

SIERRA

May 1959

C L U B B U L L E T I N



Out of the wilderness and alongside a road?

Dawn at Image Lake

A bird in the hand is a certainty—
but a bird in the bush may sing.

—FRANCIS BRET HARTE

Wallace Stegner on the War over Wilderness

Some Work, Some Play at CTL

SUMMER in the High Sierra is knocking at your door. Open the door and what will you find? Trails winding through pine-scented forests, cool, dark, and friendly; sapphire and emerald lakes set in silver granite, the mirror-like reflection broken only when the wind and ripples play tag across its surface or a trout leaps in a shimmering arc to splash back into its watery home; thunderstorms that come out of a blue sky so that Nature may play for a few hours on cymbals and drums and leave behind a stillness and peace that can be found nowhere else; the small animals darting here and there too busy ever to notice a mere human watching them. All this and more is waiting for you. Discover it!

Have you ever been to Clair Tappaan Lodge during the summer? This is the Sierra Club's lodge on Highway 40, one-and-a-half miles west of Donner Summit. Accommodations include three meals a day and a night's lodging. The lodge provides bunk and mattress, you bring bed roll or sleeping bag. In

COVER: Bill Oberteuffer's Kodachrome catches the classic view of the unspoiled Northern Cascades at dawn, when there is a second Glacier Peak in Image Lake.

The Forest Service proposes to exclude all the foreground from wilderness protection—and also the Suiattle River's living space of virgin forest that lies between the quiet lake and the great peak. The bureau speaks of increased "roadside recreation" that will result from opening the area to logging, and of the "limited few who use it now"—all of which prompted one resident of the Chelan country to write: "I can't help but think that the Forest Service approach is like comparing Beethoven with Elvis Presley and proving it by last year's record sales."

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

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

MONTHLY BULLETIN STAFF

Vivian Schagen	Editor
John P. Schagen	Associate Editor
Doris Brown	Dorothy Otto
Fred Gunsky	Dan L. Thrapp
Charlotte E. Mauk	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.

order to keep the lodge neat, clean, and inexpensive each person is asked to sign the work sheet which obligates him to about a half-hour a day at one of our housekeeping tasks: sweeping, dishwashing, helping the cook, or setting tables. To help you find your way around is our staff, which includes Manager Keith Lummis, Chef Diane Clayton, Assistant Manager Jerry Fischer, and Work Party Supervisor John Schneider.

About half of you will be coming to Clair Tappaan for the recreation of hiking, horseback riding, swimming, water skiing, or just plain sunbathing. The other half of you will be wanting an outlet for your creative (building) talents, and for these we have a number of fascinating projects. The most important one right now is the expansion of the library and recreational area with the dormitory and bathroom facilities above it. We are gradually covering splintery old floors with maple hardwood flooring. We plan to redevelop and improve the outdoor recreational area. Mechanical improvements will be made to the rope tow. The week end is free to those participating in work parties, and not only that: drivers of cars receive

Letters

Sierra Club:

I agree with "A Member" in the March issue, who advocated the use of advertising space in *Life* or some other well-known magazine, by us. It seems to me that in many cases where gaining public opinion depends somewhat on propaganda, the less desirable side of the argument, using every means at its disposal to enlist public sentiment while the other side does less, wins the day.

Even some pro-conservation advertising by other agencies—such as the Smoky Bear billboards—really isn't fulfilling its purpose. If I saw a billboard trying to put something across, drawn like an animated cartoon and geared to pre-school intelligence level, I don't think I would be induced to join that side of the argument. We ought to have intelligent conservation advertising.

I think the Sierra Club ought to rent advertising space in some well-known magazine such as *Life* or *The Saturday Evening Post*, and then put out an advertisement that would really get the point across. For instance, the picture series in the 1958 *Sierra Club Bulletin* annual has extremely well worded captions, and the pictures are well chosen. The trouble is that they reach only an audience which is (I hope!) already conservationist. I know they wouldn't be suitable for a magazine advertisement, but the idea is there.

This would all cost money. I would certainly contribute to a fund to subsidize the movement, if I had some assurance that the money would be well spent.

VIVIAN MENDENHALL
Pasadena, California

monetary credit for transporting work party participants to the lodge. Well, all is not work. We drop our hammers and paint brushes at about 3:30 in the afternoon and head for the lakes and the hills. And we will continue the old tradition of outdoor barbecue on Saturday night. There are movies and plenty of folk-dancing, and the world's most reasonable baby-sitter service.

For information or reservations, write Keith Lummis, Clair Tappaan Lodge, Norden, California.

ROBERTA CODIS

Convention News

Clair Tappaan Lodge will be the scene of the 1959 convention of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs over the Labor Day week end, with the Sierra Club as host. Representatives of the more than thirty member clubs of the Federation will meet for discussion of conservation matters, and to take advantage of the recreation opportunities described above after business sessions. Registration will be handled by Ramona Wascher, 2741 Clay Street, San Francisco 15.

Sierra Club:

I am writing to ask whether an error has not been committed respecting an illustration on page 19 of the February *Bulletin*. Should not the person pictured with Mrs. Kanawyer and Professor Le Conte be Mr. Kanawyer and not Poly Kanawyer? I was in the Kings Canyon in 1908 and remember both Mrs. and Mr. Kanawyer well. In fact, because I had a slow horse, Poly put me on his beautiful sorrel mare and I rode the mare down and all the way in from Horse Corral Meadows. I'm certain the person designated is Mr. Kanawyer.

ROBERT S. HOLDEN
Napa, California

Sierra Club:

My congratulations on the expanded and colorful new *Bulletin*. I find my file is becoming increasingly valuable as a resource file on conservation.

Your February *Bulletin* contained a picture of Napoleon (better known as Poly) Kanawyer. One of his cousins is active with me at Lakeside Presbyterian Church. Wendell Kanawyer is very interested in knowing if it is possible to get a copy of the picture. He tells me many tales of Camp Kanawyer, its hotel and lost landmarks.

JOHN L. DANNER
San Francisco

- Conversations with Dr. Wendell Kanawyer have established the fact that both generations of Kanawyers were named Napoleon, or "Poly."



Where We Can Go From Here

Opportunities Unlimited: Funds Come First

In response to questions about the raising of funds for conservation education, the executive director has prepared a summary of ideas that is presented to you herewith.

What the article talks about may lead to discomfort; it is disquieting to think about all the things we should be doing more about unless we use Howard Zahniser's philosophy: "Think of all the wonderful opportunities that lie ahead of us!"

Don't be alarmed by length alone. Put a check by the items we are already progressing in, that are already work-in-progress, and you may be able to conclude that the program is actually within our grasp if we bring fresh thinking to it, if we think about where we should go for help in the things we want to do, and not about where we should cut the program because the money doesn't walk in our door.

Introduction

The Need—The conservation movement, and particularly our special concern for preservation, is growing and vigorous, but not enough. The pressures on the places the Sierra Club needs to be working for are growing faster than our ability to cope with them. On every side we can see that more should be done than we are now able to do. We should have put more steam behind the Wilderness Bill, Northern Cascades, Dana-Minarets, Kern Plateau, to name a few of our own special obligations, and more coöperative effort on pesticide control, pollution abatement, and so on.

There will always be more to do than we can do. But there is so much to be done that no one is doing, and our own coöperative set-up is so strong within our volunteer ranks, and time is running out so fast in so many places—for all these reasons and more we should strive to close the gap between what we do and what needs doing.

Our Potential—The Sierra Club is organizationally unique in its gathering together of people who, because they know the values they are trying to preserve first-hand, are willing to volunteer substantial time and talent to the preservation program.

There will be more members. Membership has trebled in the two past decades which

include the World War II hiatus. We have grown 100 per cent in the last seven years. We can expect a membership of 25,000 by 1956. Our net worth will probably exceed a full million before then (it has more than doubled in the past five years). Our annual conservation-program budget has risen from \$5,000 in 1952 to \$30,000 in 1958 (from 5 per cent of the budget to 28 per cent), and may therefore rise to \$60,000 by 1970. Our outing program capacity, for summer wilderness trips, could probably expand from 1800 per year to 4,000 or 5,000, the geographical scope including the Quetico-Superior and Alaska. All this assumes a continuation of the present growth rate.

However, normal growth does not seem likely to enable us to meet our destiny halfway. Too much will have been lost that we have the skill to prevent losing, but for which we do not have the program or manpower or finances, now. We need more money.

We need more foundation support, more philanthropic support than we are now getting. We have the volunteer board and committee members to govern the program this broader support would make possible. We have volunteers to do a great deal of it. We know how to organize staff to do what volunteers, owing to other demands, have not the time to do. We do not have enough staff or facilities. Additional support can help provide them.

Today philanthropic support concentrates heavily on educational institutions and health and medicine. A small amount goes to the arts. Very little goes to conservation,

and most of that is concentrated on the aspect of conservation we are least concerned with—the ordered utilization and using up of commodity resources.

Our basis for attracting further support is about as follows:

1. We are a going organization of long standing, recipients of substantial support in the past, and wise users of that support.
2. Our present and potential program is strong; many elements can be far more effective if tied with blue ribbon instead of with shoestring.
3. This type of program is receiving too little philanthropic support.

Most of what follows is concerned with what our program is and which of its elements need shoring up. There are examples included of what could be added to the program, or in any event very much needs to be added to some conservation program *some-where*.

This is not an effort to dream up make-work projects for the purpose of filling pieces of paper with impressive lists. Rather, it is a picture, roughly sketched, of a conservation vacuum. Nature abhors vacuums. We can and should share the abhorrence.

Projects in Conservation Education

There are many projects in this field in which we have served merely as catalysts. It is good for us to be catalysts when we can be. The one drawback is that no one knows the good we, as an organization, have done. There are also opportunities for us to supply the nail for the want of which the shoe may otherwise be lost.

In the categories below most of the items would bear our name as producers, co-publishers, or sponsors. Categories are not listed by priority, nor are the items within them.

News and Abstract Service—There is great need for a conservation news service originating in the West. William J. Losh has outlined what it could do and could direct the preparation of it. He does not have the time to volunteer to carry it out. An Infor-

(Continued on page 12)

WILLIAM H. WRIGHT

Dr. William H. Wright, Honorary Vice-President of the Sierra Club since 1936, and a Director of the club from 1925 to 1931, died in San Jose on May 17 at the age of 87. He was director of Lick Observatory until his retirement in 1942. A world-famed astronomer, his discoveries in the field of infra-red photography led to the first clear pictures of the planet Mars, and enabled him to photograph Yosemite Valley from Mount Hamilton, an astounding feat of the early 1920's.

Left: U. S. Forest Service photo of a sheep driveway on the Cache National Forest, Utah.
By Paul Bieler, 1941.



Right: The Triplets, just above Cascade Pass, in Washington.
By Tom M.

Wallace Stegner

The WAR BETWEEN the ROUGH RIDERS and

IT USED TO BE that when so-called "resource-development" interests undertook one of their raids against the public lands, Bernard DeVoto would appear like the Lone Ranger, trail the villains, and end by yanking out their shirt-tails and setting fire to them. If he were alive now, as God knows I wish he were, he would be warming up his blowtorch, not because what he used to call Two-Gun Desmond is shooting up the town again but because conservationists are moving to make at least part of the public domain permanently safe from raids. There comes a time in every horse opera, as Mr. DeVoto knew, when the Better Element sets out to clean up the Territory.

At issue in 1959 is the National Wilderness Preservation Bill (S. 1123, Senators Humphrey *et al.*, and H. R. 1960, Reps. Saylor *et al.*) which would establish on federally owned land a system of wilderness areas that could not be broken up without the consent of Congress. A wilderness is defined by the Senate bill as "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." Here man's travels would leave only trails. Two-Gun Desmond—quite aside from the fact that such a sentiment profoundly puzzles him—is opposed: *his* travels characteristically leave overgrazed ranges, erosion gulleys, ruined watersheds, muddy streams, gravel-choked creek beds, stumps, bulldozer tracks, and other signs of Progress.

On the face of it, Desmond's concern is odd, since the lands in

question would seem already out of his reach. All the wilderness proposed by S. 1123 is already in wilderness status: 22,000,000 acres in national parks and monuments of a "primeval" kind; 14,000,000 acres in 80 primitive, roadless, wild, or wilderness areas within the national forests; and nearly 14,000,000 in wildlife refuges and ranges. In addition there are between 4 and 5 million acres in Indian reservations which are managed as wilderness by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; these would become part of the Wilderness System only by the consent of the tribes which own them. Of the potential total of around 55,000,000 acres, 15,000,000 are in Alaska and 246,000 in Hawaii; the bulk of the rest is in the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Coast states.

No new agency would be created by the Wilderness Bill. Administration would remain, for the forest lands, with the Department of Agriculture, and for the park, wildlife, and Indian lands with the Department of Interior. Unchanged would be the National Park Service's difficult duty to conserve its scenery unimpaired and at the same time to provide for its use by millions. Unchanged, except to be written into law, would be the Forest Service's unwritten policy of multiple use. But within the wilderness sections of either forests or parks, no use that destroyed the wilderness character would be permitted. No resorts, ski lifts, installations, dams. No roads except the essential fire roads and minimum access roads to private

Director of the Creative Writing Center at Stanford University and one of the nation's foremost writers, Wallace Stegner has been a member of the Sierra Club since 1948. He was elected an Honorary Life Member in 1955 for his contribution to the book, *This Is Dinosaur*.

On the jacket of Stegner's remarkable book, *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian*, Edward Weeks wrote: "What makes Wallace Stegner a major writer is the integrity of the writing, the freshness of the Americana, and the ever-deepening sympathy which one feels for his characters." Sympathy will not deepen for all the characters Stegner describes here.



the BIRD WATCHERS

property landlocked by the reservations. No timber cutting or mining. Grazing, motor boat, and landing field rights, where they now exist, would continue as nonconforming uses.

These rescued remnants of our once-magnificent wilderness would "serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservational, and historical use and enjoyment in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment *as wilderness*," and they are conceived by the bill's sponsors as being "for the permanent good of the whole people." To insure that the people can keep an eye on their property, and to back up the bureaus charged with the administration of wilderness policy, the bill would create an unpaid advisory National Wilderness Preservation Council composed of the Secretaries of the Interior and of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian, and three "informed" and "interested" private citizens. Two-Gun Desmond, because he thinks conservation prevents the "development" of the West, or because he feels that whatever is good for him or his industry is good for the public, or because he despises all federal control of the public lands—which he generally wants "returned" to the states, which never owned them—is as opposed to the Council as to the wilderness it would be out to protect.

Actually he is now on the defensive against a conservation movement that is powerful, bipartisan, and widespread, and that no longer conceives itself to be fighting a hopeless rear-

guard action against forces of population and development that will eventually overrun the whole continent. Nevertheless Desmond and his friends have managed to stall wilderness legislation through two sessions of Congress, and are working to stall it permanently.

AN EARLIER Wilderness Bill, S. 1176, introduced in the first session of the 85th Congress by Senator Humphrey and others, encountered both substantive and procedural objections, even among some people and agencies friendly to the bill's intentions. After hearings in both House and Senate, and after careful revision, it was reintroduced in the second session as S. 4028, again with a potent list of co-sponsors including Senators Humphrey, Neuberger, Douglas, Morse, and others. It never reached the floor, but it had another airing before the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs on July 23, 1958; and when it appeared that both proponents and opponents would welcome field hearings in the West, those hearings were scheduled for Bend, Oregon on November 7, San Francisco on November 10, Salt Lake City on November 12, and Albuquerque on November 14, 1958. Presiding at Bend and San Francisco was Senator Neuberger, at Salt Lake City, Senator Murray, and at Albuquerque, Senator Anderson. [Sub-



The marks of Desmond's travels—

(1) Cull logs on tree farm, White River approach to Mount Rainier, 1958. By John Warth. (2) Range badly depleted by overgrazing, Tonto National Forest, New Mexico. U. S. Forest Service photo by Rex King, 1945. (3) Mark of a disrupted watershed. Channel in alluvial fan, including mudflow of 1919, Sevier River, Utah. U. S. Forest Service photo by A. R. Croft, 1936.



sequently Senator Jackson presided over a hearing in Seattle on March 30 and 31, 1959 and Senator Goldwater in Phoenix on April 2.—ED.]

It would be pleasant to report that the hearings were dramatic and vital, and that like ex-Senator (then Congressman) Barrett's "Wild West Show" of 1947 they resulted in a clear-cut triumph of light over darkness. No such luck. The hearings were, like most hearings, pretty dull, with only a spat between witnesses at Albuquerque to enliven them, and they produced no dramatic shifting from one side to the other. I attended only the one in San Francisco, but I do not feel that I have been deprived. The forces in support and opposition have been clear ever since the hearings on the original S. 1176 in June, 1957. The transcript of that hearing runs to 444 pages, that of the July 23 hearing on S. 4028 to 218. The full transcript of the four western hearings, not yet available, will run to another thousand more. Only a devoted partisan is likely to read them. I have seen witness lists and partial transcripts of them all, and read most of the written statements submitted for the record. Some witnesses, especially those favoring the bill, represented only themselves; but most on both sides represented organizations or said they did, and many of the organizations and some of the individuals were present at more than one hearing—some at all four. The lineups are hauntingly familiar.

Present and vocal in support were representatives of the National Wildlife Federation, Trustees for Conservation, the Izaak Walton League, the Wilderness Society, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, and many local outdoor clubs. Present and statistical in opposition were the stockmen's associations, the mining associations, the lumber and pulpwood associations, the oil and gas associations, the reclamation associations, the National Forest Recreation Association (resorts), and the chambers of commerce.

Those same lineups had faced each other in 1947 when Congressman Barrett led his filibuster westward in an attempt to grab for a few stockmen great chunks of the public domain. In 1951 (and every year since) they disputed the Forest Service's right to reduce the numbers of stock on forest ranges. In 1953 they fought over the tidelands and public lands policy in general. In 1954 and 1955 they banged heads over the attempt to build Echo Park dam in Dinosaur National Monument and thus breach the protective wall around the national parks. In 1957 they tangled over the proposal to reduce the Three Sisters Wilderness Area in northern Washington. The opponents knew each other to their inmost viscera, and their arguments were largely predictable in advance.

So, though the western hearings were judicial, with none of Congressman Barrett's virulence, with no stacked meetings or overprivileged witnesses, they were hardly meetings in which either the Committee or the opposed forces learned anything. They were sounding boards for rival philosophies, a means of bringing government closer to the people and publicizing an issue upon which there were deep and even acrimonious disagreements. These hearings, a somewhat cynical observer might have said, were four more rounds in the sixth or seventh rematch between old enemies. In this corner, wearing black guns,

the rough riders with their seconds, the state politicians; in this, wearing knapsacks and binoculars, the bird watchers.

Over the years the despised bird watchers have won more rounds than they have lost (their principal losses were on the equivocal tidelands and on the reduction of the Three Sisters Wilderness), but as their organized strength has grown, so has the nation's population and the pressures on the public lands both for resources and for mass recreation. And the bird watchers had a few years of evidence of what one such Secretary of Interior as Douglas McKay could do to conservation policies more than half a century old. The national parks are protected to a degree by the National Park Act of 1916, though the protection does not extend to the dangers incident on growing population and the need to develop more and more public accommodations. But the Forest Service has no such legislative armor; its primitive and wilderness areas were the creation only of a farsighted bureau policy; they are founded only on an administrative order and could be undone by another order. Under a Secretary so inclined, any Forest Service wilderness could be thrown back overnight into the multiple-use, timber-cropping, resort-permitting status of the other 92 per cent of the national forests—a status desirable for the 92 per cent but fatal for the precious remnant. Even without change of rules, a national forest like a zoned suburb can be whittled away by variances and extensions of the permit system.

THAT WAS the urgency behind the move to protect remaining primeval lands by congressional action. Farther back, as far back as Roosevelt and Pinchot, Powell and McGee, was the beginning of our growing consciousness that much was already lost; that uncontrolled gutting of resources, especially in the West, left ruined land that could never in ten lifetimes be brought back; that wilderness once spoiled was gone forever; and that wilderness for a half dozen reasons was important. All of our forest reserves, national parks and monuments, wildlife refuges, stem from the official and unofficial strenuousness of those bird watchers, sentimentalists, old ladies, backpackers, and barefoot nature lovers whom Secretary McKay lumped under the name of "punks." All of our eroded watersheds, blasted timberlands, and dust-bowl ranges were presented to us in fee simple by Two-Gun Desmond's grandfather. The reason Desmond fights the Wilderness Bill even though the lands it would reserve are already reserved is that he hopes sometime he can un-reserve them, and an administrative order is a whole lot easier to break down than an act of Congress.

It is interesting to listen to him as he testifies.

He is always a friend to wilderness, and likes to see it protected. But this bill would reserve far too much of it. And why does it all have to be set aside in the West, thereby locking up the resources on which the West must depend for its payrolls and its growth? And is there justice in a bill that would restrict the livelihood of present permittees and permittees as yet unborn? And any wilderness area, roadless and full of campers, is more in danger from fire and pests than regions more accessible. And prohibiting dams in the high country where most



More marks by Desmond—

(1) Drawdown at Cle Elum reservoir, Washington. Photo by David Simons. (2) "Roadside recreation"—a picnic table overlooking clear-cut forest on approach to Mount Rainier. By John Warth, 1959. (3) Recreation cut in a once-beautiful forest of virgin Jeffrey pine, near Deadman Summit. By John Haddaway, c. 1954.





Glacier Peak from Miner's Ridge, Northern Cascades.

By Philip Hyde, 1956.

Desmond would love to clear-cut the forest to help "roadside recreation" and "make the wilderness more accessible."

wilderness lies would seriously hamper water-development plans for all the western states. And stopping all timber cutting would interfere with watershed control and the scientific increasing of the run-off.

There are answers to these, and they were patiently put forward at every hearing. There is *not* too much wilderness; at the maximum extension of the Wilderness Preservation System it would incorporate only 2.2 per cent of our land area, and that is a small enough reserve against present and future pinching. The population of the United States in the year 2000 may be 400 million, and our supply of every resource, including fresh air and living space, will be chillingly smaller. Moreover, almost all the proposed wilderness is in the West and Alaska because those are the only places any is left, and it is there only because up to now it has been protected from Desmond by certain high-minded and farsighted federal bureaus in the interest of the public at large, including the public of Desmond's own state. What resources there may be in the wilderness areas—and they don't amount to much—are already "locked up"—that is, they are preserved for the future, with keys for the future to use in case it needs to unlock them. The losses to the western states because of the withheld lands and their resources are more than made up by in-lieu funds, federal road assistance, kickbacks to states and counties from mineral leases, and in other ingenious ways that Desmond always forgets to remember. As to fire hazards in the wildernesses, Edward Crafts, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, has testified that with smoke jumpers and other modern fire-fighting methods, the danger of fires in remote areas can be met. And only a small number of wilderness fires are caused by campers: most are caused by lightning. As for watersheds, wilderness is their best defender. From wilderness come few dirty streams to silt up dams lower down; out of it do come steadier and more dependable water supplies; on it lies a less vulnerable snow-pack. The watershed control by timber cutting which is currently an object of research by the Forest Service does indeed produce more run-off; trees that are not there cannot transpire moisture or intercept and evaporate snow. But they can't

create, either, the sponge of duff, soil, and the web of living roots that are the abiding essence of a forest watershed, and the long-range effects of timber cutting cannot be predicted. Powell's Report on the Lands of the Arid Region in 1879 commented on the increase of stream-flow that followed settlement in the mountain states; but it would be a rash man who would say that a hundred years of settlement have improved the watersheds there. The Desmonds, as represented by Mr. Bob Steiling of the Wyoming Natural Resources Board, are full of enthusiasm for the timber-cutting method of watershed control.

BUT WHAT elevates Desmond's testimony above the level of high comedy, which inspires thoughtful laughter, and into the realm of farce, which elicits horse laughs, is his sudden, touching affection for the Forest Service and its principle of multiple use. The opposition to the Wilderness Bill has its eye primarily on the national forest wildernesses, for only in the national forests is there any appreciable logging, grazing, or mining allowed. Only there is there a fair chance of breaking down protective measures and getting unlimited access by the states or—which is the same thing essentially—by the stock, timber, oil, and mining interests of the states. For these reasons Desmond has been fighting the Forest Service tooth, claw and rock for fifty years or more. Congressman Barrett's hearings in 1947 let loose against that poor bureau such vituperation, hatred, venom, vilification, and misstatement that even some western papers protested. And now behold, the lion has lain down with the lamb.

For look: an outrageous violation of fixed policy! Here is a proposal to turn over a to few thousand backpackers, for their exclusive use, 55 million acres of the public domain. Here is a bill that would yield a princely domain to a noisy minority, a little bunch of selfish eccentrics, while forever excluding the honest cowboy, miner, and lumberjack.

Further, the proposed National Wilderness Preservation

"Devastated forest land surrounding Abernathy lookout tower near
Ryderwood, Washington. This area once was covered by
magnificent stand of Douglas fir and was clear cut using high level
logging by the Long Bell Lumber Company. Repeated fires after
logging have made this area practically a wasteland.
Cowlitz County, Washington. Taken by L. J. Prater—Sept. 1947.

Forest Service legend, U.S.F.S. photo.

Desmond would hate to pay good money to restock such area
as long as there is still timber and pulp to be taken
from wilderness forests.

Council would be one more bureau to break the back of the bureau-ridden West and bury the eleven public lands states deeper in colonial dependency. Why should the West be owned more than fifty per cent by the federal government, and run by absentee landlords? And if we must have bureaus, then what is the matter with that noble outfit, the Forest Service, which has done such a magnificent job up to now? What has it done that it should have an overriding council created to spy on it? Fie, for shame.

This is a fascinating speech. I was more fascinated each time I heard it. It says, in effect, that we oilmen, lumbermen, cowmen, sheepmen, and chambers of commerce must rally to the defense of the Forest Service against the base charge that it is no longer capable of protecting its forests against us.

The multiple-use and crown-colony arguments, related but not entirely compatible, may be answered together. The answer to the first is that under the Wilderness Bill the wilderness areas would still enjoy multiple use, if the word "multiple" implies, as I think it does, more than two. The customary uses of any national forest, in order of their practical importance, are watershed protection, recreation, conservation, selective logging, grazing, and mining. To these must be added some "impractical" uses. A forest, and most especially a wilderness forest, is a vast research laboratory, a vast schoolroom, a vast non-denominational church. These functions are a good deal less trivial than the resources of timber, minerals, and grass that may be locked up. But a succession of biologists, scholars, and nature lovers who testified to these values of wilderness brought indulgent smiles to the faces of the rough riders at the meetings.

To Desmond, multiple use has always meant *my* use, and it has been the Forest Service's administration of a true multiple use policy that has made it so many enemies in the entrepreneurial West. It does not, apparently, signify to Desmond that any wilderness, under the Wilderness Bill, would still be protecting watersheds, providing healthy recreation to hikers,

campers, climbers, fishermen, and hunters, providing a habitat for many species of wildlife, offering in its ecological islands invaluable facilities for research, preserving an incomparable outdoor schoolroom, and giving a spiritual refuge to people harried and driven by the civilization men have created. No matter: if it doesn't have grazing, lumbering, and mining, it isn't multiple use. It is all recreation, and pretty silly recreation at that.

AND NOW THE CRY that the West is the plaything of absentee bureaucrats. Listen to ex-Senator Watkins of Utah, who until his defeat in the last election was one of the bitter antagonists of the Wilderness Bill and probably still is. He is speaking at the Senate Committee hearing of July 23, 1958.

In the States where much of the pressure for this legislation is coming from, Federal ownership of land is almost negligible. These States control their lands and their resources and, sometimes, exhibit little concern for the crown colonies in the West. Sometimes it seems that our neighbors in the East and South would like to hamstring economic development in the West, leaving this vast area as a playground, and an undisturbed national playground . . . Paradoxically, the West also is where the great bulk of our already reserved wilderness is located. Many States of the East and South have eliminated their wilderness and lost public access to their lakes and to their seashore. Now they become concerned about wilderness preservation, not in their own back yard where the need is apparent and urgent, but way out West where the buffaloes roam and the deer and the antelope play. While it may come as a surprise to some of the wilderness-loving city slickers of the East that we in the West love the wilderness too . . . Out our way millions of acres are already quite adequately preserved and reserved in the wilderness state, and probably always will be, because nature has made it that way . . . May I interpolate here that I have flown over a great part of the United States, and I have been greatly impressed with the vast amount of acreage in the East, in the Midwest, and in the South which is not already occupied for some proper, useful purpose. A lot of areas in the East and in the South can be put into wilderness reserves . . .



If he had worked at it a month, Mr. Watkins could not have incorporated into two paragraphs a more representative list of the hostilities, misconceptions, and lamentable myopias that befall the wilderness issue. In the first place he hasn't the slightest conception of what a wilderness is; it is evidently a place with grass and trees on it, or a place where you can get down to the seashore, or a 160-acre county park. He thinks the East and South should get busy and create some and set it aside. He thinks that millions of acres out his way are "quite adequately" reserved as wilderness and "probably always will be because nature made it that way." For the record, apart from national parks and monuments there is one wilderness area reserved in Utah, the High Uintahs Primitive Area, and it contains 240,717 acres. It is not reserved because nature made it that way, but because a Forest Service order made it that way. And it is not adequately reserved, because another order—under promptings from people like Mr. Watkins—could unmake it. One should recall, too, that a few years ago Mr. Watkins himself was fighting to unmake the Dinosaur National Monument wilderness.

In his bitterness at what he calls crown-colony status, Mr. Watkins expresses a characteristic attitude of western business, especially resource business. He resents federal ownership of the public lands and makes the usual assumption that they should properly be handed over to the states. He forgets that they remain federal property because decades of land laws assisted by monumental graft could not dispose of them; he forgets that if the states had not renounced title to them upon entering the Union they would have been stuck with them, and with an absolutely impossible job of management. For this is the arid West he is speaking of, and in the arid West the abuse of land has immediate and catastrophic consequences, and the characteristic western users of land have known how to do nothing but abuse it for quick profit.

Mr. Watkins hates it that Utah should be a "playground" for eastern city slickers. But does he, and does the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce who echoes him, want those city slickers to stay home? Does he really? It is true that Utah, like any other western state, depends on its natural resources for its economic stability. But the few resources, mainly timber and grass, in the High Uintahs Primitive Area would not tip the balance much either way, except as the area, preserved as wilderness, draws a continuing stream of fishermen, campers, and hunters—many of them city slickers from out of state who can be soaked with a high fee for a deer tag. It may well turn out that in the long haul one of Utah's most productive and profitable resources will prove to be its incomparable scenery, much of which, by now, an amiable Uncle Sam has set aside and is taking care of in the public interest.

I love ex-Senator Watkins' state, but not his state of mind. He speaks narrowly and parochially and irritably; he suffers from a characteristic Utah xenophobia; he suspects eastern slickers of manipulating his state's interests, just as he suspects that villains in California fought the Echo Park Dam because they want to steal Utah's water. Unhappily, his state of mind is not uncommon in the Rockies.



Yet if it had not been for federal ownership and control in the arid West, even more of the West than has already gone would have blown eastward toward the Missouri. There would be more stripped and dangerous hillsides, there would have been more frequent and more disastrous floods. Game would be scarcer because its habitat would have been partly destroyed. The streams would be roily far longer past the opening of trout season. The West's roads would be worse because the states would have had to build them themselves. And as for payrolls, those who say the West depends entirely on resource industries forget how vast, in the aggregate, is the federal payroll in all the public lands states.

It is not a persuasive argument that Mr. Watkins permits himself. For the resource industries and the chambers of commerce have consistently screamed about crown-colony status when times were good, and hollered for federal rescue when things went bad. Between times they trade the South peanuts for sugar, flood control for reclamation. In many ways the mountain states are not unlike the South; they evince a persistent, acrimonious lust after states' rights, which in the West are inextricable from natural resources and the public lands. Mountain West and South are alike too in the possession of a regional guilt and a tendency, under criticism, to embrace it as a moral crusade. If the South had black slavery, the West has had its crimes against the land. And the effects of that criminal and ignorant disregard of consequences would have been even worse if the states' rights argument had ever fully succeeded.

USING ANY STICK to beat the dog with, the anti-Wilderness Bill people suggest that everything be tabled until the findings are in from the National Outdoor Recreation Resources

commission authorized by Public Law 85-470. The argument goes that because the commission's investigations would involve the forests and their wilderness areas as well as the city, county, state, national, and private parks, monuments, and recreational areas, we should wait to see if we need any wilderness at all. But the wildernesses are already wildernesses; they are simply not yet a system, and not yet protected by federal law. The Wilderness Bill would change the recreational picture not at all. And anyway, this tabling proposal is another stall, and another attempt to suggest that the sole purpose of wilderness reserves is recreation.

Which it is not. At present there are only two places in the United States, outside of Alaska, where you can walk and be more than ten miles from any road. Even one of those the California Highway Commission seems to want to split in two by a trans-Sierra highway. We have arrived, moreover, at the point where an exploding population threatens to overrun the continent and the planet. The population of California, which passed 15,000,000 a few months ago, will be twice that in two decades. The thirty or forty thousand people who jam Yosemite Valley's eight-square-mile floor on a peak summer day may be twice that many even sooner. The millions of cars on the roads will be tens of millions. A nervous man might even fear for the carbon cycle: we may need our wilderness for making oxygen.

Carbon cycle or not, there is no alternative to preserving the wilderness that we still have, and since much of it is in federal ownership there is no agency but the United States Government that can and will do it. The nature lovers who testified to the spiritual value of nature unmodified and unspoiled by man, and who drew smiles from the rough riders at the hearings, were

not talking nonsense. In the long run they were not being impractical. They were speaking of something absolutely vital to many of us now, and something that will be three times as necessary to our grandchildren. Their concern was not a selfish attempt to grab off a special and exclusive form of recreation, but the abiding concern of thinking and feeling people to preserve what helps keep men human, to save our contact with the nature of which we are a part.

THE ROUGH RIDERS have never exercised themselves overmuch about the future, or about any considerations except economic ones. They don't conceive that they owe the future anything, and neither did their grandfathers: hence the half-ruined natural endowment of the West that we have inherited. What agitates the bird watchers is something that the rough riders cannot even comprehend; it is the absolute reverse of narrow self-interest; it is the hope that by work and by renunciations today they may give their children and coming generations, in their coming age of steel and concrete and plastic and crowding and the accumulating carbon compounds of human and automotive waste, some humble notion of what it is to be a man, an evolved mammal, part of the natural world.

If the Wilderness Bill loses or is stalled again in committee, the nation will have lost, the West will have lost, the future will have lost. In spite of former Senator Watkins's feeling that we ought to help establish a few wildernesses in other parts of the country and let the West get on with its lumbering and mining, it has never been man's gift to make wildernesses. But he can make deserts, and has.

Upper left: Western wilderness.
By Cedric Wright.
There is no more where this came from.



Right: "Sheep range. Badly overgrazed.
Montana. Taken by D. Swan—
September 1946."
U. S. Forest Service photo.

Desmond still uses the formula man
discovered for making desert in the
Middle East.

Funds (from Page 3)

mation and Education man on the staff could include this among other duties. A file on the project is on hand, prepared for the Executive Committee at the time it was authorized.

Probably still more important, and more difficult to produce, is a conservation abstract service—a condensed Reader's Digest on conservation, covering the journals in the field and the articles that appear in the popular press as well. Under the late Professor Samuel C. May the Bureau of Public Administration, on the Berkeley campus, developed a good format. There is nothing close enough to it in the field. The Natural Resources Council has its Legislative News Service (covering the Congressional Record and the Calendar) and the newer Executive Branch edition, to cover the Federal Register and intelligence developed within the federal departments. But this is bound to be undercovered with an understaff which is underpaid and underfinanced.

The need is for a full-time position, with facilities to match. There is good possibility that the service could be largely self-supporting once it got under way on a pilot basis for perhaps three years. It would go to selected organizations, press, periodicals, radio and TV editors.

This is eminently well worth careful outlining as a project and presentation for major support.

Films—We have some films completed and several projects under way. An I & E man on the staff could help build their distribution. We have hardly begun to exploit our opportunities to get other organizations to help us.

For example, we have sold a copy of "Wilderness Alps" to the State Department of Education. The department should have more than one—and so should other states. One has gone to public schools in Fresno, another to Des Moines. Libraries in Kennebec, Washington, and Wichita, Kansas, have purchased copies—*without solicitation*. We are missing a tremendous potential.

Another example: The Appalachian Mountain Club bought a copy and immediately worked for and has scheduled a TV showing; so did the North Cascades Conservation Council. We haven't even scouted out how to do it. An I & E staff would help enormously.

"Wilderness Alps of Stehekin" was made possible largely owing to the gift by Abigail Avery of \$2,500. We eked some money out of the Film Reserve, the Conservation and Memorial Fund, the conservation budget, and from sales of copies to help meet the total cost. Altogether there are now more than 50 copies. The total cost will exceed \$9,000, much of it recoverable.

"Two Yosemite" has been quite effective as far as it has gone. Upon hearing that there were six copies, Conrad Wirth said there should be 600. We have stretched our budget to the limit to get what we have and we could use assistance. Given a staff with time, we might also try to sell some to other organizations as we did with "Wilderness River Trail" and "Wilderness Alps." More help needed.

"Two Forests" is nascent. It, like "Two Yosemite," would be a 10-minute low-budget short underlining the difference between commercial forest and wilderness forest—and the importance of letting the latter alone and not mixing up the two. We probably have enough footage on hand in our "stock library," largely a by-product of "Wilderness Alps."



"Two Roads" is another 10-minute short for which we probably have enough footage. It would have as a theme the approach to the parks and would attempt dramatically to point out why the Sierra Club developed and urges its *Policy for National Park Road Standards*.

"Your Natural Heritage" is a film on regional-park natural areas by Professor Robert C. Stebbins, brought so far to a magnetic-print stage with no Sierra Club help other than volunteered advice. It is an important film, important in taking the public by easy stages to an appreciation of wilderness, easy stages by a familiar route. The Nature Conservancy has also encouraged him in this, as well as the Regional Parks Association and the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology (informally). The club could well seek funds to further this as a co-sponsor.

"The Meadow" is the working title of a film, footage for which was shot in 1946, 1947 and 1948. The Visual Education Committee has had three separate editors try a hand at making something of the footage, but so far nothing has come of it. The film should tell of our outing program in Sierra wilderness.

"The Sierra Club" is a film the Council has urged and the Board has approved as a project to proceed with "deliberate speed." Walter Ward has the project started, but only funds can finish it. This is a film for which we should probably not expect financial support from outside the club budget or club membership.

"No Room for Wilderness"—what overpopulation does to the land and the people—is the tentative working title of Professor

Stebbins's current film project in the course of his sabbatical in Africa. Some help has already come for this from the Conservation Foundation. Other help will be needed, and our offices can serve this purpose well. This may be the most important single effort the club has ever assisted.

"Ski Touring" was proposed years ago and Joel Hildebrand wrote the brief of a scenario. It could well move soon, what with the greater number of touring huts we now have.

"Mountaineering" has a script by Will Siri and a modest expenditure was authorized but lapsed because it was too modest to get the job started. This film would have great public interest, and probably could carry only a minimum conservation message—as is true of the touring film. Outside support is not too likely.

"Wilderness River Trail" probably should be revised to omit parts no longer timely. The rest of it, stressing the beauty of Dinosaur, the fun of river running, and the continuing threat, can still serve good purpose. It would be especially helpful to have this hit the road again to help Dinosaur National Park.

In addition, some footage is accumulating on Olympic National Park and the Ocean Strip, and the Pacific Northwest Chapter has urged that we produce a film of this. The Central Cascades of Oregon need film treatment if a program of adequate preservation is to get started in time there. We ought also to do, or inspire, Southwest coverage. We have beautiful footage available on the Salmon La Sac country—which needs a film to help it.

Books—The Mexia bequest, allocated in part to publications, greatly accelerated the club's publications program and our conservation-education effort. The Mexia Publications Fund has held its own. Its growth would show up almost spectacularly if we were to tabulate the subsidies this fund has provided toward reprints, for free books to dignitaries, for the helping of publications which could not otherwise have paid their way, and for the wide promotion of *This Is Dinosaur*.

The gist of all this is that the decision to set up a revolving fund was a very good one. The fund will need more capital to accomplish the program outlined below, most of it already authorized. The expanded list should carry itself in addition to furthering the conservation-education program.

This Is the American Earth, based on the Adams-Newhall exhibit produced with the assistance of the California Academy of Sciences, the club, and Walter Starr, and distributed with the assistance of the Smithsonian Institution and the United States Information Service. We have a grant from the McGraw Foundation to-

ward the cost. Printing cost is to be about \$35,000. We are prepared to go the rest of it on our own. This will be the club's most important book. Further funds can help assure optimum distribution.

The Olympic—Peninsula, Mountains, and People, is a working title for a potentially superb book on the Olympic, superb in prose and in pictures, both by Don Moser, student of Wallace Stegner, who will assist the completion of the book. To get desired photographic quality at a price that isn't prohibitive for the first edition we need a grant. This project can help Olympic National Park greatly.

Northern Cascades. Several authors will complete the book this summer. It could probably use existing halftones to advantage. This would be a beautiful and important book that we should do on our own.

Glacier Photography. Arthur Harrison's revised manuscript is now at hand. The project has been authorized. The book will probably not make its own way financially, but it is a worthy contribution to our list and an addition to our scientific publishing program.

Place Names of the High Sierra. Francis Farquhar promises the revised manuscript soon. Again, a book not too likely to stand on its own financial feet, but this is a Sierra Club project and duty.

Photographic portfolios. By Ansel Adams to start with, then by other outstanding photographers, typography by Grabhorn; prestige items already authorized, with a \$6,000 grant on hand—and in production.

Guide to the Mammoth Region. Genny Schumacher has completed the editing. The book will be ready in early summer. It should stand on its own in subsequent editions. It will be helpful to the Sierra Club program in Owens Valley and vicinity.

Ski Mountaineering. A revised edition is under way. The University of California Press is willing to do it as a paperback, "under the auspices of the Sierra Club." It is our product.

Camp Catering. This good book by Joel and Louise Hildebrand is languishing and the Hildebrands would like to see us take the book over and do something about it. Joel and Milton would do the revising.

John Muir's Studies in the Sierra. This is out of print and there is a constant, but not heavy call for it. It may be possible to bring it into print again by offset, perhaps with a small subsidy to help.

François Matthes' Little Studies in the Yosemite. A gathering together of pieces done for the *Sierra Club Bulletin* and

elsewhere, plus one or two still unpublished. Fritiof Fryxell is editing the book—an approved project, worth an assist.

Reprints, revised editions. The seventh printing of *Starr's Guide* is just off the press. A further generous gift of \$5,000 came from Walter Starr to help keep the price down and to help the program in general. (See page 14.)

Research

We have a long way to go in discovering how to make the most of science in our scenic-resource preservation. We are not alone. The Natural Resources Council of America had, as a prime reason for being, a Scientific Advisory Committee through which the technical-society members would help the other members. But these particular hopes never quite came to pass.

The Sierra Club has done a little researching in the past. Our library has helped some historical and political-science writing. Most of the early *Bulletins* reflected geographical research and some of that continues, at least up until the Makalu expedition we helped and for which we received National Science Foundation funds. We helped the study of Sierra botany and published it. We instigated the Matthes geological studies in the Sierra.

More recently we urged the Park Service and Forest Service to get some impact studies under way, and when these got almost nowhere, or even fell short of that, we tentatively started some of our own but could spend no money on them. Continuing these, with vigor, is one of the most important contributions we can make to wilderness preservation, and one of the most promising ways for the demonstration that there is not yet enough wilderness dedicated. We can continue to try to get the federal agencies to carry this on themselves, but we can almost be completely confident of needing to supplement their work. Our own trips can help provide the vehicle for the studies, but for us to count on busy trip leaders as impact observers is for us to expect too much. We can do better if we have funds to attract special observers to the program and

to finance impact-study planning, coordination, and publication by the club.

Dean Samuel T. Dana recently made a report on research needs in forest recreation. (January 1956 *SCB*, see pages 28 and 29.) Frank Craighead was appointed to the USFS Washington office, presumably to head up the programming of the 17 items Dana recommended be studied, but we have been told that no adequate appropriation was requested by the Forest Service. We can and should help stimulate progress on the 17 items, and consider whether we should more specifically set up pilot projects on some of them, which we and other independent organizations might co-sponsor.

Two specific Forest Research problems which should *not* be undertaken by agencies having any fondness for sawdust, are:

1. In an objective appraisal, what are the relative economic values of the various multiple uses on national forests?
2. How serious is the genetic decline resulting from the sanitation-salvage program, and how serious the soil decline resulting from monoculture?

We can continue to give little grants-in-aid, as we did to Philip Hyde for Dinosaur photography, and to David Simons for the Northern Cascades studies. With funds we could help much more, and should help more in those fields where present research is cut on the wrong bias.

Building

The question of a Conservation Building has been left almost to the last because there seems to be so many other birds almost in the hand. If we ought to save something it would be better to save it in a shack than fail to save it because we spent our money instead in getting comfortably ensconced in something more elegant.

However, it has been pointed out that major gifts for memorial monuments, such as buildings, are much easier to come by than grants for research and publication. We shall certainly need more space soon, in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and probably elsewhere too.

Personnel

All that has gone before has related to things to do in conservation education and, briefly, to space in which to do some of them and administer the others. This is just a section to serve as reminder that it takes people to do things, and that there is usually just about a dollar's worth of someone's time involved in getting a dollar's worth of things done.

Nevertheless, looking ahead to growth something like that projected above, we can bear in mind the conceivability of a staff with several departments, each serving the



growing needs of the volunteer committees, probably including: conservation, editorial, outings, lodges, library, finance, natural sciences, information and education, and the needs of the Board as a whole.

Sources of Funds

Foundations—Most foundations seem anxious to make nonrecurring grants for projects that are relatively short-lived. They have means for projects with *ends*. They are not too anxious to spend their endowment endowing some other organization. Few have been active in scenic-resource conservation (or better, preservation). In any event to get foundation help in itself requires careful preparation and staff work.

Individuals—Generous cash gifts for specific projects have come from our patron members Harold Bradley, the Grubbs, Mrs. Hall McAllister, the Shands, and the Starrs. C. M. Goethe and Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr. have helped. Max McGraw is the latest—plus Abigail Avery and an anonymous donor of \$1,500 who lives near Boston. From this last source, plus about \$9,000 from other sources, in small amounts, we have received what now constitutes the Conservation and Memorial Fund, presently at \$8,200.

The subject of bequests is a separate one, and the *Handbook* covers all of them except the full report of the Duncan and Jean McDuffie and the Marion Randall Parsons bequests, which will total more than \$100,000.

From the results of the Trustees for Conservation fund appeals, which have brought in, in all, nearly \$60,000, we can see that there is grass-roots support (averaging \$10 per donor) for good work. We have never tried to see what this would do for a specifically Sierra Club program in an approach to Sierra Club members.

The National Wildlife Federation and the National Geographic Society testify eloquently that bold ideas can work. We could do enormously more with wilderness outings, publications, and films than we have done, and almost all the rest of the program could be carried as a result, and scholarships to worthy individuals too.

This is a traveling nation. We are foremost among those planning and conducting wilderness outings. We have demonstrated their feasibility and the demand has come to fill them—almost entirely from one state. Suppose we really let people in the other states know what we are doing? Suppose, too, that we concluded that our organization was no longer the small, compact, face-to-face group that used to enjoy reading about each other's summer trips and climbs, and strove instead for material of national interest and importance that is not being handled adequately elsewhere because of the paucity of magazines that still do a job for journalism, and an absence of magazines that

do a job for conservation journalism. (Our piece herein by nationally famous Wallace Stegner is a notable example of what we might try to do more of.) And suppose we had something for the 60 million park visitors!

Perhaps this is a good rule of thumb: A strong conservation-education program could be built with extra five- and ten-dollar bills in good number, and just lots of one-dollar bills. If we also continue to receive such major bequests and gifts as have been coming from people who want the club to go on doing its good work, then there is a reasonable chance that tomorrow's outdoor people will not have to fall back to timberline for a last line of defense. With support, we can save more for coming generations than some untrammelled Alpine-Arctic rocks to drive by at high speed. There will be some trails, some wilderness forest, and some lonely places too. —D.R.B.

Department of Correction

The word has been going around that our January center spread ("What Does Wilderness Forest Mean to Water?") was inaccurately captioned—that the logged-off foreground to Mount Rainier (see cut) was not on land owned or controlled by the Forest Service, and that the color picture of the Kern-South Creek junction attributed to logging some muddy water that came from the flushing out of a millpond.



We asked the Regional Forester in San Francisco for specifications and they came in a patient 1600-word letter (copies available on request) which stated that the concern was not so much the actual wording as with intent and implication. The wording misappraised "multiple use" and was too zealous; it was overextended.

After careful check with the photographers we find:

Rainier was photographed from just outside the Snoqualmie National Forest boundary and much of the foreground is a privately owned section within the national forest but not under FS control. We should have found this out sooner and should have made it clear.

We did not, however, mislead. Photographer John Warth says: "I recall vividly how everything else was clear-cut to the south and south-

Starr's Guide

The seventh edition of *Starr's Guide to the John Muir Trail and the High Sierra Region*, first published by the Sierra Club in 1934, is just off the press.

In this new edition, trails have been checked and found to agree with the new United States Geological Survey 15-minute maps, which cover the High Sierra from the Merced River to the South Fork of the Kings River. (These new maps, unlike the old ones, have all trails exactly marked, and have appropriately named some of the knapsack-route passes marked for many years on the map which accompanies the *Guide*.)

A "Continuous Schedule of Elevations and Distances" between points on the route of the John Muir Trail from Yosemite to Whitney has been added at the end of the book, with page references to the trails which meet the Muir Trail along its length. Distances are recorded on all main trails in both directions. The sequence of sections has been changed in a few places; otherwise it is the same dependable, indispensable *Guide*. The Sierra Club is deeply grateful to Walter Starr for his devoted attention to the continuing revision of the book (the work of the late Walter A. Starr, Jr.), and for his generosity. The price, including the three-color back-pocket map, is still \$2.

Notice of a change of address for your Sierra Club Bulletin should be received at the club office at least 30 days before the change is to take effect. Please give both your old and new addresses, and include the postal zone number. Remember, periodical mail, which is unsealed, is not forwarded by the Post Office (nor returned to the office.) Duplicate copies are 35¢ (\$1.50 for the annual magazine).

cast as far as eye could see. I could see no difference between private and F.S. sections."

We shall add that the Whitechuck approach we showed is F.S. controlled cutting on F.S. land and it looks no better to us than the Rainier approach. This was our point. Stumps and disrupted watershed are alas inevitable in the harvesting of timber—and unacceptable as part of the living space of a superb area.

As for the muddy water, we have affidavits and will stand by every word. This is a fair example of what will happen in the Kern Plateau country if the Forest Service follows its present intention and drives through more unnecessary timber sales there "to help roadside recreation" and "multiple use."

Be wary of that term "multiple use." One of our Wisconsin sociologist members describes it as "a snake-in-the-grass semantic antic." The *Fresno Bee* says editorially, "Insofar as recreation is concerned it is usually a trap."

There will be enough timber. There will need to be forest recreation too, and not just in sawdust. —D. R. B.



Book Reviews

THE GREAT WEST, edited, with an introduction and notes by Charles Neider. Coward-McCann, Inc., New York, 1958. 441 pages. \$11.50.

This massive anthology contains 250,000 words and more than one hundred illustrations and maps. It offers the reader a heady distillation of the best of the American West. With discretion and devotion, the editor has blended excerpts from the writings of men prior to 1900 who were "the Pathfinders, the Heroes and Villains, and the Observers" of the vast area west of the Mississippi. In his daily journal Zebulon Pike describes his camps in the mountains of Colorado; Pat F. Garrett tells with relish how he killed Billy the Kid; and John Charles Frémont gives a first-hand account of an unexpected buffalo hunt—three selections from an index of fifty-nine. Here is a book which has great appeal for all who wish to share "the extent and intensity of one man's enthusiasm for the West and for its documents and legends."

MADLEINE ELDER

GRAND CANYON, Today and All Its Yesterdays, by Joseph Wood Krutch. William Sloane Associates, New York, 1958. 276 pages. Map and one photograph. \$5.00.

Joseph Wood Krutch is a passionate conservationist, a lover of wilderness for its spiritual values, as well as a naturalist. His latest book might be called the layman's guide to the geology and ecology of Grand Canyon, where close-packed life zones give evidence of the "intricate wholeness of the natural world." The book is an attempt to see nature not only as a spectacle but as a phenomenon to be interpreted. It is also a philosophy full of signposts to out-of-door beauty.

Here is a volume not only to be read but to be carried under the arm on one's next visit to this unique National Park.

FIRST THROUGH THE GRAND CANYON, by R. E. Lingenfelter. Foreword by Otis Marston. Glen Dawson, Los Angeles, 1948. 119 pages. Bibliography, index, five photographs. \$7.50.

Author Lingenfelter examines some fresh evidence on the controversial question of who was first to navigate the waters of the Grand Canyon. His conclusion, though not positive, is that James White probably made the first trip on a raft in 1867, two years ahead of John Wesley Powell, who is usually credited with the honor.

VIVIAN G. BRECKENFELD

THIS IS the time of year when rich yellow sun-cups and orange poppies and many-shaded iris blazon my partly wild hillside lot. Quail are calling, and lizards have reappeared to frisk among dry leaves, while the maples are suddenly bright with bronze and green foliage.

A special feature (an encore from a year ago) is the visit of a house guest who eats incessantly and has very odd table manners.

The bird I mean perches in a live oak opposite a living-room window. Starting early in the morning and all through the day, he darts to the window, fluttering against it and beating a tattoo with his beak as he captures and swallows insects *du jour*.

Even a frustrated bird-watcher who is blind as a bat—I refer to myself—can identify a creature who comes as close as this and stays around for weeks. Our house guest appears to be a Western Flycatcher. He has a yellow belly, two white wing bars, a long reddish tail and a jaunty crest. He catches flies and other small insects, cramming hundreds of them into his plump stomach daily.

As for his affinity to window glass I can only speculate. A year ago, when this noisy affair began, we thought he might be demented, or that perhaps he had been trained to enter somebody's open window. Now I am satisfied that he is simply an intelligent flycatcher who has invented a use for glass. It helps him to trap his food.

Well, you're thinking, what kind of mountain talk is this?

For one thing, it's foot-of-the-mountain talk, since the crested flycatcher comes calling among the live oaks near the base of Mt. Tamalpais. My point, however, is that it's spring. And spring is the time of year when most of us carry our city-bound thoughts out into the open.

After a season of introspection, under wraps, we feel the sun. We react to the new growth around us and take fresh notice of our fellow species.

Certainly a case can be made for the attractions of the other three seasons—if you concede that seasons exist at all in California. But none of them excites my corpuscles, my senses and imagination as spring does. The poets have generally concurred in this excitement.

Think about it, and you'll probably agree with me that one of the magnetic properties of the mountains in summer is that they offer us another touch of spring.

In July, when I hope to revisit the Sierra, the meadows and forests of the upper elevations will have recently lost their snow. The streams will be running full, between banks that are emerald with new grass, sparkling with flowers. The air will be newly washed.

Birds who follow the seasons will be there to celebrate the repast that is spread for all. Flycatchers will be among them, for all I know, but in the wild high country they won't let me approach.

Being a mere nature-watcher, I am usually on distant terms with the nimble-footed, quick-winged inhabitants of the wilderness. Marmots scramble back of the rocks, startled deer leap away, ground squirrels scold, stare and vanish. Sometimes a hummingbird hovers-briefly, however, and I have been studied by buzzards.

Just now I relish listening to the flycatcher's rat-a-tat and looking at him closely from my own cage as he flutters at the glass—wild and free, a slave only to appetite.

He reminds me that it's the season of longer sun, of the flowing of juices, and of new growth. The season that we too can follow, migrating in due time to the mountains, to cling to that deepest joy, the sense of participation in the gift of life on a good green earth.

FRED GUNSKY

Bulletin Board

*Starred items call for
your interest and attention*

On the National Scene:

★ It is hoped that the Wilderness Bill (S. 1123) will be moved out of committee (Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate) in early June, so that action can be taken on this vitally important legislation in this session of Congress. [Note: The field hearings on the bill last fall have just been published—1050 pages. Write the Club or the Senate Interior Committee for a copy.]

Congressman Wayne Aspinall, Colorado, has introduced legislation (H.R. 6597) to revise and define the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument—increasing its size by some 10,000 acres—and to acquire land for an access road.

A number of resolutions have been introduced into both Houses of Congress to accelerate reforestation programs in the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. Aim of this legislation is to plant 48,000,000 acres of idle and unproductive land to meet timber needs of the United States by the year 2000.

The House Committee on Government Operations has recently directed studies regarding the exchange of Government timberlands for private timberlands. The conclusions of these studies follow: "On the basis of the reports of the three departments

(Army, Agriculture and Interior) and the Committee's own study and analysis, the Committee believes that the proposal to exchange Government timberlands as payment for the private timberlands acquired for reservoir projects is contrary to the public interest and overall economy and efficiency and that Congress should not authorize or encourage such exchanges."

★ Bills (S. 1899, Warren Magnuson, Washington; H.R. 7045, Herbert Bonner, N. C.) have been introduced to establish the Arctic Wildlife Range. The Sierra Club has long urged that this be protected.

★ Senator Richard Neuberger, Oregon, has introduced legislation (S. 1920) to give added protection to national forests from mining abuses. This bill would allow for removal of minerals without patenting of land—thus putting mining in national forests on essentially the same basis as timber production.

★ A new group, the Kern Plateau Association, with headquarters in Bakersfield, California, has organized to protect the Kern Plateau, largest remaining stretch of wilderness in Southern California. Recommended reading: the article on the Kern Plateau in

Sunset for June, which gives an excellent picture of this endangered area.

In California:

Whether the State Park Commission will remain a strong, policy-making body (S.B. 393, Nelson Dilworth), or become purely advisory (A.B. 720, Mrs. Pauline Davis, despite amendments) is undecided. Legislative action is still pending.

Newly appointed chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks is Charles A. DeTurk, formerly state park planner for the Park and Recreation Commission of the State of Washington. Mr. DeTurk follows Newton B. Drury, who retired April 30 after a total of 21 years' service with the Division.

Senator John McCarthy's bill, S.B. 75, for control of billboards, was so weakened by amendments that it was withdrawn.

No further action is expected in this legislative session on the location of an all-year highway on the west side of Lake Tahoe. The Legislature has referred this controversial subject—which involves possible mutilation of two of California's finest State Parks at Emerald Bay—for further study.

EDGAR AND PEGGY WAYBURN

"Wilderness Cards from the Sierra Club"



Autumn paints the vine maple early along the Stehekin River as it rushes down to Lake Chelan, most spectacular of the gateways to the park country of the Northern Cascades of Washington. An array of glaciers in the headwaters adds color to the river.

Photograph by Paul Bergman.

Cards to help the Cascades and wilderness 2 sets for \$1

The first ten Northern Cascades cards are now being distributed: three "junior jumbo" size (as on the covers of January and February *Bulletins*), and eight of regular size, the fourth of which we show here. The large size, 10¢; regular size, 5¢. Less 30% on orders totaling \$5 or more (at list price), 40% on \$25 or more, 50% on \$50 or more, 60% on \$250 or more. All excess over cost goes to conservation. Order from your chapter or from Mills Tower.