



NEVADA FALL, YOSEMITE

*by Ansel Adams*

# SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN

*April  
1958*

# People You Know

THE STORY of Southern California during the late winter was snow and plenty of it, and skiing and plenty of that, too. In fact it came just at the right time for *Roy and Dede Gorin*, who moved their family to Big Bear with a sort of back-of-the-mind notion that it would make them handy to a lot of seasonal fun.

Three dozen ski mountaineers and friends enjoyed Keller Peak Ski Hunt's first central commissary of the season early in February. *Susan Moir* served roast beef for one meal, while the men of the party cranked the cranky generator, working up an appetite. They gave out just as candles were lighted for supper. *Frank and Elfriede Rhylick* were hosts.

A Southland visitor was *Guss Pollard*, now of Oakland, who was born in 1872 but hasn't yet reached his 21st birthday, since his natal date was February 29.

*Gene Minor* directed folk dancing at Harwood Lodge over Washington's Birthday. The minuet would have been more appropriate, but no one could remember how to do it.

**THE SIERRA CLUB**,\* founded in 1892, has devoted itself to the study and protection of national scenic resources, particularly those of mountain regions. Participation is invited in the program to enjoy and preserve wilderness, wildlife, forests, and streams.

DIRECTORS	
Harold C. Bradley	President
Elmer C. Aldrich	Vice-President
Lewis F. Clark	Secretary
Clifford V. Heimbucher	Treasurer
Nathan C. Clark	5th Member, Executive Committee
Ansel Adams	Charlotte E. Mauk
Harold E. Crowe	Bestor Robinson
H. Stewart Kimball	William Siri
Richard M. Leonard	Edgar Wayburn
A. Starker Leopold	R. Clifford Youngquist
Kathleen Jackson	Chairman, Club Council
David R. Brower	Executive Director
August Frugé	Chairman, Editorial Board

MONTHLY BULLETIN STAFF	
Vivian Schagen	Editor
John P. Schagen	Associate Editor
Fred Gunsky	Editorial Consultant
Phil Greene	Photo Editor
Doris Brown	Dorothy Otto
Charlotte E. Mauk	Dan L. Thrapp

Peggy Wayburn

Published monthly except July and August by the Sierra Club, 2061 Center Street, Berkeley 4, California. Annual dues are \$7 (first year \$12), of which \$1 (nonmembers, \$3) is for subscription to the *Bulletin*. Entered as second class matter at Post Office, Berkeley, under act of March 3, 1879. All communications and contributions should be addressed to Sierra Club, 1050 Mills Tower, San Francisco 4.

\*Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

*Don Wilson* and *Bob Kamps* made a first ascent of a 500-foot sandstone spire in Oak Creek Canyon on January 31 and named it Oak Creek Spire.

*Bill Dixon* reported that he made a climb to 30,000 feet on January 31, without leaving the ground. His rate of climb was 1,500 feet per minute, and was done in the altitude simulation tank at Lockheed. With instructors for Sherpas, the intrepid explorer explained the effects of suddenly going without oxygen at 28,000 feet and concluded he would prefer to do his climbing hereafter in the mountains.

Some 67 Sierrans took part in a desert week end at Deep Canyon, south of Palm Desert, where *Randall Henderson* was host. Somehow, in an adventure involving *Crystal Karstens*, a bedroll was set on fire with a water jug, survivors reported. No casualties, however.

*Crystal* and *A. J. Basinger* led a party of Riverside Chapter people on a grand Grand Canyon trip March 31-April 4, which included a hike down the trail to Phantom Ranch.

Travelers: *Elsa* and *Erna Brennehan*, to Indonesia, Thailand and India; *Helen Hunter*, to the West Indies; *Sarah Chavez*, to Barcelona; *Stella* and *Norman Fiske*, to Istanbul; *Hazel Elbinger*, to South America; *Richard Winkler*, to Holland for 10 years to come; *Mary Galton*, to Long Beach to continue her law studies.

*Chuck Miller* is new chairman of the Sierra Peaks Section and two new emblem peaks have been named: Mt. Humphreys, 13,986, and North Palisade, 14,242. The total is 14 now, and climbing any 10 qualifies you for the badge.

After several unsuccessful tries, *Dick Worsfold* led six club members on a successful attack on Condor Peak. Since no one had brought along a pencil, they signed their names in the seldom-used register atop with lipstick, which is never forgotten.

*George Wilkens* has a new book on philosophy in print, "Justice of the Universe." *Bob Greenawalt* has an article on Bat Cave on the Colorado in *Desert* magazine for January.

A devoted member of the club for over 50 years, *Kate E. Smith*, died last December. She went on her first High Trip in 1903. Memorial contributions, for the purpose of sending a foreign student on a summer outing, have been received by the club office from several of her friends.

DAN L. THRAPP





# Sierra Club Bulletin

VOLUME 43

APRIL, 1958

NUMBER 4

... TO EXPLORE, ENJOY, AND PROTECT THE NATURAL MOUNTAIN SCENE ...

## Our Natural Resource: Volunteers

TRAVELING OVER 25,000 miles among themselves to reach San Francisco, 111 people vitally interested in conservation education—from as far away as San Diego, Reno, and Portland—attended the Sierra Club's week-end Conference on Information and Education March 15 and 16. After some 1300 man-hours of listening, thinking, and talking, the conference was presented with four recommendations prefaced by a significant statement of eight premises. Perhaps the premises are equal in importance to the recommendations, for they epitomize the group's growing awareness, as the conference progressed, that the many accomplishments of the Sierra Club over the years have been largely the accomplishments of dedicated volunteers, dedicated amateurs who have devoted uncounted hours to conservation work. The group also came to realize that a volunteer's devotion may not be enough, that to be effective and to receive the satisfaction of doing a job well our amateurs need more guidance and instruction. Recommendations Chairman Gordon Misner, of Campbell, stated the eight premises which describe the organizational environment of the Sierra Club:

1. This is a volunteer organization.
2. Its accomplishments are the work of a relatively few, dedicated people.
3. The character of the Sierra Club and the mission we have chosen make the volunteer nature of much of our work absolutely essential.
4. Our reservoir of volunteers—the composite of their intellect, information, enthusiasm, skills, and ideas—is the

most precious commodity of our organization.

5. It is incumbent upon us to make sure that this talent and energy and devotion is not wasted, is not misdirected, is not dissipated, is not lost because of frustrations.
6. Perhaps we should investigate methods by which this volunteer genius may be more adequately utilized.
7. Our attention should, perhaps, be directed toward answering the question, "How may the rare talents and zeal of our great volunteer organization become more effective in fulfilling the expressed purposes of the Sierra Club, to which we all are dedicated?"
8. In organizing and utilizing our volunteer talent, we should be guided by Gifford Pinchot's type of conservation—optimum development and wisest use.

With the volunteer nature of the Sierra Club as a background, the conference then accepted four specific recommendations—four items of priority importance selected by a twelve-man committee representing all chapters present. The following four were selected from the many suggestions expressed by many members during the week end:

- I. To make more accessible the available conservation education resources:
  - a. Chapters need an annual inventory of the conservation education resources available from both club and chapters. This inventory should include visual education materials, library resources, and personnel resources.

- b. One central, permanent place is needed to provide adequate storage space, a clearing-house, and a work area for the distribution and construction of conservation education materials.
  - c. With the wealth of resources which we as an organization possess, our problem is really one of "information retrieval"; we need to improve our channels of communication and information flow.
- II. To foster the optimum development and wisest use of our volunteers:
- a. Chapter leaders need annual training and orientation.
  - b. Chapters need better coördination and dissemination of conservation education resources.
  - c. Chapters need improved coördination of volunteer conservation education activities.
  - d. Since these tasks would be tremendous undertakings for a volunteer, we recommend the acquisition of a qualified, paid, professional field-

worker with clearly defined conservation education duties.

III. To further the club's conservation education mission, we recommend holding biennial conferences on information and education.

IV. To discuss and implement the above recommendations, we recommend that responsibility for doing so be placed upon the Sierra Club Council.

Some of the above recommendations came to your conference chairman as complete surprises. Perhaps an important value of a conference *is* its surprises—surprising combinations of people and ideas, the stimulation that provokes expression of latent ideas, unexpected unanimity, unforeseen controversy. The recommendations, compiled by an alert and thoughtful committee, are the result of a frank interchange of ideas and are certainly a credit to those who attended the conference.

GENNY SCHUMACHER,  
*Conference Chairman*

## Sierra Club's Spot on Kilimanjaro

Requests from members for Sierra Club registers to be placed on California peaks are not too unusual, but when a request comes all the way from the Dark Continent, extraordinary circumstances must certainly prevail.

In March, 1957, Anton (Ax) Nelson, who is well known in climbing circles for his first ascent of the Lost Arrow from its base, with John Salathé, wrote about four registers which the Mountain Club of East Africa wished to obtain and place on the highest peaks of Africa. What was most intriguing was that if the registers were indeed placed on these peaks, they would easily be the highest Sierra Club registers.

After consideration, the club decided to donate the registers—five-pound boxes complete with the Sierra Club emblem and the peak names. Ax writes from far off Tanganyika that the highest has already been bolted in place on Kilimanjaro (19,717

feet), and the others will follow on Mawenzi (17,386), Meru (15,000), and on a secondary peak of Kibo (Kilimanjaro).

Ax also mentioned that the view from his home includes Kibo. For week-end trips the family can motor to several of the National Parks of East Africa, and an afternoon picnic may include the sight of rhino and hippo.

Official thanks for the registers have recently been received from the Secretary of the Mountain Club of East Africa. As of last year, the summit of Kilimanjaro had been reached by about 580 climbers, and in 1956 was visited by people from six continents. According to Ax, the register is a definite improvement on top, since for years the only item on the summit was a dilapidated leopard carcass, hardly suitable for recording names on the highest peak in Africa.

RICHARD C. HOUSTON





*Evolution  
Valley,  
High Sierra*

*Philip Hyde*

## What Can We Do for Wilderness?

“What there is is all all men will ever have, and all their children.  
It is only as safe as people, knowing about it, want it to be.”  
There will never be a greater opportunity to act in its behalf.

### Beware of Multiple-Useanship!

Labels and slogans have great value in these busy days when there is so much to read and so little time for reading. Used correctly, they can save a great deal of time.

But they can also be used as substitutes for thinking, and that is the way the long-hallowed term, “multiple use,” is being used by opponents of the Wilderness Bill.

In common-sense application, multiple use does not mean a mad scramble to accommodate every conceivable use on a tiny plot of ground. It means zoning within a total area, with priorities being given in certain zones to those uses that can get along with each other.

Wilderness preservation is zoning. It is compatible with more other uses, in the long run, than any other dedication of land. *Important* uses in the long run. (They are listed briefly in the following article.) But it is one-way zoning: We can't create wilderness; we can only decide what we ought to

protect for our days, and hope that other generations will choose to do the same for their posterity. They, with their advanced technology, are likely to know for sure what we only surmise—that there is a transcendent value, in our remaining samples of the original wilderness, of the creative force that has flowed down through the ages uninterrupted by man's technology and that it exists *only in wilderness*. Everywhere else our civilization is experimenting with hothouse cultivation; we had better not forget the importance of wild strains—the source of tomorrow's wonder drugs.

So whether we're thinking of national forest lands or national parks, zoning for wilderness is part of the multiple-use concept applied to those lands; and a multiplicity of uses of incalculable value are possible in that wilderness zone *without destroying its wilderness*.

Be on the lookout for the ploy. If “mul-

multiple use" is just a euphemism—just an attention-diverting device on the part of some interest bent upon exploiting some raw material for the greatest financial good of the greatest number of stockholders for the immediate present—then you are being exposed to multiple-usemanship.

To set aside wilderness, to save it, is to

extinguish no resource. It is a demonstration of restraint, of a willingness to bequeath the coming generation the right to choose—the freedom to choose—between raw-materialism everywhere and wildness somewhere.

True multiple use will accommodate both civilization *and* wilderness. D.R.B.

## What About Wilderness and Multiple Use?

[Last May a forester submitted to Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon a copy of a talk given the preceding month to a group of Forest Service supervisors assembled in Portland. On May 17, 1957, Senator Morse placed the document in the body of the *Congressional Record*. His introductory remarks and a pertinent excerpt from the talk appear below.]

Mr. MORSE: Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an excellent speech by Mr. David Brower, executive director of the Sierra Club. The speech was delivered to the supervisors of the United States Forest Service, at a meeting in Portland, Oreg.; and I consider that the speech merits widespread dissemination. In addition, I wish to comment on it today.

Mr. Brower asked whether the foresters' term "multiple use" is a shibboleth. He stated that an eminent forester in the Northwest prefers to refer to the many uses of the national forests as coordinate uses. I do not care to argue the point, but I must confess that the term "coordinate use" more nearly fits my concept of what we are trying to achieve in our great national forest programs. In my judgment, we are bound to courses of action which protect the water and the soil, for these are the basic natural resources that provide the strength of America. We must coordinate the uses, be they for recreation, grazing, or logging, so that the soil retains its full fertility and its ability to promote the best production of water.

Mr. Brower makes the interesting observation that we can hold an area available for water production, as a fish and game habitat, for recreation and research, and the

basic soil and water resource can be maintained. If we proceed to cut timber before we have the facts which establish the effect upon soil and water, we may destroy or damage the basic soil and water resource.

We have marched across this Nation with the ax and the plow, turning the forest and the prairie into farms and cities. We have caused our rivers to run brown with mud, and one has only to walk from this Chamber to the banks of the Potomac to witness this fact. In recent weeks in the great States of Texas and Colorado the citizens have been flooded with water while they could hardly breathe for the dust in the air from terrible soil-destroying duststorms.

Our national forests stand as jewels among the treasures of our heritage; but, as Mr. Brower pointed out, there is much to be done to insure their radiance. Even more important is the need to extend conservation practices across all of our land.

To my way of thinking, research is an important program that needs considerably more emphasis at the Federal, State, and private levels. Research produces carefully documented evidence, which, if properly applied, can guide our actions. I want to take this opportunity to urge that we gear our research programs to a level that provides us with the facts we need in order to assure proper management of our vital soil and water resources. We must assure these basic productivity agents as we harvest the crops that the soil and the water provide.

So, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks—because I find myself in such hearty approval with its major premises—the speech entitled "A Conservationist's Questions About Natural



Forests," and I urge my colleagues to read the contribution to this subject that Mr. Brower has made.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONSERVATIONIST'S QUESTIONS ABOUT  
NATIONAL FORESTS

(Statement made before supervisors' meeting, United States Forest Service, Portland, Oreg., by David R. Brower, executive director, Sierra Club, April 5, 1957)

\* \* \* \* \*

What about wilderness and multiple use? I submit that wilderness dedication is multiple use in perpetuity. Is there any evidence to back this up?

First, let's try this definition of multiple use: In national forest management the term relates to management of the forest as a whole, and not of a particular acre. Some plots may be zoned for an exclusive use; on others, a paramount use is designated, with which a few others may be coordinated.

What are the various uses? I count 11, some already recognized by tradition, and some likely to be:

*Timber:* This was once the most important use of national forests.

*Watershed (and soil) conservation:* This is now the most important use of most national forest lands.

*Mining,* [if surface rights are reserved].

*Grazing,* [if soil is fully protected].

*Fish and game habitat protection:* For recreation and for the fish and game per se.

*Science:* A control area for research, and a genetic reservoir of unmanaged species and strains of incalculable value to the future.

*Education:* A natural museum for public information about resource values.

*Roadside recreation* of all kinds, including some in which the natural beauty of the whole scenic setting is preserved.

*Reservoirs* and other water-development structures.

*Conservation reserve* of commodity resources for future generations if they must choose to use them.

*Wilderness recreation.*

All these uses could be accommodated on a big national forest. But how many of these are fully compatible within a particular area? There's room for a wide spread of opinion here. Conceivably some people would think timber production was fully compatible with all the other uses. I don't think it fully compatible with any, but I would say it was partly compatible with grazing, fish and wildlife, roadside recreation, and reservoirs.

I won't take the time to list all the various intercompatibilities, full and partial, and doubt that any two people would agree anyway. A committee, however, might come up with some interesting results. I will say, however, that wilderness preservation is almost fully compatible with five other uses—watershed protection, fish and game habitat, science, education and conservation reserve—almost all of which are mutually compatible [in national forests *and* national parks].

However we rate them now, the relative importance of the uses has changed and will change. For example, watershed management is assuming enormous importance; forest recreation, hardly thought of 30 years ago, is now the dominant use on many forests. We are only beginning to realize the irreplaceable value of the genetic strains and microbiota to be found only in the natural complex of wild lands. (For example, what pest-resistant genes may we lose, or what new wonder drugs, if we lose wilderness? We don't know.) Forest lands will become increasingly important for outdoor wild museums as suburbia spreads over the land. And it was hardly three decades ago that we began to realize that wilderness was vanishing so rapidly as to have a scarcity value. More and more people will have more and more time for multiple-use enjoyment of wilderness—whatever wilderness, that is, we save for them.

Would it not be helpful to attempt a monetary estimate of the worth of each combination of uses? This could be developed in several ways: (a) Totals, in terms of a constant dollar, for each decade of national-forest history; (b) totals, per decade, from now until the year 2000 accord-

ing to our best estimates; and (c) variations of the estimates as they would be effected by various combinations of preference uses.

For example, according to studies on the Roosevelt National Forest, Colorado, returns per acre of forest per year were as follows:

Grazing (Federal receipts from permits) .....	\$0.50
Timber (Federal receipts).....	1.00
Water (at headgate) .....	5.50
Recreation (spent by users) .....	25.00

It must be borne in mind, of course, that the grazing and timber receipts are gross receipts. Legitimate offsetting costs, not shown, are the increased costs of personnel to manage the timber as well as Federal costs of access roads and watershed restoration that would not be necessary if the area were left as wilderness. The receipts for water probably reflect only the amortization of development works and the cost of labor, and so forth, and nothing for the water itself. So our analysis would require our finding an honest yardstick for measuring values.

Such an analysis of the various uses would, I think, demonstrate that wilderness preservation fits in nicely with the most valuable blend of uses, in the long run, that can be found on the national forests.

## Kuchel Asks Early Action on Wilderness Bill

Senator Thomas Kuchel of California, one of the original sponsors of the Wilderness Bill in the 84th Congress who found himself unable to sponsor the bill in this Congress, has expressed his satisfaction with changes in the improved bill now proposed and his hope that favorable action will soon be taken in the Senate Interior Committee.

The Senator has stated his views in a letter of April 4 to Senator Murray of Montana, Chairman of the Committee, as follows:

“Dear Senator Murray:

“Thank you for the copies of Committee Print No. 2 of the Wilderness Preservation

The traditional national forest crops—wood products, minerals, forage—will more and more come from alternative sources: Wood products from gentle-sloped woodlots and private forests in the humid regions, minerals from seawater reduction, forage from irrigated pasture. Water and wilderness, I think, can get along fine together; wilderness will insure good protection of the quantity and quality of water, and gravity will bring it down to civilization. I am aware, of course, of work on the Frazer experimental Forest seeking to increase water yield by cutting windows in the forest. I am also aware of the pressure to initiate an operation tin roof in the Salt River watershed in Arizona. But I think we will do well to have our wilderness standing by, un-tinkered with. It can reveal how man may stop the chain reactions he invariably unleashes, for all his scientific skill, when he upsets nature’s balance. For example, thanks to wild lands near that German experiment with spruce forests, man was able to observe the important ecological role of the lowly ant, and thus to reintroduce ants where monoculture had wiped them out—and the timber crop along with them.

Let me close with a plea that you all assume a role in making sure that we look ahead to all the needs our forests must fulfill as thoroughly as we have been looking ahead to timber-resource needs.

bill, S. 1176, which you recently sent me. You know, I am sure, of my strong interest in this bill and its subject matter.

“California has a greater acreage in wilderness areas, I believe, than any other State. They are areas of prime importance, not merely because of their high scenic and recreational values, but because the maintenance of wilderness conditions ensures the protection of many watersheds. Without such protection, especially in the higher mountain ranges, there would be a constant threat that the waters which are essential to the economy and the lives of the people of California would not be adequately con-



served, with results which would be disastrous.

"You may recall that I made some specific objections to certain sections of S. 1176 when hearings were held by the Committee. Study of Committee Print No. 2 prompts me to write that the changes which have been made have resulted in a better version than the bill as introduced. I am particularly pleased to note two changes, which have eliminated the objections of certain officials in California. On Page 15, line 19, the insertion of the words 'and water conservation works' is a clarification which is desirable.

On Page 16, line 25, a new paragraph, (c)(5), makes it clear that nothing in this Act may be construed to modify existing water law. The language seems to me adequate:

"Nothing in this act shall constitute an express or implied claim or denial on the part of the Federal Government as to exemption from State water laws."

"It is my hope that our Committee can give favorable consideration at an early date to the proposed changes in S. 1176 as set forth herein.

"Sincerely yours,  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL."

## "...and of course, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce"

Senator Clinton P. Anderson of New Mexico, in entering into the hearing record the organizations opposed to the Outdoor Recreation Resource Review Bill, listed two or three who had submitted opposing statements and added, "and of course, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce."

He probably had in mind the small group, within this important and valuable organization, who are most devoted to the back-to-McKinley school and who produced Chamber statements not only in opposition to the much-needed Recreation Bill, but also to adequate federal financing of scientific research, pollution abatement, and many

other programs that seek to recognize that speed has shrunk the forty-eight states.

This same small group, of course, has opposed the Wilderness Bill. The March issue of "Natural Resources Report" is devoted entirely to opposition, and contains a remarkable aggregation of inaccurate and misleading statements. Multiple-usemanship pervades the document. Write the Chamber (Washington 6, D. C.) for a copy and write the Senate Interior Committee for the February 11, 1958, Committee Print No. 2 of the revised Wilderness Bill. This is a splendid opportunity to judge for yourself. An analysis by Sigurd Olson appears below.

## Wilderness Bill—Facts and Fancies

[In the Morning Hour on April 3, Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota placed in the *Congressional Record* a document of great importance to the preservation of wilderness in America.

The document consists of a careful refutation, point by point, of a series of erroneous statements widely circulated by a department in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The man who thus helped set the record straight is Sigurd Olson, President of the National Parks Association, noted author, and one of the country's outstanding conservationists.

The introductory remarks by Senator Humphrey, primary author of the Wilder-

ness Bill and staunch supporter of it, are self-explanatory.]

MR. HUMPHREY: Mr. President, the March issue of the National Resources Report issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has done a disservice to its readers by presenting an entirely erroneous analysis of the wilderness bill, S. 1176, of which I am the sponsor.

I respect the right of the United States Chamber of Commerce to oppose this or any other constructive legislation. However, it would be more fitting for such an organization to inform its members truthfully, whatever its views and opinions may be, rather

than to attempt to justify its position on misstatements and misconceptions.

I am pleased that the National Parks Association has effectively refuted the United States Chamber of Commerce report by pinpointing a dozen misstatements of fact and providing the corrections from the bill itself. For my part, I have more respect for the views of the National Parks Association on our natural resources than I do any supposed Natural Resources Report from the United States Chamber of Commerce. It is regrettable that so much misinformation has been deliberately circulated in an attempt to stir up opposition to a constructive proposal for the public's good.

Mr. President, to set the record straight I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by the president of the National Parks Association refuting the United States Chamber of Commerce report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The March 1958 issue of the Natural Resources Report issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has come to my attention. It deals entirely with the wilderness bill—S. 1176—and states the chamber's continued opposition to the bill, any revisions thereof, or related bills.

The National Parks Association has endorsed the objectives of this legislation, and in *National Parks Magazine* we have sought to present it clearly to our readers and the public. We consider this an outstandingly important measure.

Since the United States Chamber of Commerce report goes to a wide audience of businessmen over the country, it seems important that any inaccuracies found therein be pointed out and recorded.

We are, therefore, much concerned with this report. Despite continued efforts made by the sponsors and proponents of the wilderness bill to clarify the objectives and purposes of this measure, we find a dozen misstatements or misconceptions set forth in this report. Here they are:

Misstatement No. 1: "The proposed legis-

lation could abolish the long-established principle of multiple use of Federal lands by many citizens in favor of single-purpose, restricted use by a relatively few people."

Misstatement No. 2: " \* \* \* it would provide additional areas of public lands for their exclusive benefit \* \* \* " (meaning the exclusive benefit of outdoor enthusiasts and organized conservationists).

Misstatement No. 3: "At present, our \* \* \* wilderness, primitive, or wild areas include about 14 million acres of Federal lands. \* \* \* An enlarged wilderness system, however, proposes immediate inclusion of a total of more than 55 million acres of Federal land. \* \* \* "

Misstatement No. 4: "Radical changes would occur in the uses which can now be made of those lands."

Misstatement No. 5: " \* \* \* forest access roads required for forest protection are excluded under the wilderness plan."

Misstatement No. 6: "Administration of \* \* \* wilderness areas \* \* \* could be removed from the executive agencies and given to Congress or a Wilderness Preservation Council."

Misstatement No. 7: " \* \* \* the bill would make additions to the system relatively easy and removals extremely difficult."

Misstatement No. 8: "The bill inserts a council between Congress and the executive agencies. \* \* \* "

Misstatement No. 9: "The bill gives Congress an additional administrative responsibility. \* \* \* "

Misstatement No. 10: "Free and effective application of administrative judgment would be seriously hampered."

Misstatement No. 11: "The revised bill \* \* \* contains new language which makes possible the addition of Indian lands \* \* \* with little control by the Indians."

Misstatement No. 12: " \* \* \* land areas now controlled by the States or private interests could be considered by the Wilderness Council for possible inclusion in the national system."

Each and every one of these statements can be proven false or misleading by merely quoting the appropriate passages from the measure itself. The writer of the chamber's



attack refers to the revised bill. Therefore, the wording, Committee Print No. 2, dated February 11, 1958, is used in the following point by point discussion of the above objections. Here is the way it looks to us:

Correction No. 1: The wilderness bill maintains and indeed strengthens the long-established principle of multiple use of national forest lands in the following phraseology: " \* \* \* it is further declared to be the policy of Congress to administer the national forests with the general objectives of multiple use and sustained yield, and in order to carry out this policy the Secretary of Agriculture is accordingly directed to administer the national forests on a multiple-use basis so that the resources thereof will be used and developed to produce a sustained yield of products and services, including the establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas \* \* \* "

Correction No. 2: The wilderness bill establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System "composed of areas of public lands in the United States \* \* \* retaining their natural primeval environment and influence and being managed for purposes consistent with their continued preservation as wilderness. \* \* \* "

It does not provide for the exclusive benefit of any segment of the American public, but rather for the preservation of currently designated wilderness areas "for the health, welfare, knowledge, and happiness of its citizens of present and future generations." These benefits are open to all citizens.

Correction No. 3: The chamber statement No. 3 is simply a twisting of statistics to prove a point. The present 14 million acres of wilderness primitive and wild lands referred to are the Forest Service administered wilderness country. The 55 million acres expected to be included in the total wilderness system includes these 14 million acres of national forest wilderness plus 22 million acres of existing national park wilderness plus 13¾ million acres of existing refuge and range wilderness plus 4¾ million acres of existing Indian wilderness (if—and only if—the Indians themselves want their land included).

Correction No. 4: This is not a reform bill.

The chamber fails to point out what the "radical changes" are which they claim "would occur in the uses that can now be made of those lands." As we have shown above, the multiple-use policy of the Forest Service most certainly is not harmed by the bill. Further, the bill provides that, "Nothing in this act shall be interpreted as interfering with the purpose stated in the establishment of any national park or monument, national forest, national wildlife refuge, Indian reservation, or other Federal-land area involved except that any agency administering any area within the \* \* \* system shall be responsible for preserving the wilderness character of the area \* \* \* ." Special provisions with respect to national forests provide for continuing grazing, use of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have already become well established. Where the interests of the United States will be better served by opening a specific national-forest area of the system to mining or maintenance of reservoirs and water-conservation works, the President will have the power under this measure to authorize same.

Instead of making radical changes, the wilderness bill provides congressional sanction for the continued preservation as wilderness of those federally owned areas that have so far remained wilderness.

Correction No. 5: Special provisions provide that the President may authorize "such measures as may be found necessary in the control of insects and diseases, including the permanent road construction found essential to such mining and reservoir construction" when in the national interest. The general provision quoted above also applies in answering this misinterpretation.

Correction No. 6: Our quotation in point 4 again answers the question raised regarding removal of administrative authority from the executive agencies and giving it to Congress or the Council. Amplification of this point is given further in the bill. The administration of the areas within the system is quite clearly defined as remaining, as at present, with the executive agencies involved. The fact is that the Council established by the wilderness bill; as the bill says, "shall have no administrative jurisdiction

over any unit in the system nor over any agency that does have such jurisdiction."

Correction No. 7: Additions to or deletions from the national-forest areas included in the system are treated equally, as is evident from the following provision of the bill itself:

"Any addition, modification, or elimination of any national forest area, \* \* \* to, in, or from the system, shall be in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish \* \* \*."

With respect to park, monument, and refuge wilderness, where either executive or legislative means may be used to add areas to the system, while only an act of Congress may remove them, the bill simply carries on the present policy regarding monuments, and no area could be put in the system as a national park till after Congress had made it a park.

Correction No. 8: The Council is not inserted between the Congress and the executive agencies. The bill says: "Any proposed addition to, modification of, or elimination from any area of wilderness established in accordance with this act \* \* \* shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or other official or officials having jurisdiction over the lands involved \* \* \*."

Correction No. 9: The bill gives Congress no administrative responsibility. It does give Congress a chance in the rare instance of an unwise administrative decision to pass "a concurrent resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification, or elimination" within "120 calendar days, of continuous session of Congress." Numerous precedents exist for such review by the Congress. The wilderness bill merely elevates wilderness preservation from the level of administrative policy to that of congressional policy. Administrative responsibility, as the bill clearly states, is left with the executive.

Correction No. 10: Free application of administrative judgment is in no way interfered with. The veto power of the Congress is likely to be put into use only on rare occa-

sions. Only a decision extremely adverse to the national interest in wilderness preservation could be successfully challenged through the process established by the bill. The protection afforded is thus rather an insurance that the free administrative judgment of the land-management agencies will be protected.

Correction No. 11: The implication that the revised bill takes control of their lands away from the Indians is false. The following provisions of the bill attest to this fact:

"Such designation shall not change the title to the land or curtail or take away any authority or power of the tribe over its tribal land. Any proposed addition, modification, or elimination [of Indian lands] shall be made only with the consent of the several tribes or bands through their tribal councils or other duly constituted authorities."

"Nothing in this act shall in any respect abrogate any treaty with any band or tribe of Indians, or in any way modify or otherwise affect existing hunting and fishing rights or privileges."

Correction No. 12: The only references to state and privately owned land are in a section providing that areas acquired by gift or bequest by any Federal agency for preservation as wilderness be included in this system, and also in a provision that the Council may include maps and information regarding such areas in material furnished the public regarding use and preservation of wilderness. It in no way permits the Wilderness Council to take action leading toward addition of any State or private lands to the System.

You and other supporters of the bill have clarified the above misconceptions and misinterpretations before—some of them many times. Yet the Chamber of Commerce of the United States continues to use these arguments against the bill, and our efforts must accordingly continue to combat the error and to advance public understanding of a proposal that we are sure is in the public interest.

Sincerely,

SIGURD F. OLSON, *President*  
National Parks Association

[Reprints of this letter are available from the Sierra Club]



## Second Student Conservation Program

**F**ORTY-SEVEN high school boys, college and graduate men and women will assist the National Park Service in Grand Teton and Olympic National Parks this summer. Although no salaries can be offered, room and board will be provided. Interested students must write immediately for application forms to: Student Conservation Program, 435 East 52nd Street, New York 22.

In Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming, from June 26 to August 23, twelve college students and graduates (minimum age 19 years), single men and women, will work with the Protective, Interpretive, and Engineering Divisions of the park. They will live with Mr. and Mrs. Albert Nelson at their "95 Ranch" near Park Headquarters. Three additional undergraduate or graduate students in natural science will assist on field research problems at the Jackson Hole Biological Research Station, where they will live. Field trips with the other conservation agencies in the area will help explain the complex conservation picture of the region.

Under the guidance of the Park Biologist and Park Naturalist, two graduate men or women, in cooperation with their colleges, will be able to do independent research toward a graduate degree in Olympic National Park, Washington.

From July 7 to July 31, and from August 4 to August 28, two groups of high school boys, 15 years or older, will work in Olym-

pic National Park, Washington. They will construct trails and rehabilitate over-used areas by razing old buildings, and will also spend one week camping in the high country. Mr. and Mrs. Jack Dolstad will be camp and job supervisors. The Dolstads have had considerable experience with youth groups, teaching first aid, mountaineering, and wildlife research.

The Student Conservation Program is sponsored by the National Parks Association (2000 P Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.) in cooperation with many conservation organizations throughout the country, including the Sierra Club. Four Sierra Club members participated in the initial sessions last year in Olympic and Grand Teton National Parks.

---

The formally garbed penguins pictured below will be part of the entertainment at the informal Sierra Club Annual Dinner (Northern Section) on May 3 at the Leamington Hotel in Oakland. Feature of the evening will be the first showing, by club director Will Siri, of the official film of the International Physiological Expedition to Antarctica, in which he participated during 1957. Tickets are \$3.75, from Georgella Perry, 2610 Etna Street, Berkeley 4. Detailed announcement was mailed to all club members.



## Three Sisters Trip

The fifth annual wilderness trail trip conducted by the Friends of the Three Sisters Wilderness, Inc., July 4-6, 1958, will center on a portion of the region rarely visited in recent years—the Lowder Mountain Area. The party will follow the Walker Creek-Tipsoo Butte Trail from the McKenzie South Fork Road, past Tipsoo Lookout and eastward on the Tipsoo-Yankee Mountain Ridge to an excellent camping area with an open view of the high country in nearly every direction. From this point, members of the party will explore, photograph, make scientific observations, and enjoy the wilderness experience.

Trip fee for the three-day trip, including packing of 30 pounds of dunnage, is \$8.50. For further information write Mrs. Doris Sims, 2181 Washington St., Eugene, Ore.

## Machines and Wilderness

One of the articles concerned with the "Where Should Management Stop?" theme of the January *Bulletin* was entitled, "Machines Violate Wilderness Philosophy." One of the machines which the author, Frederick Eissler, singled out as a violator was a tractor (and its 52-inch blade) used by a National Park Service contractor in the Tuolumne Meadows back country of Yosemite.

In all fairness to the National Park Service it should be made clear that the use of a small "cat" for hauling steel bridge beams to replace outworn timber bridges on the Glen Aulin trail was approved by the Directors of the Sierra Club. We appreciate the fact that the Park Service went to considerable trouble to obtain Sierra Club approval of the construction and the use of mechanical haulage, and expressed its willingness to adopt the solution desired by the Board.

The Park Service, in requesting Sierra Club advice, described the tread of the "cat" as 37 inches wide, and of the accompanying dolly, 30 inches wide; no mention of a blade was made in the request. Steel beams were recommended since they would provide a permanent bridge and involve no cutting of prime timber and hauling it to the bridge at seven-year intervals. The Park Service be-

lieved that less scarring and damage would result in the long run. The Directors debated the matter, and the following telegram was sent to Keith Nielson, Yosemite's acting superintendent at the time: "Sierra Club approves steel beams hauled by airborne cat minimal damage meadows and trail."

How extensive was the damage done can only be determined by inspection when the snow melts off this spring. The larger question raised by Fred Eissler's article in the January 1958 *Bulletin*, of whether mechanized vehicles should be allowed on our back-country park trails (except in emergencies) warrants further study by both the Park Service and the Sierra Club.

HAROLD C. BRADLEY

## Details on Tioga Road

John Preston, Superintendent of Yosemite National Park, has given us further word on the surfaced width of the new Tioga highway, planned and under construction to replace the famous Old Mine Road. "In this case the blacktop or asphalt mat on the road will be twenty feet wide. The road shoulders (6 feet total) will be surfaced with a mixture of crushed rock and top soil . . . to provide a growing medium for native grass on the road shoulders. In road construction terminology this is what is referred to as a 'stabilized base native grass shoulder.'"

It is good to learn that the pavement planned will not exceed twenty feet in width—"except on the lower side of the super-elevated curves where the pavement will be carried across the shoulder principally for drainage purposes."

We only wish the gradients and curvatures and the cutting of trees alongside the road were equally conservative! It is difficult to understand why a park road in the wild mountainous back country, to be used only in summer when icing is not a problem, must be laid out in broad sweeping curves and with a grade limit of six per cent. These are the standards which result in speeds much in excess of the 35-mile-per-hour limit established by the Park Service. These too are the standards which require large cuts and fills, and cause heavy scarring of the scene.

HAROLD C. BRADLEY



# Mountain Talk

THE PARTICIPATION of a stocky, 68-year-old gentleman in the first session of last summer's Sierra High Trip is interesting for two reasons. Neither reason is his age, for many in their sixties, and some in their seventies, have accompanied Sierra Club outings into the high country over the years.

Our man's name is Otis McAllister. He is a Californian who has been a teacher of languages in Mexico for four decades. His avocation in that country is the first reason for our interest.

In 1922 Mr. McAllister founded the Club de Exploraciones de Mexico, devoted to mountaineering and exploration.

The club, whose emblem includes "the Water, the Mountain and the Tree," is Mexico's largest and oldest organization of its kind, and Mr. McAllister says it has more ascents to its credit than any other in the country.

He himself, he reports, has climbed 476 peaks and visited every part of Mexico in his endeavor "to uncover all the beauty spots of Nature . . . of which there are no few." His diaries and collection of pictures form a considerable record.

The other reason for our interest is that there was an Otis McAllister, aged 17, with the Sierra Club High Trip of 1906. Last year's sojourner was the very same man, returning after 51 years to "drink again at the deep wellsprings of mountaineering in America, the Sierra Club of California."

Mr. McAllister has copied for us his youthful diary of the 1906 trip. It was the

Sierra Club's second outing to Kings Canyon, which had been visited in 1902. Despite the recent San Francisco earthquake and fire, which disturbed the lives of so many members, 80 Sierrans assembled at Sanger and took the stage for Sequoia Lake, whence they hiked to Cedar Grove.

Marion Randall (later Mrs. Parsons) wrote the *Bulletin* account of the trip, which was led by an Outing Committee composed of William E. Colby, J. N. LeConte and E. T. Parsons. Of course the McAllister diary, scribbled at odd moments by an enthusiastic teen-ager, is no match for that thoughtful essay.

But to one who has also been an enthusiastic teen-ager, mountain-struck, the jerky, sometimes cryptic entries convey a sense of the time, the place, and the opportunity. It is splendid to be young and on your two feet in the wilds, among these great trees and rocks and rushing streams!

It happened that the streams rushed excessively that year. Arriving at Cedar Grove on July 6, the party found the Kings River in flood. Bridges had been swept away, including the main span separating them from their supplies in the camp at Copper Creek. Instead of touring the country many of the men had to do bridge-building, and it was a week before they reached the Copper Creek camp. Water and storm damage, in fact, limited the whole outing.

Yet young Otis McAllister had the time of his life and noted on the 27th, "I wish this was eternity"; Marion Randall wrote, "The unusual conditions gave rise to so many unusual experiences and laughable incidents that we might well thank the tumultuous river for the trouble it thought to cause us."

It is amusing, but also instructive, to look at the old pages. They bridge the half-century, and they explain something of the idea and energy behind the Club de Exploraciones de Mexico—and what brought a man, nearly threescore and ten, to the Evolution country and Muir Pass last July for another drink at the spring.

FRED GUNSKY



## Bulletin Board

• *Marked items urgent; individuals can help*

• **A crucial time is at hand for the Wilderness Bill. Action is expected shortly in the Interior Committees of the Senate (S 1176) and the House of Representatives (HR 500). The future of much of our wildland heritage land may depend on the public's action now.**

S 846, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review, is still on the House calendar, awaiting action.

• **A bill to authorize the purchase of land at El Portal badly needed by the National Park Service is being prepared by Congressman Engle (Calif.). Acquisition of the El Portal area by the Federal government will enable the Service to move structures which are not needed there out of overcrowded and priceless Yosemite Valley. Speedy enactment is vital.**

Recently a number of bills and resolutions have been introduced into Congress for public works programs for the relief of unemployment and "to provide for the restoration of depleted natural resources." Under these bills large appropriations would be authorized for the Park and Forest Services, along with massive increases to the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. In specific appropriations to accommodate overexpenditures Congress has added \$10 million for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam in the Colorado River Storage Project. No plan has yet been approved to assure the protection of Rainbow Bridge.

The House has voted funds for water pollution control. Among other purposes, \$45 million is provided for grants to municipalities to help build sewage disposal plants, the same amount as was voted last year.

The public roads bill (HR 9821) containing billboard control measures, has passed both houses of Congress. This bill establishes a national policy on billboard regulation along the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System, together with an incentive plan for state participation.

• **The President has vetoed the Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill, which included \$1 million for engineering plans for the controversial Bruce's Eddy Dam proposal. Chief Forester McArdle has established the Ancient Bristlecone Pine Forest on White Mountain as a botanical area under Regulation U-4 and has applied for withdrawal of the 27,000 acres from mining entry to protect the oldest known trees.**

Funds amounting to about \$6.5 million annually would be available for acquisition of wetlands as waterfowl areas under S 2617 (Magnuson, Wash.). This bill, suggested by the Fish and Wildlife Service, has passed the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

**Funds of \$7.5 million, voted for California's parks under the 1957 Omnibus Park Act (Chapter 2169, SB 1000), have been made available as an amendment to the 1958 Budget Act.**

A Senate-approved resolution calling for the rerouting of State Highway 89 through D. L. Bliss and Emerald Bay State Parks has died in Assembly Committee. Statements in opposition to the measure were made by Newton Drury, Chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks, DeWitt Nelson, Director of the Department of Natural Resources, and Robert Golden of the Sierra Club.

EDGAR AND PEGGY WAYBURN