not yet finally settled. Although it has never reached the intensity of the "Battle of Bunker Creek", the dispute over Glacier View Dam has the potential of becoming a national issue.

Glacier View Dam is a proposed development in the plans
of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Corps of Engineers to harness the Columbia River. The dam site is located on the North Fork of the Flathead River several miles upstream from the Big Creek Ranger Station, on the eastern edge of the Glacier View District.

The proposed dam is of earth-fill construction. It would be 416 feet high and 2100 feet long. It would create a reservoir of 30,500 acres which would afford 3,160,000 acre-feet of storage. Three generators of 70,000 KW capacity each are planned for the dam to provide 210,000 KW of name-plate or installed power. The estimated cost of Glacier View Dam, including interest during construction, was $102,084,000 in 1948.

The estimated annual costs and benefits of the dam would be as follows: (1948 figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest $3,063,000</td>
<td>Local flood control $271,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization 905,000</td>
<td>Regional flood cont. 367,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oper. Maint. 567,000</td>
<td>Navigation 16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim replacements 70,000</td>
<td>Power 7,773,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pmts. in lieu of taxes 4,000</td>
<td>Recreation 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $4,609,000</td>
<td>TOTAL $8,488,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accepting these figures at face value, the cost/benefit ratio for Glacier View Dam is 1.00:1.84. This ratio is one

1The following data pertains to the proposal of the Corps of Engineers. See the Review Report on the Columbia River and Tributaries, Dept. of the Army, Corps of Engineers, North Pacific Division, October 1, 1948.
of the highest for any proposed project in the entire Columbia Basin and hence Glacier View is an extremely attractive and desirable site.

The controversy arises because of the ownership pattern of the flowage area. Some 5,000 acres, mostly in stagnated stands of lodgepole pine, would be flooded in the Forest Service land west of the North Fork. About 15,000 acres of privately owned land in the river bottom would be flooded. The remaining land in the reservoir area, about 10,000 acres, lies within the boundaries of Glacier National Park ownership, and it is this portion that has caused the most intensive reactions.

The National Park Service itself has led the battle to prevent construction of the dam. It bases its arguments on various Congressional actions. The act that created the Park Service in 1916\(^1\) read in part:

\[...\text{to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.}\]

The enabling legislation for Glacier National Park came four years after the park was created. This act\(^2\) provided for:

\[...\text{Preservation of all timber, natural curiosities, and for the protection of animals...}\]

The Corps of Engineers held a public hearing at Kalispell,


Montana, on May 25, 1948 to consider Glacier View Dam. At that time, the then Director of the Park Service, Newton B. Drury, sent a signed statement to be entered into the record. The statement listed five principal reasons the dam should not be constructed: (1) it was not required for the economic stability of the country, (2) the reservoir would seriously impair the values that the Park Service was obliged by law (Drury quoted the 1914 Act) to protect, (3) the white-tail deer winter range would be reduced by 56%, elk and mule deer winter range by 30%, and beaver habitat by 70%, (4) the wilderness aspect of the Park would be damaged, and (5) 19,460 acres of land within the Park would be flooded, (nearly half of which is privately owned), including 5,535 acres of state-owned land that supported the only extensive stand of Ponderosa pine within the park. (Subsequent legislation led to Park acquisition of this state-owned land.)

The Park Service has argued from this standpoint ever since, with variations and refinements. On March 31, 1960 a panel discussion was held in Kalispell, sponsored by the Flathead Wildlife Club, to again discuss the dam issue. Mr. Edward A. Hummel, the current Park Superintendent, reiterated the earlier objections and added several species to the list of affected wildlife—the Park moose population and a rare creature, the northern bog lemming, whose habitat would be eliminated.

Thus the opposition to the dam has two potent and re-
lated arguments: the legal obligation of the Park Service and the emotional aspect of unimpaired natural wilderness. Support for this opposition comes largely from national groups. The AFL-CIO has resolved its objection to construction of the dam. The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Sierra Club, and various national wildlife and wilderness organizations have all opposed construction of Glacier View Dam. (The issue of Glacier View parallels the controversy that arose over a similar dam-proposal in Echo Canyon of Dinosaur National Monument in Utah. In that instance, the national conservation organizations were nearly unanimous in their effective protestations which ultimately killed the proposal. We might suspect a similar reaction when and if support for Glacier View becomes so intense that construction seems imminent.)

Local objection to the dam arises in the wildlife groups--the Flathead Wildlife Club, the Whitefish Sportsman's Club, the Flathead Lake Wildlife Association, the Rocky Mountain Sportsman's Club, the Kalispell Sportsman's Association, etc. But within these groups the principles of multiple membership and overlapping loyalties exerts a dissipating influence--and the active minority counteracts it.

The leadership of the wildlife groups seems to be found largely in professional men: doctors, lawyers, dentists. These men particularly enjoy the wilderness aspect of the Flathead area and tend to take a "preservationist" attitude toward the forest resources, preferring to elevate recreation
use to the exclusion of "development" uses such as timber harvesting and, in this case, water power.

There is some resentment toward this attitude among the acquiescent memberships of the wildlife groups. It is found in the men who work in the woods and mills and depend on the timber resource for their livelihoods. Although this segment of the groups also enjoys the wildlife and recreation resources, it may not be so adamant in objecting to development. And those members who are connected with the construction industries are actively supporting construction of Glacier View Dam.

Local opposition, then, is centered mainly in the wildlife groups, and has not been nearly so unified and effective as have the national organizations in obstructing construction.

The enabling legislation for the Park contained the following provision:

...the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.¹

This provision has been the lever which pro-dam groups have used to prod the Park Service arguments. According to Superintendent Hummel², this provision was included to protect the irrigation projects benefitting the Blackfeet Indians east of the park, who had established small developments on

¹Ibid.

²Interview with Mr. Hummel, April 14, 1960.
St. Mary's Lake prior to the creation of the Park. With no reference to its foundations and removing it from context, the provision has been stretched to distortion in support of construction of the dam.

The support for the dam has been carried, sustained, and cultivated by the Corps of Engineers. The Corps' report on the 1948 Kalispell hearings seems less than impartial:

Local attendance was not fully representative, as the hearing occurred at a time of severe flood in the Flathead Valley. [And hence, inferentially, supporters of the dam were busy battling flood waters the dam would prevent.] Several local committees, Chambers of Commerce, and labor councils favored the project, but the balance of local sentiment unquestionably gave far greater weight to the views of the National Park Service than to the over-all needs for basin-wide power and flood-control.¹

The Corps' report presented an exemplary interpretation of the reclamation provision:

The Act of Congress referred to [by Director Drury—Glacier Park's enabling act] also specifically provides for storage development for reclamation purposes within the Park, thus acknowledging the fact that provision for beneficial use of water resources has a higher priority than 'Preservation of all timber,...natural curiosities,...and animals.'²

This interpretation has been voiced repeatedly by the Kalispell Chamber of Commerce whose members endorse Glacier View Dam almost unanimously. (Seven members of 100 polled objected to the dam. One of these, a surgeon, is the president of the Flathead Wildlife Club. Another is a lawyer who is District President of the Montana Wildlife Federation. Once

²Ibid., p. IV-48
again, a case of overlapping loyalties.)

The motives of the supporting groups can be traced almost exclusively to the short run benefits of a construction boom. The Chambers of Commerce in both Columbia Falls and Kalispell have resolved in favor of the dam.

The Whitefish Chamber was not so united, perhaps because of Whitefish's greater distance from the dam site and consequently less favorable potential for capitalizing on construction business. Evidently the Whitefish Chamber membership leaned toward the wilderness position of the national-group interests. The Directors of the Whitefish Chamber passed a resolution of advocacy, but failed to get full support of the Chamber membership. It is interesting to note the variation in effectiveness of the overlapping loyalty principle between the Kalispell Chamber, where it was evident, and the Whitefish Chamber, where it was decisive.

The Kalispell Building Trades Council has favored construction, and so have the local labor groups. (National labor groups, we recall, oppose it.) The valley radio stations and newspapers, the Hungry Horse News and the Daily Interlake, have supported the dam. Other support has been given for a variety of reasons.

The Pacific Power and Light Company favors the dam because of its ability to increase firm power for downstream PPL dams. The allied Montana Power Company has given its tacit approval, too. With federally-built headwater storage,
relatively cheap river-run dams become attractive investments.

If a headwater dam is to be built at all, the Montana Fish and Game Department would favor Glacier View over an alternative site at Spruce Park on the Flathead's Middle Fork. The Middle Fork lies entirely within Montana, and can be adequately and completely managed for wildlife production. But the North Fork arises in Canada and is therefore less accessible for intensive drainage-wide management. The Fish and Game Department, however, would prefer that neither headwater dam be built and has given its full support to the construction of Paradise Dam, a large dam far downstream on the Clark Fork River, that would eliminate the need for headwater storage.

Summarizing the opposing forces in the Glacier View Dam controversy, we recognize two general patterns, one in favor of the dam, one opposed to it. The national groups, the Park Service, and local wildlife and wilderness interests oppose the dam, favoring the idea that long run benefits will be maximized only if the dam is not built.

The local groups and commercial interests advocate immediate construction to gain a short term benefit—construction money—and seem to submerge this motive in references to out-of-context provisions for reclamation storage. In this respect they have a powerful ally in the Corps of Engineers.

The effects of the dam on the multiple use management of the Glacier View District would be immediately felt.
The recreation patterns would change drastically as mass use of the reservoir developed. Relocation of the relatively fast, straight, valley-bottom mainline road would probably involve a winding, shoreline route and increased hauling costs for logging operations.

Longer term modifications of management might involve the utilization of currently unmerchantable species as pulpwood. The dam's power and streamflow-stabilizing benefits could provide the energy and dissipation of mill-effluents to support a 200-ton pulp mill.

But the activities of pressure groups have already affected the administration of multiple use on the District. The Glacier View Dam was proposed twelve years ago. Today it is simply not there. And the opposing forces have obtained federal legislation prohibiting the construction of any dam, without prior Congressional approval, that would flood any national park. So a partial equilibrium, as in the "Battle of Bunker Creek", has been attained once more, and the controversy of Glacier View Dam, for the present, is dormant.

The "Figure 8" or "Loop Road" is an issue currently under discussion. The figure eight would be the rough shape of a completed road system encircling and dividing Glacier Park. Surfaced highways presently run across the bottom of the Park over Marias Pass, through the Park over Logan Pass, and along the eastern boundary of the Park. A new segment across the top of the Park would link the east-side highway
with a proposed surfaced road paralleling and/or superimposed on the present gravelled road that runs along the North Fork through the Glacier View District.

If the Glacier View segment were built, 400,000 recreation visits and a haul of 26 MMbf of timber would be its estimated annual and immediate use. The conflicts are obvious and inevitable between the two uses; less obvious but just as inevitable is the potential conflict with renewed interest in the Glacier View Dam and the subsequent location of the proposed road.

The road proposal has enjoyed the support of nearly all the interested groups in the area. The lumbering interests foresee faster and cheaper hauling. The Park administration favors a valley-bottom location to ease the pressure on recreation facilities within Glacier Park (and to discourage construction of the dam?). And recreation interests are currently speculating—cabins under construction on private land have already been sold to customers in Chicago and Florida.

One small group in opposition is the North Fork Improvement Association. These rugged people have had their fill of development and malignant civilization. When and if the Loop Road is completed, the forty hardy homesteaders may finally get their daily mail deliveries, but they may lose something in the transaction they don't realize they have. (Or possibly they do.)
CHAPTER VIII

THE ERA OF INTENSIVE MULTIPLE USE

PROJECTIONS AND COMMENTS

We stand today on the threshold of this phase in the development of the multiple use concept. If the Forest Service, or any other organization, has succeeded in side-stepping the issue, it cannot do so for long. Pressures are building apace with our population growth, and demands will again be made for the timber of countless Bunker Creeks and the power of many Glacier View Dams.

We suppose multiple use can meet the challenge, but I think not without improvement.

Current practices and indeed the current Forest Service Manual (which legitimately can be excused, considering its provisionality), overemphasize short run or static multiple use nearly to the exclusion of several vital considerations.

We proposed in Chapter II that long run multiple use would be realized through a succession of short run partial-equilibria, but reserved a critical proviso for later consideration. That proviso is deliberation. We might very well reconcile static and current conflicts, and even a succession of them, but spontaneous reconciliations could result in an eroding wasteland. The obvious necessity, and a crucial one, is adequate prior planning.
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The Forest Service has a long history of excellent planning in all its resource management activities, but there seems to be a chronic oversight in regard to the forces of demand.

Immediate demands, we proposed earlier, are manifested through the activities of pressure groups. They are often manifested explosively so, as in the case of the Bunker Creek controversy. The administrator infrequently needs an extraordinary sensitivity to recognize such demands as these.

I should hope that an understanding of pressure group behavior could well serve to anticipate demands of future time periods. Such phenomena as the realization of potential groups—the Flathead Conservationists, for example—and the activation of organized groups are no more than reactions to disequilibria, and the reaction will always bring demands of one sort or another given a sufficiently intense disequilibrium.

With respect to the administration of a multiple use policy, a disequilibrium is created whenever the currently established configuration of uses is altered, no matter how slightly. The subsequent reactions will vary in intensity and in tactics with the degree and kind of alteration. An astute evaluation of the alteration should produce a sound prediction of future demands.

The evaluation must consider the groups to be encountered. A periodic survey of organized groups that come
in contact with the operating unit should be a part of any plan for multiple use administration. In addition there must be a summary of local sentiments, opinions, and attitudes—the raw material of potential groups. The accumulation of demand data is just as critical to multiple use administration as is the inventory of supply.

Analysis of this sort has its place in multiple use planning, but it has its limitations, too. It cannot predict demand for long run periods if we define "long run" in terms of, say, timber rotations.

Long run demand predictions are probably most soundly based on the identification of trends. This is beyond the scope of this paper, but is currently under intensive investigation by the Cooperative North Fork Study.

To tie the demand situation into a neat bundle we can summarize as follows: (1) immediate demand is usually quite conspicuous, (2) "short-" or "middle-run" demand may be inferred from pressure group behavior, (3) "long-run" demand may be derived from the identification and study of trends in demand.

(No plan of multiple use management, however erudite its analysis of demand forces and inventory of supply, can presume to attain a final and complete balance between the two. Any prediction involves uncertainty, and to minimize its effects there must be a built-in provision for periodically regular re-planning.)
One of the vital considerations currently neglected, then, is the concept of demand. Another is a failing of organization.

Demands vary not only for different quantities of resources but also for different resources. The Forest Service organization on a "vertical" basis of the separate resource functions is susceptible to short run pressure group demands that might jeopardize the long run maximization of the use of all resources.

Fortunately, Title 2100 has recognized the difficulty. In the Washington Office, the Assistant Chief in charge of National Forest Resource Management has been assigned the responsibility for multiple use management. Title 2100 provides a rudimentary framework for similar multiple use staff positions in the Regional Offices and the offices of Forest Supervisors to supplement the existing functional staff positions concerning timber, recreation, grazing, etc. This portends an intensity of multiple use as yet unseen.

We can hope that a more rational system will result wherein use-coordination on "horizontal" planes will develop at Ranger District, Forest Supervisor, and Regional Forester levels.

And on the operating unit, where timber surveys now result in timber management plans and recreation surveys result in recreation plans, we can hope for improvement, too.
A resource survey would indicate the biological capabilities of the unit. Coupled with a demand survey, and with iron-bound provisions for periodic re-planning, the resource survey could produce a unit plan to ensure long run multiple use.

As our population will continue to increase, so will the pressures on our forest resources. We can only hope and believe that the concept of multiple use and our freely evolved system of group politics will resolve conflicts, after all, for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.
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Forest Service Region I Materials


Personal Interviews


Wallner, Dr. Alfred. Physician; president of Flathead Wildlife Club, member of Kalispell Chamber of Commerce. Kalispell, Montana, April, 1960.

Sykes, Robert. Attorney; District President, Montana Wildlife Federation, member of Kalispell Chamber of Commerce. Kalispell, Montana, April, 1960.


Miscellaneous sources

Arnold, Dale L. "The Forest Service and Problems of Economic Development in Flathead County, Montana," a rough-draft manuscript.

________. An un-titled paper concerning the Bunker Creek controversy.


HISTORICAL

In 1897 President Cleveland set aside as a Forest Reserve a vast area of wild land, which included what is now Glacier National Park and most of the present national forests in northwestern Montana. In 1908 President Theodore Roosevelt designated a portion of this reserve as Flathead National Forest. Glacier National Park was withdrawn from the national forest in 1910. The Blackfeet Forest was eliminated in 1933 and most of that area became a part of the present Flathead National Forest, one of the largest forest units in the United States.

The name "Flathead" is derived from a tribe of local Indians. David Thompson of the Northwest Trading Company established the trading post near Kalispell about 1811. He was probably the first white man to enter this region. In 1884 the first school district was established. It extended from Flathead Lake to the Canadian line and from the Continental Divide to the Idaho line. The Great Northern Railway was completed into the Flathead in 1891.

With shipping facilities available, lumbering became an industry of increasing importance. As the desirable agricultural lands were cleared of timber, they were put under the plow. Timber and agriculture have progressed jointly to build up and maintain the prosperity of the Flathead Valley.

MANAGEMENT

The national forests are managed with the objective of public service of the greatest good to the greatest number in the long run under the principle of multiple use. The essence of multiple use management means making each area yield the maximum number of benefits to fit
each use to the other. For example, in cutting national forest timber, trees are reserved along permanent roads or bodies of water to enhance their esthetic value whenever possible. Thus, the interest and benefits of recreationists are not denied and, at the same time, the lumber industry is provided with sawtimber.

**Timber**

Timber production is a primary function of this forest. Principal species of commercial sawtimber are western larch, spruce, and Douglas-fir. Other species of lesser amounts include lodgepole pine, ponderosa pine, white pine, and alpine fir. Approximately four billion board feet of sawtimber is available on an area of 1,037,000 acres of non-reserved commercial timber-growing areas within the forest boundaries. Mature sawtimber is found on half of this area. On the other half are growing young stands of less than 40 years of age, many of which originated following the destructive forest fires of 1910 and other years. Sixty million board feet of sawtimber can be harvested annually from these stands without depleting the growing stock.

**Water**

Water is a basic resource of any land. Its protection, development, and control is essential if a nation is to prosper. The Swan, Flathead, Whitefish, and Stillwater Rivers rise on the forest, and provide water for irrigation, power, and domestic use. Every watershed, large or small, contributes to man's welfare. Hydroelectric dams, such as Hungry Horse and Big Fork, depend upon water supplied from the national forests.
GRAZING

The Flathead is mainly a timber-producing area, but there are suitable summer ranges for cattle and sheep. About 2,000 head of cattle and horses graze under permit. This number can be increased to the carrying capacity in keeping with proper use and development of other resources, including good watershed conditions and forage needs of big game. Due to inaccessibility of ranges and other unfavorable natural factors, no sheep have grazed on the Flathead forest for several years.

ROADS AND TRAILS

The Flathead National Forest maintains 3,419 miles of trail and 600 miles of road. Sections of forest roads are often maintained by the lumbering firms purchasing national forest timber to better facilitate removal of timber products under terms of special agreements. Although considerable progress has been made, new roads are urgently needed in certain areas to more adequately administer and protect the forest.

WILDLIFE

Wildlife is one of the major resources of the forest. Of special importance is the habitat management of the big game population. The entire forest supports big game. An estimated 4,500 elk, 6,200 deer, 1,100 black bear, 230 grizzly bear, 240 moose, and 1,230 goat are found on the forest. An average of about 1,000 head of elk are killed each year. In addition, there are upland birds and small fur-bearing animals. Stream and lake fishing represent a major outdoor sport. Brook, native or cutthroat, Rainbow, and Dolly Varden trout are found in practically every stream or lake.
FIRE PROTECTION

Destructive fires in 1910, 1919, 1926, and 1929 burned over thousands of acres of productive forest land. Prevention of fires pays big dividends and it is the duty of each citizen to do his part in being careful with fire.

Past records show that 20 per cent of all fires are caused by man, and these cause about 75 per cent of the total damage.

To protect the forests adequately from fire, it is necessary to maintain lookouts and keep an active alert organization of men, skilled in the techniques of fire prevention and suppression. The use of radios and airplanes has become common practice. Bulldozers are used in the accessible areas to build firelines, while smokejumpers man the fires in the more remote, high mountainous areas.

RECEIPTS (Fiscal Year 1953)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber sales</td>
<td>$376,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$380,109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-five per cent of the gross revenues from the sale of national forest timber and other commercial uses is paid to the states for distribution to counties in which national forests are located, to be used for roads and schools. The fund is a large part of the revenues of many counties. Another ten per cent is made available to the Forest Service for use in building and maintaining roads and trails in the national forests. The remainder of the receipts is deposited in the United States Treasury and can be disbursed only by Congressional appropriation.

ORGANIZATION

The Flathead Forest is administered by a force of men and women averaging 30 to 40 yearlong. Seasonal workers employed from 3 to 8 months each year supplement this force and employment reaches an average peak of about 210. Additional manpower is needed to control the larger fires. These workers, recruited principally from local labor sources and from forestry colleges, maintain trails, telephone lines, roads, control fires, and perform related tasks.

The district ranger, as land manager of his unit, is chiefly responsible for all activities on his district, and upon him is placed most of the administrative burden. Members of the supervisor's office, the rangers, and assistants have intime knowledge of forest conditions. They gladly cooperate in providing information about the forest.

FLATHEAD NATIONAL FOREST FACTS

Located in Flathead, Lake, Lewis and Clark, Lincoln, Missoula, and Powell Counties, the Flathead National Forest comprises an area of 2,335,565 acres. Within the boundaries of the forest are 289,830 acres of privately owned land.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's Office</td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Lake Ranger Dist.</td>
<td>Big Fork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Bear Ranger Dist.</td>
<td>Coram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier View Ranger Dist.</td>
<td>West Glacier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coram Ranger District</td>
<td>Coram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Prairie Ranger Dist.</td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condon Ranger District</td>
<td>Swan Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tally Lake Ranger Dist.</td>
<td>Kalispell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Except for very small areas and for limited periods of time when the fire hazard risk is unusually high, the national forests are available for general public use. The Forest Service wants everyone to enjoy the forests with a minimum of restriction and asks active cooperation in leaving clean camps for the enjoyment of those who come later. Hunting, fishing, and camping can be enjoyed in practically every part of the forest.

The remote Bob Marshall Wilderness Area, with its vast scope of wild forested land, offers solitude away from the noise of congested traffic and odor of gasoline. Here, straddling the Continental Divide, is the spectacular Chinese Wall with a 20-mile section of rugged and rocky escarpment with 1,000-foot walls.

Accessible only by foot or horse travel is the Mission Mountains Wild Area, where only a few trails exist. Airplanes are prohibited from landing in both the Bob Marshall Wilderness Area and the Mission Mountains Wild Area.

The Flathead Forest has 18 small public campgrounds. Many shady, cool picnic areas can be found along the main roads. Dude ranches, resorts, and cabin camps are located within accessible parts of the forest and in adjacent towns. Horses and guides can be hired.

Six miles north of Whitefish is the Big Mountain Winter Sports Area, which is considered one of the best skiing centers in the northwest. There is a 3,220-foot ski lift to the top of Big Mountain for skiing in winter, sight-seeing in summer. On clear days, there is an unusually fine panoramic view of the valley and Flathead Lake.

CONSERVATION PLEDGE

I give my pledge as an American To save and faithfully defend from waste The natural resources of my country— Its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife.

TANGO CREEK FIRE, MAN-CAUSED
August 19, 1953

PREVENT FOREST FIRES!