



## **Box 17, Folder 1: Government publications, 2002. 2002**

[s.l.]: [s.n.], 2002

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/NO3IJUD56QWLR8G>

<http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC/1.0/>

For information on re-use see:

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

# FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS AND THE USDA FOREST SERVICE

**Gerald W. Williams, Ph.D.**  
National Historian  
USDA Forest Service  
Washington, DC

March 4, 2002

For many years there has been discussion—many times heated—about the fate of the national forests and the USDA Forest Service, the agency that manages the 192 million acres of national forest system lands. Early arguments were concerned with keeping portions of the public domain versus land grants and sales to homesteaders and corporations, federal versus states rights, with the establishment process—presidential proclamation or by Congress—and which agency or agencies should manage the national forests. For almost a century, the arguments have for the most part been silenced by court decisions and congressional actions. There was, of course, an occasional bubbling of opposition to any federal control of lands, as well as notions about putting the national forests on a sound economic (i.e. profitable) base. Yet today, there is consensus that national forests established by proclamation from the public domain are legal; Congress only, after 1907, would have the approval to establish new national forests; after 1905, management would continue by the USDA Forest Service; and that purchase of lands in the East for national forest purposes, after 1911, is a legitimate function under law.

Since that time, there have been many proposals—some serious, others frivolous—about the need to change the Forest Service and the National Forest System. In recent years, there were attempts internally to reorganize the agency and externally there were proposals put forth to combine the Forest Service with other federal land management agencies. The most striking proposals—in terms of the media covering the stories—have come from those groups and individuals who would like to see the national forests sold to the private sector. Here at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century—and the 2<sup>nd</sup> century of the Forest Service—it is time to revisit and review the many different proposals for changing the management of the National Forest System and the managing agency.

## PURPOSES OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

There is a common misunderstanding of the purposes of having national forests. Simple wording in the original act from March 3, 1891, allowed the president to establish forest reserves:

SECTION 24—The president of the United States may, from time to time, set apart and reserve, in any state or territory having public land bearing forests, in any part of the public lands, wholly or in part covered with timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not, as public reservations; and the president shall, by public proclamation, declare the establishment of such reservations and the limits thereof. (26 Stat. 1095)

There is nothing in the above act, referred to as the Forest Reserve Act of 1891, that specifies any purposes, other than the reserves had to come from the forested land in the public domain. In fact, even the provision about forests is broadened to include “timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not.” Thus, the original forest reserves were not necessarily designed to protect water supplies or timber for cutting. The very first forest reserves (as they were first called) were proclaimed by the President for multiple purposes, including, but not limited to, scenery, recreation, watersheds for cities and towns, buffering national parks, and protection of the forest areas. For example, from 1891—when the first forest reserve was established at the southern edge of Yellowstone National Park—until 1897, 29 forest reserves had been established that covered some 37.9 million acres.

Generally, most people quote two ideas from the Forest Service's Organic Act of 1897—that the national forests can be established for only watershed protection and a continuous supply of timber. Yet a careful reading of the 1897 act shows that there is one important additional and overriding purpose: Improve and protect the forests. The wording of the act clearly shows the intent:

No public forest reservation shall be established, except to **improve and protect the forest within the reservation**, or for the purpose of **securing favorable conditions of water flows**, and to **furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States**; but it is not the purpose or intent of these provisions, or of the Act providing for such reservations, to authorize the inclusion therein of lands more valuable for the mineral therein, or for agricultural purposes, than for forest purposes. [Emphasis added.]

The first purpose, that of "securing favorable conditions of water flows," is often blended with the overall purpose of "improving and protecting the forest." An unstated assumption was that if an area was designated as a national forest, then both these conditions were achieved. Therefore, management for the "continuous supply of timber" should come next. However, this was never the case until after the end of World War II.

Alas, many writers simply assume that water and timber are the only reasons that the national forests were established. This is simply untrue. Only beginning in 1898 did any new forest reserves (changed to the national forest name in 1907) have to meet the three-pronged criteria of the 1897 act.

It should be added that the third purpose "to furnish a continuous supply of timber" was always considered to be a permitted and regulated activity, not the specific reason for creation of the national forests. The regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior (that began to manage the forest reserves in the summer of 1897 under provisions of the Organic Act) contained the following phrase from section 22 regarding timber activities: "The following provision is made for the sale of timber within forest reservations in limited quantities...The sale of timber is optional, and the Secretary may exercise his discretion at all times as to the necessity or desirability of any sale." For decades, the Forest Service and the public assumed that the latter two purposes were sufficient for the management of the national forests. And for 75 years they were until a lawsuit decision in 1973 against Forest Service timber harvesting under the wording of the Organic Act changed the way in which the agency manages the national forest system.

## **NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT IN THE 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY**

Management of the national forests has undergone significant change over the last 100-plus years. Protecting forests through Presidential and congressional actions was essential in the early 1890s, as was trying to get congressional approval and funding to manage these entrusted lands. During the first part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, protection of the newly created national forests from fire and abuse was of paramount importance.

From the late 1890s until 1945, the basic management concern was sheep grazing on the national forests. The agency hired many new personnel during this time. Graduates from the growing number of forestry schools were almost guaranteed employment in the Forest Service. A very important law was passed in 1911. It was called the Weeks Act. Basically, it allowed the federal government to purchase land in the eastern states for national forest purposes. Many of these lands were wasted—farmed out, cut over, and highly erosive. Previously, all the national forests came from carving up the remaining public domain lands. The first national forest established under the Weeks Act was the Pisgah National Forest in North Carolina in 1916. Others quickly followed. New ideas were taking hold, including the start of the wilderness system in 1924 on the Gila National Forest and internal studies about which areas would be designated as wilderness or primitive areas.

The Great Depression (1933-1942) created opportunities for the national forests and the Forest Service to play a major role in helping people survive economically through conservation work programs and projects. In the depression era, the management concern was improving conditions in the forests—controlling erosion, planting trees, building roads, and building a forest infrastructure (e.g., construction lookout buildings, guard and ranger stations, trail shelters, trails, etc.) and developing the forest areas for recreation through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The Sustained-Yield Forest Management Act of 1944 authorized the establishment of two classes of sustained-yield timber units. Cooperative sustained-yield units were to combine the management of Federal timber land with private land to stabilize communities. Federal units, the other category, reserved national forest timber only for one geographic area—usually one community and one mill. The act was first heralded as protecting mills and jobs in the communities, but it soon other companies and towns that were not included in the agreements thought them to be monopolistic, non-competitive, and exclusionary. The Shelton (Washington) Cooperative Sustained-Yield Unit agreement was signed in 1946—the only cooperative unit ever established—and still in operation today, although the company is attempting to pull out of the agreement. Five Federal sustained-yield units were established: Vallecitos, New Mexico (Carson National Forest); Grays Harbor, Washington (Olympic National Forest); Flagstaff, Arizona (Coconino National Forest); Lakeview, Oregon (Fremont National Forest); and Big Valley, California (Modoc National Forest). Only the Lakeview unit is actively operating today.

Following World War II, the national forests began playing an increasing role in the production of timber products. Funding by Congress allowed the Forest Service to build a cadre of timber experts who responded with great energy and skill to supply the wood for the rapidly expanding home market. But this rather quickly led to controversy about the "weight" of timber production in the mix of uses coming from the public forest lands.

The first of the environmental protection laws was the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act (MUSY) of 1960. The Act was the first important law to redirect the agency to consider all uses—not just timber. Its purpose was to ensure that all possible uses and benefits of the national forests and grasslands be treated equally. The "multiple uses" included outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish in such combinations that they would best meet and serve human needs. This act was necessary because many members of Congress and interest groups felt that the Forest Service was giving too much attention to timber harvesting on the national forests—just 15 years after the huge post-war development push to open the national forests for needed timber to be used in the national housing boom. Multiple-use forestry was in "full-swing," with an increasing emphasis placed on non-timber resources, while timber production increased to the maximum in the private sector and approached that in the national forests.

Quickly following was the Wilderness Act of 1964 that incorporated the existing wilderness into a National Wilderness Preservation System (NWPS). Initially the agency believed that the act was unnecessary, as wilderness was one of the many multiple uses specified in the MUSY act. But Congress and the special interest groups overcame opposition and it was signed into law in 1964.

#### **RECENT LEGISLATION AND ACTIONS**

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), signed into law January 1, 1970, mandated the comprehensive analysis of environmental impacts of proposed Federal projects. An important part of the act made it mandatory for agencies to seek public participation on projects—from the planning stage to the review-of-documents stage. These requirements were quickly incorporated into the many projects already underway on the national forests.

Although intensive forestry and protection of the land had taken on even more importance with the adoption of many new forest practices and procedures, certain intensive forestry practices became a problem. A legal decision against the Forest Service for clearcutting on the Monongahela National Forest (Izaak Walton v. Butz) called the interpretation of the Organic Act of 1897 regarding timber sales into question. The results of this decision caused an extensive internal review of Forest Service

management. On the other side of the country, in the late 1960s, there was controversy over the management of Montana's Bitterroot National Forest, when residents became concerned about the scenic and reforestation problems being caused by clearcutting and terracing on steep slopes. In 1970, Montana's Senator Metcalf called on Arnold Bolle, Dean of the Forestry School at the University of Montana, to investigate the allegations and prepare a report. Bolle's committee report was critical of Forest Service operations. This was consistent with several internal Forest Service reports by the Regional Office in Missoula. Congressional hearings on clear cutting practices in 1972 would later set the stage for the National Forest Management Act of 1976.

The Wilderness Act directed the affected federal agencies to study existing roadless areas for possible wilderness designation. The draft Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE) report was completed in 1972. The controversial wilderness review process evaluated some 55.9 million acres of land and 1,449 roadless areas for possible inclusion into the NWPS. The final report was published in 1973, with 274 of the roadless areas (12.3 million acres) selected for possible wilderness designation by Congress. The decision became immediately embroiled in controversy. A lawsuit in California over a roadless area that had not been selected, as well as an inconsistent public response assessment, resulted in the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service ordering a new study of all roadless areas—called RARE II—in 1977.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 provided for protection of rare, threatened, and endangered animal and plant species. It established Federal procedures for identifying and protecting endangered plants and animals in their native, critical habitats and declared broad prohibitions against taking, hunting, harming, or harassing the listed species. The intent of the act was to restore endangered species to a level where protection would no longer be needed. Implementing this Act would have drastic consequences on the management of national forest timber and road construction programs during the 1980s and 1990s.

The early to mid-1970s saw a continued major national forest planning effort under the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960 (MUSY). Unit plans (ranger district level), single resource plans (e.g. timber, recreation, road, grazing plans), and several forest plans were being developed under MUSY. Many national forests established planning teams to assist in the multiple-use planning of their many resources. New Forest Service specialists were hired because of the planning needs—wildlife biologists, soil scientists, landscape architects, and hydrologists.

Controversy was only beginning as battles over clearcutting and roadless areas have plagued the agency for more than half a century. A series of new laws including the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (RPA), and various environmental protection acts, such as the Clean Water and Clean Air Acts, have changed how the Forest Service operates.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA) repealed major portions of the Organic Act of 1897. Importantly, NFMA mandated intensive long-range planning for the national forests—the most comprehensive planning effort in the western world. NFMA specifically incorporated public involvement and advisory boards, various natural resources, transportation systems, timber sales, reforestation, payments to States for schools and roads, and reporting on the incidence of Dutch elm disease.

A committee of scientists crafted the implementation regulations for NFMA, which became final in 1979, and an intensive new forest planning effort began. The Forest Service employed new specialists, many of them women, to address the various provisions of NFMA—including public affairs/relations, economists, archeologists, sociologists, geologists, ecologists, biologists, and operations research analysts. The Forest Service began an extensive public involvement effort to prepare the new plans. In 1997 and 1998, a new Committee of Scientists met to evaluate and recommend changes to NFMA and the revised forest planning regulations.

In the late 1970s, RARE II once again launched the Forest Service into the controversial public arena. The draft RARE II report, published in 1978, led to many public demonstrations and letter-writing campaigns. The final RARE II report, published in January 1979, recommended that Congress add 15

million acres (only 12.3 million acres were recommended in the original RARE) to the NWPS. However, the final roadless decisions and wilderness legislation would have to wait until Congress acted. Today, after a series of congressional acts that established many new wildernesses, the Forest Service manages over 35 million acres of wilderness. This is approximately 18.4 percent of the entire National Forest System.

The Forest Service has incorporated these new laws and promulgated regulations into the administration of the national forests—the most recent change has been the embracing of ecosystem management and collaborative stewardship. It has been a process of gradual change, but not without controversy, that has made the Forest Service the leader in multiple-use forest management.

## **OPTIONS FOR THE FUTURE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS**

Yet, with the dawning of the new 21<sup>st</sup> century, arguments have again surfaced about the role and importance of the national forests and the Forest Service as the managing agency. There are at least eight different proposals on the table to “solve” the current issues. The *first*, is simply to keep everything as it is; *second*, is to do no active management, especially timber harvesting and road building, to the national forests; *third*, change the laws and regulations that hamper good management of the national forests; *fourth*, to transfer management of the national forests to another federal agency; *fifth*, to transfer the best lands to the National Park Service or private industry; *sixth*, to set up long-term leases of public land; *seventh*, establish land trusts; *eight*, transfer the federal lands to the various states where the lands are located; and *ninth*, to sell the public lands. Several of these options have sub-proposals worth considering. Each of the options are discussed below in varying detail.

### **Option 1- Keep Everything the Same**

This refers to continuation of current management of the national forest system, or what some might call the “no change alternative.” Here everything remains the same—the national forests remain in federal ownership and the USDA Forest Service continues to manage the 192 million acres. There are incremental changes in the form of management priorities from the Chief, President, Secretary, and new laws from the Congress. New terms are invented (such as ecosystem management or the natural resources agenda) to discuss the new priorities for the agency to both the employees and the public. John Fedkiw calls this notion the “pathway hypothesis” where new knowledge is impressed on the management of the national forests to make the forests better. This involves a gradual shifting of management over time, taking into account new laws, changing emphasis by top agency leaders, and incorporates new scientific information.

Currently, after a century of relying heavily on the scientific model, the Forest Service seems to be gradually moving into the realm of collaboration with the public on management of the national forests and grasslands. Public relations and public involvement, both are forms of collaboration, take on a new role of better and more efforts to work with the public to come to a common understanding of issues and concerns and propose new ways of future management of the federal forest lands. In the future, the Forest Service would need fewer specialists and more need for generalists.

Overall efficiency, in terms of economics (dollar return to the U.S. Treasury), remain low. Probable number of employees will be reduced over the years, but workload remains high. Profit to be derived from the lands remains a low priority. Public benefits, especially through increasing recreational demands, rules management.

### **Option 2–Return the Forests to No Management**

As opposed to the no change option, this could be called the “no action alternative.” In this scenario, active management is returned to no management of the late 1880s. Letting natural processes evolve would be the major priority.

The national forests become essentially national parks. The Forest Service is done away with. Only management for fires that threaten lives or private property would be fought. Since there would be no priority for management, other than wilderness, most multiple use management would be forbidden. This option would be even more restrictive than national park status.

Centuries old fire-dependent ecosystems would change, with more deadly, catastrophic fires. Some animal and plant species would thrive, while others would have to adapt to the changing conditions or die. Economic efficiency would be low, but expenditures for management would be very small. Profit is not important, while some public benefits would be high. This option is strongly supported by a number of environmental organizations through the “zero-cut” proposals.

### **Option 3 - Change the Laws and Regulations Affecting Forest Service Management**

Currently, the Forest Service is trying to get the agency “back to operating,” as it once did in previous decades, by identifying laws and regulations that impose unnecessary and burdensome rules on local decision makers. Recently, Jack Ward Thomas, former Chief of the Forest Service, noted the problems in the many laws that govern land management activities:

consider that the various laws are applied by an array of departments and agencies...each with their own cadre of skilled and accomplished bureaucrats dedicated to the achievement of their mission...If that were not bad enough, the situation is further exacerbated by the structure of committees and sub-committees in the Senate and House. The departments and agencies get their budgets through different committees who, likewise, fiercely guard “their” agencies and programs—for therein lies maximization of their individual and collective power...This all adds up for a disaster waiting for a time and place to happen...significant land management actions on the federal estate are grinding to a halt. Some consider that outcome desirable and some object vehemently...It seems likely that if the process [set into law, agency regulations, procedural guides, and differing interpretations of what is required] is everything and the outcome of little consequence you get “analysis paralysis” wherein there is furious and ongoing activity that leads to little or no management action. Again, some consider that outcome desirable and others object vehemently (Thomas 2001: 2).

Randal O'Toole, in a 1988 book entitled *Reforming the Forest Service*, came up with a similar way to reform the agency. His approach was to change the way Congress has prescribed, over the last 80 years, the way the Forest Service does business. Essentially, O'Toole suggested that the real need for change comes from inappropriate laws that were made decades ago and the creative ways in which the agency has carried out the intent of the law through regulatory means. Reform would come from Congress, not the administration, but the process could be helped by an analysis of what really needs changing and why.

Congress has passed several very important laws that changed the management of the national forest system, for example, the Organic Act of 1897, the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, the Wilderness Act of 1964, and the National Forest Management Act of 1976. Congress has been actively involved with the agency through politically appointed Chiefs (e.g. especially Jack Ward Thomas and Mike Dombeck, although every chief has been appointed or approved by the President, with the exception of Earle Clapp who was only acting chief 1939-1943), testimony from top officials, hearings on the many bills in Congress each session, and requesting reports and analyses.

As with every past effort, the Congress is a very important "player" in any attempt at reconfiguring the laws under which the agencies manage the federal land, and the concerns of members of Congress should not be taken lightly. Congressional committees and sub-committees often call for agency, interest groups, and concerned citizen testimony in these situations. Inevitably, it is easier to do nothing than to uproot the agency, embroil the interested public, and impact local communities. There are three important ways that Congress can change the agency: 1) change the laws under which the Forest Service operates, 2) approve the restructuring submitted by the Executive branch, including approval of politically appointees to leadership, and 3) write legislation to accomplish a reorganization.

The Thoreau Institute, led by Randal O'Toole, drafted a bill in 1996 for consideration by Congress (Thoreau Institute c1996). There was little consideration by Congress for such an act. Jack Ward Thomas suggested several ways to achieve a reform of the laws:

First, the idea of a Public Land Law Review Commission could be brought out and dusted off. The last effort, in 1969, was directed by a collection of big names that, basically, came up with nothing except that things were badly screwed up. And, that, I remind you, was before the onslaught of environmental legislation of the 1970's. But, now that things are even more seriously convoluted and dysfunctional, it may be time to try again. But, this time, the Commission should be composed of top level experienced natural resources professional and legal assistants with the mission of not "moaning and groaning" but of producing a legislative package to present to Congress.

But, I don't think that Congress nor the Administration has the stomach for that. Why? I challenge you to examine the purpose of each of the laws in question. Who could disagree with the purpose of any one of the laws in question? I certainly can't. And, each of those laws has champions in the folks that know how to use those laws to achieve their objectives and in the Agencies that derive their powers and, even, reasons for their existence therefrom.

However, the administration in power has the authority and ability to revise regulations. The administration could establish a "czar of regulations" related to public land management and task that person, and the heads of involved agencies, to simultaneously revise pertinent regulations with the aim of coordination, simplification, and efficiency. This could be ordered achieved within a time certain with only the czar would have authority to grant any extension of time lines (Thomas 2001: 5).

There will certainly be further efforts in Congress and the Executive Branch to attempt changing the laws under which the major land management agencies operate. Past efforts have shown that such efforts have been mostly in vain, but perhaps a radically new perspective will change the nature of the debate that has been affecting the federal land management agencies for over 100 years.

#### **Option 4 - Transfer Management into One Agency**

Gifford Pinchot's successful effort to take over the administration of the forest reserves from the USDI General Land Office culminated on February 1, 1905. The Forest Service with its huge land base has always been near the center of government reorganization efforts in the natural resources arena (O'Callaghan 1983). Almost every administration has at least put some thought and effort into putting the national forests into one large federal land management agency that includes the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish & Wildlife Service, and Corps of Engineers administered federal lands, as well as the programs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service. About every decade and/or presidential administration, there has been an attempt to reorganize the Forest Service, take away the national forests, combine the agency with the Department of the Interior, or make a new department (Appendix A lists a brief exposition of the major attempts at reorganization). Some have come very close to moving the Forest Service or the national forests to a different or new agency. Also, there were a few attempts by the Forest Service to take on the responsibility of managing the lands of other agencies.

As mentioned above, one of the most popular past efforts has been recombining the USDA Forest Service with the Department of the Interior or as part of a new Department of Natural Resources. On the surface, merger of the USDA Forest Service with the other land management agencies in the Department of the Interior make logical sense and would create "administrative tidiness" out of the administrative situation the land management agencies now face. Managing the federal lands under one set of rules and regulations, with one top administrator and set of managers, is also logical and probably cost effective (Clawson 1965). Such an overall environmental agency would eliminate overlap of top officials, research staffs and experts, as well as people on-the-ground doing similar work on adjacent areas, with fewer offices and administrative costs, etc.

However, there are also drawbacks, such as which agency or agencies would take the lead, which rules would continue/or be dropped, which administrators would stay or go, managers and staffs would have higher workloads with fewer personnel, consolidation would take time and money, special interest groups would be often at odds with any change of agencies, local communities would feel that their interests in federal land management would not be counted in decisions especially if made further away from the activities, congressional support may be lacking as in the past, etc. There is also the case that placing very different programs into one department will not eliminate policy conflicts and may not result in better decisions.

Ross Gorte and Betsy Cody, in their 1995 Congressional Research Service report, note that there are four policy implications in any merger proposal between the Forest Service and the BLM, although these points also apply to combining the Forest Service with other land management agencies: 1) Federal fiscal impacts - that is potential cost savings; 2) institutional effects - morale and ways of operating; 3) legal and political considerations - laws and legal authorities/regulations; and 4) service to the public - one agency, with one administrator and one set of laws and regulations, as well as centrally located offices. The authors note:

Reducing costs by eliminating duplicative personnel and offices is one of the primary benefits cited in most merger proposals...Another benefit commonly cited by proponents is the creation of a more efficient and effective structure for managing the Federal lands and resources, by merging duplicative efforts. The two agencies have nearly identical missions....In areas with intermingled, adjoining, or neighboring lands, these functions arguably could be more effectively conducted by a larger single entity than by separate agencies. A merger could lead to some higher costs, as well, at least in the short-term. There would be implementation costs... some personnel and planning costs from eliminating redundant positions and from transfers necessary to have the right people in the right locations (Gorte and Cody 1995: 9).

Any merger or consolidation of the Forest Service with the BLM, National Park Service, Fish & Wildlife Service, Natural Resources and Conservation Service, as well as a host of related agencies or functions assumes that in the end the public will be better served by one agency rather than many (Clawson 1965). It is a simple and intuitive proposition, although "critics counter that a merger would create a monolithic agency that would stifle creativity and public policy debates, while creating a larger, less responsive bureaucracy (Gorte and Cody 1995: 14)." It is also unclear that the public will be better served, money will be saved, or that the number of laws and regulations will be fewer. To make such a merger happen, there are many barriers to be overcome from the institutional, congressional, special interest groups, states and communities, and the general public.

Marion Clawson noted that special interest groups are powerful influencers in the congressional arena, especially if the group believes that any legislation will cause harm or undo cost. These interest groups use the land and resources, and are thus concerned about and opposed to any major changes to the management, especially by a new agency with new rules and new people in charge:

Whatever one may think about the desirability of major reorganization of federal land management agencies, my judgment is that such reorganization is *highly unlikely*. There are simply too powerful forces against it, with no corresponding pressures for it. The

federal land agencies concerned oppose major reorganization...It is not only the agencies that are moved which resist change; those who might gain additional responsibility are cool, at least, and sometimes more than cool....

While many will support efficiency in government as a general idea, and hence support reorganization proposed in the name of efficiency, nearly all will have cogent reasons for opposing specific reorganizations....At the best, it is probably impossible to conceive of any federal agency reorganization which will have unanimous and enthusiastic support from the various groups interested in use of the federal lands...In a word, the present rules of the game are known...and all prefer the known problems to the unknown ones... (Clawson 1965e:\_\_-\_\_).

#### **Option 5a - Transfer the Best Recreation Lands to the National Park Service**

With this proposal, the best recreation and scenic lands would be transferred to the National Park Service, but retain the most timber productive lands in federal ownership. In this case, the Forest Service would find itself out of the recreation business. The Option 5a proposal is similar to what happened to the New Zealand Forest Service in the 1980s (Reidel 1992). In this option, all the wildernesses, scenic areas, wild & scenic rivers, national monuments, national volcanic monuments, geologic areas, national grasslands, national tallgrass prairie, and national recreation areas would be transferred to the Park Service. The Forest Service would retain the highly productive timber lands and probably the grazing lands.

It would seem likely that most research, state & private forestry, and international forestry would be "spun off" to other federal agencies so that the remaining lands would be managed much like the private or corporate tree farms. Under this alternative, only those functions necessary to implement a timber management program would be kept in the greatly downsized Forest Service. Remaining functions would include tree planting, genetic improvements, intensive management, thinning operations, vegetative management, and related activities. In all probability, tree harvesting would be where the Forest Service would hire or contract with companies to cut and transport the trees.

With this land management arrangement, the Forest Service would oversee and directly contract private companies to cut, plant, and haul logs to sorting yards where the agency would then sort and sell the logs to the highest bidders. The agency would have maximum control over the timing, location, and procedures in timber management operations. It would resemble a large scale timber corporation, but have responsibility to public lands. Timber sales would only occur at the log sorting yards, that would be scattered around the country in strategic locations. The emphasis would be on getting top dollar for the logs, that would then be either put back into replanting operations and/or returned to the U.S. Treasury.

#### **Option 5b - Transfer the Best Timber Lands to Private Industry**

The proposition that the highest and most productive timber lands be transferred or sold to private industry has been discussed by a number of forest economists over the years. Marion Clawson was a strong supporter of this option. The Option 5b proposal is similar to what happened to the New Zealand Forest Service in the 1980s (Reidel 1992).

One result would be that the federal government would be left (unless all the land was transferred or sold, with submarginal lands. The costs of management would be very high. Major restructuring of the Nation's laws would be necessary.

### **Option 6 – Long-Term Leases for Federal Land**

Under a leasing arrangement, large watersheds would be leased to one corporation that would be given specific direction in the stewardship of the land, that would include recreation, road building, tree harvesting, planting, thinning, and second and third harvesting after decades of growth and management. This is what many would consider to be a "hands off" management of the national forests, yet the agency would retain a great deal of oversight to the process and procedures that the companies use to manage the forests. A long-term leasing operation would be the standard.

In the distant past, the Forest Service had large timber sales that used this procedure. A number of watershed-scale timber sales were made in the 1920s that emphasized a decades-long management for sustained-yield operations. Many of these sales, like the Westfir sale on the Willamette National Forest, were designed for railroad operations. Cutting would proceed initially at the lower elevations, then as the timber would be all cut, the railroad line would be slowly built up the drainage with spur lines to smaller, side drainages. Timber would then be cut, logs rolled or dragged to the rail line, then transported to the mill. These sales were designed to take decades to finish, so while the lower areas were harvested and replanted, the upper reaches of the watershed would be harvested. By the time the upper drainage was all cut, the lower elevations would have 30-50 years of new tree growth-ready for a new round of harvesting.

Canada uses a similar method of managing its rich timber lands. There are significant differences, however. The Canadian Forest Service does not have management of the crown forest lands—the provinces have direct control. Each province has its own provincial Forest Service and each agency sets the rules for the long-term leases or contracts with corporations within the province. Public input to the process is limited, in part because of the different set of national laws dealing with environmental procedures and processes.

### **Option 7 – Establish Land Trusts**

The idea of establishing land trusts, essentially large groups of interested groups and individuals, to oversee the management of the national forests and other national lands (Fairfax 1999; Kemmis 2000, 2001, 2002; Reidel 1992). The most recent version of the was presented in the 2003 budget proposal from the Bush administration that called for "Charter Forests." Marion Clawson proposed that many groups form a "joint oversight committee" (an advisory group) to "exert considerable pressure" on the many public land management agencies. He described the potential committee membership and the function:

To be specific, The American Forestry Association, the Society of American Foresters, the National Forest Products Association, American Forest Products Industries, the National Audubon Society, the Izaak Walton League, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the various regional forestry associations, the American National Livestock Association, the National Woolgrowers, the American Mining Congress, the National Reclamation Association, and many regional or state groups join together in a private but comprehensive citizens public land oversight committee?...

A highly diverse group such as this would rarely agree; that would not be its purpose. Instead, it should seek to bring out issues clearly, to sift fact from rumor, to sharpen up the policy issues, to delineate the real alternatives of public action...Policies would still have to be settled by political processes; public land managers would still have to make decision on programs (Clawson 1965f: \_\_\_\_).

### **Option 8a – Transfer the Federal Lands to the Various States Where the Lands are Located**

This option has been discussed for many decades. It was argued long and hard for more than a century. The most recent arguments have centered on long-revered property rights. Initially, forest reserves created in the 1891-1893 era were non-controversial, but in 1897 they became the center of a great western multi-state outcry over the establishment of some 17 million acres of forest reserves on February 22, 1897. The controversies were fueled by state legislatures, chambers of commerce, miners, timber barons, settlers, and sheep owners. Congress reacted by suspending most of the reserves, but allowing the first management of them by the new forest rangers hired by the USDI General Land Office.

Other short-lived efforts followed to transfer federal land to the states or corporations: As early as the Taft administration (1908-1912), there were officials in most administrations who favored the idea of massive federal land transfers. Various national timber industry groups favored national forest transfer to private interests after both world wars. Even the ranching industry led a "great land grab" movement in the late 1940s and early 1950s seeking to have the public grazing lands transferred to those private interests who used the land for cattle and sheep grazing and thus had "vested interests."

The Public Land Law Review Commission of the late 1960s sparked another round of public land transfer ideas. Wayne Aspinall, chair of the commission, favored most if not all of the public lands to the private and/or state sectors. He was reported to have said "We must find the means to provide for the transfer of the public land into non-federal ownership (as quoted in Klyza 1996: 13)."

A quite different land reform movement came about in the 1970s and 80s with the "Sagebrush Rebellion." This effort was largely a land-owner inspired effort to take over or purchase, cheaply, federal grazing land (mostly Bureau of Land Management administered land), which they were accustomed to using. This movement, which was gaining tremendous popularity in the mid- to late-1970s, was effectively taken over by the Ronald Reagan administration of the early 1980s. Reagan, and Interior Secretary James Watt, were sympathetic to the western-led effort, but it fizzled into political slogans and then an aborted "asset management" program to sell off unwanted portions of the public lands.

The "Wise Use Movement" (an off-shoot of the Sagebrush Rebellion), came into being after an August 1988 "Multiple Use Strategy Conference." This national meeting was called by the people, organizations, and companies which utilize the many resources found upon federal lands. It was intended to start an effort to counteract the highly successful efforts by environmental groups to enact tough environmental laws, enforce existing regulations, and stop or slow down projects on federal land. At the conference, 21 goals were adopted covering national parks, wilderness, grazing, mining, timber harvesting, etc.

The Wise Use Movement members are almost all in the West, located in rural communities that are in some ways dependent on mining, forestry, and ranching ways of life. The Wise Use Movement despises federal and even state ownership of land and the complexity of overlapping laws and regulations. Ideally, under the Wise Use Movement scenario federal ownership of lands would disappear, to be replaced by state or county ownership or even ownership by individuals and corporations (Klyza 1996). Today, these land issues are referred to as the "Property Rights Movement" and the "Home Rule Movement."

There would be no guarantee that the states would want to keep all the former national forests and grasslands, as well as BLM grazing lands, national wildlife refuges, and national parks. The cost of administering these lands would be horrendous. Disposal of the least desirable lands from the economic efficiency angle would have a very strong appeal. Besides, from the various states perspectives, selling the unwanted lands would give them more money to manage the more desirable lands. All of this is, of course, predicated on the notion that existing federal laws would not apply (e.g. the restrictions in the Endangered Species Act). If, however, Congress would not give any relief to the state from federal laws, then the states would face a huge management challenge. In addition, the states could face the "unfunded mandates" problem, where Congress directs the states to implement laws that are not funded from the federal budget.

### **Option 8b – Transfer the Federal Lands to the Regions Where the Lands are Located**

This option, similar to Option 7a above, would transfer management and oversight of the federal lands to a regional, multi-state approach (Kemmis 2001). Using this idea, the current management is flawed because of the agencies, including the Forest Service, often try to manage public lands from Washington, DC, or from regional and state centers that only have agency people with the decision making authority. The premise of this option would be to keep the public lands in federal ownership, but transfer management decisions to a regional body that takes into account natural topographic and ecological features, as well as local citizens in decision making for these lands. This idea is similar to that proposed by John Wesley Powell, director of the USDI Geological Survey in the 1870s, after his monumental journey through the arid southwest.

#### **Option 9a - Sell the Public Lands**

Selling the federal lands has always been a popular idea, at least in some circles. Behind this option is the assumption that all public land currently being held by the federal government should and must be transferred to the private sector. The notion is a very old one. Certainly from the early 1800s, and especially by the late 1800s, there was always an undercurrent of free or cheap land for the homesteader, miner, timber cutter, sheep and cattle grazer, and other people who would put the land to its best use (Reidel 1992). Many believe that land resting in the public sector should have been a temporary situation, not a permanent one. In fact, using this assumption, one could view federal ownership of land as an anomaly in American history. The rights of the citizen should override those of the government except in times of national emergencies.

These issues have been raised for more than 100 years and were at the heart of the early forest reserve movement. In the 1940s there was an attempt to take away/sell the public grazing lands to those ranchers that use the federal land. The effort failed. Another serious attempt to wrestle control of the grazing and timber lands came in the 1970s with the "sagebrush rebellion." Recently, these notions have been transformed—with the same rhetoric—into the "wise use," "county supremacy," and "property rights" movements. Despite the fact that proponents of these ideas have certainly enlivened the talk radio shows for the last several decades, all have failed.

#### **Option 9b - Give Away the Public Lands**

Another related option, that is never discussed, is that of giving the public lands to the citizens. In this scenario, the land would be equally divided into say 40-acre plots. Deeds would be assigned (or through a lottery) to each person in the U.S. The deed holders could then keep, lease, or sell their share of the public lands. In this option, there would be no "up-front" money required. Deeds would be mailed to the residents and that would end the federal government ownership of the land. Conceivably, even the national parks and monuments could be included in the gifting. Developers could purchase from the citizens any number of "shares" of land. Restrictions, if any, would come from the states and counties through zoning or land use ordinances. There would be no federal land and no reason to have federal land management agencies.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The philosophical foundations of preserving and using the natural resources on Federal land have many deep roots that date to the 19th century. After the decisions made by Congress in the 1890s, the National Forest System has grown to more than 192 million acres. This land, owned by the people of the United States, has been managed by the USDA Forest Service since 1905. Forestry, as worked out by Gifford Pinchot, the first Chief of the Forest Service, is synonymous with conservation of forests and other natural resources over the long term.

The future is very unclear. There are powerful interest groups that want the Forest Service and the national forests to revert to an intensive management era to protect and preserve jobs and use the trees and other natural resources to the fullest extent possible. While at the other end there are those who want the resources totally preserved, to have a "zero-cut" of the trees, and to keep people out of the

national forests—a policy even more restrictive than those of the national parks. Other special interest groups want to increase their "share" of the resource uses available on the national forests. All groups seem to believe that science and more data will "prove their case." But the reality is that decisions about the future management of the national forests, as well as the use of the natural resources, are essentially political in nature. Data and the scientific method can only give answers to questions, not set policy and practices.

Yet without the foresight and dedication of a great number of people during the late 19th and early 20th centuries there would be nothing to debate today. The national forests would have long ago been carved into millions of private ownership plots and extensively logged and changed forever. The national forests are our legacy for future generations.

## APPENDIX A

### REORGANIZATION OF THE NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCIES

**Roosevelt Administration**—After the transfer of the national forests in the Theodore Roosevelt administration from the USDI Department of the Interior to the USDA Forest Service, the first significant federal reorganization effort began with the Keep Commission of 1905-1909. The Commission or Committee made many recommendations, most of which were embraced and implemented by the administration (Pinkett 1965). For the first time, with the Keep Commission, reorganization came from the Executive Branch of government rather than the Congress. This set the pattern for reorganization and reinvention efforts in the future. Fortunately, Pinchot's presence on the committee kept the Forest Service out of the reorganization spotlight. In fact for years to follow, the Forest Service became widely acknowledged as the most progressive and innovative of the federal agencies.

**Taft Administration**—President William Howard Taft, Teddy Roosevelt's hand-picked successor, went against his predecessor in wanting to transfer the national forests away from the Department of Agriculture. “The first effort to transfer the national forests back to Interior was begun by Interior Secretary Walter Fisher in the Taft Administration in 1911 (Gorte and Cody 1995: 5-6).” The effort failed.

**Wilson Administration**—In the 1910s, before the creation of the USDI National Park Service in 1916, the Forest Service proposed to take over management of the national parks from the U.S. Army. The Congress was not convinced. Bills were introduced in the 64<sup>th</sup>, 65<sup>th</sup>, and 66<sup>th</sup> Congresses (1916-20) to transfer the national forests to Interior, but they failed to pass. Near the end of the Woodrow Wilson administration, a voluntary organization known as the National Budget Committee of New York proposed a reorganization plan for the federal government. The plan, reported in 1920, gained widespread attention, suggested the establishment of a department of public works (getting rid of the Department of the Interior). This new department would have all the functions of Interior with the addition of the Forest Service, the Bureau of Public Roads, and several water development programs found in the War Department. The plan was not implemented.

**Harding Administration**—The first strong executive branch effort to return the national forests to Interior came in 1921 when Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall proposed to transfer the NFs in Alaska. The *Washington Post* thought that the Forest Service was a good example of why reorganization was needed, pointing out that the agency was inefficient and did not cooperate with the Department of the Interior. However, the western livestock industry preferred the status quo over any untested new agency. President Warren G. Harding came to support the Forest Service. There was also a plan conceived by the Brookings Institution in 1923 that looked at governmental reorganization. The Brookings report, much as the National Budget plan three years previous, proposed a new department of public works and public domain, including the Forest Service and the Bureau of Public Roads.

**Hoover Administration**—In the December 1932, near the end of the Herbert Hoover administration, there was a fleeting effort to reorganize all the resource agencies under one head. This proposal was for the Department of Agriculture to create a new division of land utilization, including the Forest Service, General Land Office, Bureau of Biological Survey, Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and other programs. Also, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would have been moved to the Department of the Interior. Pressing national problems resulting from the start of the Great Depression put aside any formal attempt by the lame duck administration.

**Roosevelt Administration**—The Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) administration made a serious attempt to transfer the Forest Service into the Department of the Interior. The fight was led by Interior Secretary Harold S. Ickes and Agriculture Secretary Henry Wallace. An Executive Reorganization Order was promulgated in June 1933, which changed the name of the USDI National Park Service to the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations. By late 1934 Wallace, who would later be vice-president under FDR, changed his mind and became an opponent of any Forest Service transfer. At the same time, the Forest Service counter-proposed to take the new USDI Grazing Service (established in 1934) into the agency. This proposal caused great concern in Interior since control of grazing meant control

over the vast public domain lands in the West (which in 1946 became the core of the Bureau of Land Management). This grazing land proposal was not enacted, but it did create a very heated interdepartmental battle.

A proposal in 1936 by a Senate committee (known as the Byrd Committee) presented a government reorganization plan. This committee recommended that the General Land Office and the Geological Survey be in the same department, that grazing on public lands and in national forests be brought under common direction and that the O & C lands—managed by the USDI-BLM—in western Oregon and national monuments within national forests be transferred to the Forest Service.

By 1937-38, ex-Chief Pinchot joined the transfer battle and he became very active in defeating the proposed transfer of the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior. Roosevelt disciplined the Forest Service for the lack of cooperation in the reorganization attempt. After the death of Chief Silcox in 1939, Earle Clapp was selected to replace him. Yet, Clapp was never given the rank of Chief, only "Acting Chief," because of his strident opposition to the reorganization which earned him the displeasure of President Roosevelt. In late 1939 and early 1940, the President had a draft Executive Order prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, which included a provision to transfer the Forest Service to the Interior Department. After an unsuccessful attempt to keep the draft secret, it was leaked to Congress where it met unexpected, forceful opposition. "The opposition became so overwhelming," Clapp reported, "that the President finally decided to eliminate the Forest Service transfer provision from the transfer Order." Apparently, the transfer order was sitting on FDR's desk waiting for a signature, but it was never signed. By late 1940, energy was waning for a Forest Service transfer as the threat of impending war in Europe overcame any further reorganization efforts for the next decade.

**Truman Administration**—President Harry Truman launched another government reorganization effort in the late 1940s and early 1950s. In 1947, Congress established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, which was chaired by ex-President Hoover and was thus referred to as the "Hoover Commission." The report was printed two years later. One of these committees recommended that the Department of the Interior be renamed as the Department of Natural Resources, where all the functions and operations of the various natural resource management agencies, including the Forest Service, would be transferred. Another of the task groups, this one called the Task Force on Agriculture, recommended that the Department of Agriculture house the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM's O & C lands in western Oregon, and the grazing lands of the General Land Office.

The Commission itself could not come to agreement on a path to take regarding the Forest Service and the other land management agencies: In the end, Hoover Commission simply renewed the ideas of the Hoover presidency: Corps of Engineers to Interior; the O&C timber lands in western Oregon, as well as all grazing lands, be transferred to Agriculture; while the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service were to remain in Agriculture. There were several minor proposals in 1951 and 1952 to transfer the BLM's O&C lands to the Forest Service (Senator Harry Cain bill) and another by Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman to have the Forest Service placed in Interior, making a new "Public Lands Administration," by presidential order (Richardson 1980). Senate hearings on Senate Bill 1149 were held in 1952, but no changes were forthcoming.

**Eisenhower Administration**—Early in the Dwight D. Eisenhower administration, the new Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay was said to have been favorable to having the Forest Service placed into Interior. At the same time, a new study of the federal government was undertaken. The committee was titled the "Advisory Committee on Government Organization." This was the second Hoover Commission, also led by the ex-president from 1953 to 1955. Contrary to earlier efforts, the new commission recommendations were quite simple: The President, without separate legislation, combine forest and range management in the Department of Agriculture; appoint a committee to study the laws and federal departments which manage the land; the natural resources agencies simply coordinate efforts rather than reorganize; and there should be a uniform policy for all agencies involved in the management of the rural lands.

"President Eisenhower proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 to transfer certain functions of the Department of the Interior...to the Secretary of Agriculture. Upon further study, however, the President decided not to transmit the reorganization plan to Congress.... (Gorte and Cody 1995: 7).

**Kennedy Administration**—There were not any reorganization plans put forward by either the President or Congress during the John F. Kennedy administration. However, the two major land management departments took it upon themselves to come up with a mutual understanding: “the Agriculture and Interior Secretaries sent a letter to the President, known as the ‘Treaty of the Potomac,’ proposing greater cooperation and an end to proposals to transfer lands among agencies (Gorte and Cody 1995: 7).”

**Johnson Administration**—Lyndon B. Johnson's administration looked at ways to improve management of the federal government. A team was organized, under the leadership of Edwin Deckard from the Bureau of the Budget, in the spring of 1965 to review the management and policies of the Forest Service. The Deckard team also looked into the appropriate size of ranger districts, national forests, and regional offices and recommended that these be standardized throughout the national forest system. The report approved the basic principles of Forest Service management and even recommended strengthening the line and staff authority at all levels in the agency. The Deckard Report also looked into the regional office structure and asked a basic question of whether the “historic Regional structure is valid at the present time in view of advances made through the years in transportation, communication, managerial methods, and administrative procedures.”

**Nixon Administration**—During the Richard M. Nixon administration, the Public Land Law Review Commission (PLLRC), which was established in 1964 by Congress to study and recommend changes or additions to the nation's land laws, published its findings. The PLLRC report (*One Third of the Nation's Land: A Report to the President and to the Congress*), printed in June 1970, made 137 recommendations. One of the major conclusions of the study was that many federal lands were eligible for disposition including national forests, national monuments, and all BLM lands that had not been Congressionally set aside be reviewed by Congress for eventual disposal. The commission, with a strong commodity bias, recommended that “dominant use” should replace multiple use as the “highest and best use of particular areas.” One of the recommendations was to “transfer the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior, to be renamed the Department of Natural Resources...but a merger of these two agencies was not explicitly proposed. No legislative proposals were presented to effect this recommendation (Gorte and Cody 1995: 7).

The Nixon administration also tried to reorganize the Executive Branch through the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization, led by Roy L. Ash. The Ash Council, as it became known, was established on April 5, 1969. The council embraced several of the PLLRC recommendations, as well as others proposed by the Brownlow Committee of 1937, and the first Hoover Commission of 1949. A major recommendation was made on May 12, 1970: Create a new Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) or a Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The DENR proposal was to be more inclusive and would have joined 44 federal agencies together for land management. The President released the “fall-back” DNR recommendation in March 1971. This DNR proposal would have included the Forest Service, Department of the Interior, various programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Soil Conservation Service, parts of the Army Corps of Engineers, and related land and water programs from other agencies, but not include monitoring, energy research, setting environmental, and enforcement programs, many of which are today handled by the Environmental Protection Agency.

There was an internal government plan that was proposed during the Nixon administration—reorganize all the federal agencies into one of ten “standard” regions based on the standard military regions. In this scenario, the reorganization would have changed several of the existing nine Forest Service regions. Bob Wolf explained that “the idea no sooner got out, was announced, than, I don't think the ink was dry [and the idea was dead]... (Wolf 1990: 2).”

In Nixon's second term, beginning in 1973, he announced another reorganization plan. This time, however, he envisioned working through the problems via executive orders. One proposal sent to Congress on June 29, 1973, was for the creation of a new Department of Energy and Natural Resources (DENR). This was essentially a renamed DNR proposal from two years before, but without the energy research and development components of the old plan. However, this one too died in Congress, as with the previous plan.

**Carter Administration**—Another attempt at reorganization came during the Jimmy Carter administration in the late 1970s. During his first year in office, Carter formed a President's Reorganization Project (PRP). Basically, the new administration wanted to reorganize the government land management agencies into a Department of Natural Resources. On December 19, 1977, the PRP made public a proposal to create a new Department of Natural Resources, much like the Nixon administration proposal, which would encompass all the Department of the Interior agencies and the Forest Service into one massive land management department. Based on the report, President Carter on March 1, 1979, announced a reorganization plan to create a Department of Natural Resources that would combine the USDI agencies, as well as the USDA Forest Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from the Department of Commerce. “The substantial congressional opposition and other legislative priorities led Carter to withdraw the DNR proposal before any substantive congressional action had occurred (Gorte and Cody 1995: 8).”

**Reagan Administration**—In the early and mid-1980s, after a rising tide of outrage by western land owners about the “mismanagement” of BLM and Forest Service administered lands, the new Ronald Reagan administration proposed selling these lands to the highest bidder as a way to placate the “Sagebrush Rebellion.” While this effort was much ballyhooed across the country, the massive sale of millions of acres of federal lands never materialized. Should this sell-off have occurred, there would have been no need for either agency in the future.

There was an administration proposal on January 30, 1985, which was intended to interchange or exchange around 35 million acres of land between the Forest Service (some 10 million acres to the BLM) and the Bureau of Land Management (some 15 million acres to the Forest Service). The interchange was aimed at increasing efficiency of management by reducing costs and overlapping functions. Congressional opposition to the interchange, as well as opposition by local communities, counties, and states, essentially scuttled the program. However, there were a number of smaller interchanges of forest and grazing lands that occurred between individual national forests and BLM districts.

**Bush Administration**—There were no significant proposals by the George Bush administration to transfer federal lands into one agency or move the Forest Service to Interior.

**Clinton Administration**—The William J. Clinton administration in early 1993 discussed a massive reorganization of the Forest Service. The agency was to be split along branch lines: Research to go to the new USDI National Biological Survey, international forestry to USAID, state & private forestry to USDA-SCS, while the national forest system to the Department of the Interior. Nothing was formally proposed to Congress, although the National Biological Survey (now Service) was established in 1993 to combine all the research functions and programs within the USDI into one agency. The huge research arm of the Forest Service was excluded in the transfer. Around the same time, there was an internal Forest Service “reinvention effort” that resulted in a December 6, 1994, report (*Reinvention of the Forest Service: The Changes Begin*) which outlined how the agency would accomplish its goals. The most controversial portion dealt with eliminating or combining several Forest Service regional offices. In Congress and the various states, the proposal fell on deaf ears and was declared as “dead on arrival.”

**Bush Administration**—There is an active proposal in the George W. Bush administration to study the possibility of combining the various regional offices because of the need for greater cost efficiency. In late 2001, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has requested that the Forest Service study proposals to reduce the number of regional offices around the country. Two scenarios were presented—use the BLM regional office design or the Department of Defense model. The concept was dropped. A recent 2002 proposal would establish “Charter Forests” to manage selected national forests as a demonstration to cut through federal red-tape. The discussion continues.

#### REFERENCES

Abbasi, Susan R.

1979 *Proposed Department of Natural Resources: A Summary and Analysis*. CRS Report 79-79.  
Washington, DC: U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Ackerman, S.

1990 "Observations on the Transformation of the Forest Service: The Effects of the National Environmental Policy Act on U.S. Forest Service Decision Making." *Environmental Law*, Vol. 20, #3: 703-734.

Ade, H.G.

1931 "Objectives in Handling Federal Forest Lands Discussed by [M.H.] Wolff [Assistant Regional Forester]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 29, #5 (May): 865-866.

Alkire, Carolyn; Michael Anderson; Greg Aplet; and Michael Francis

1999 "America's National Forests: A Vision for the Future." Report. Washington, DC: The Wilderness Society.

Allen, William R.

1984 "Managing Timberlands for the Community's Benefit." Pp. 63-75 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Forests*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

*American Forestry*

1923 "Dismemberment of the Forest Service Unlikely." *American Forestry*, Vol. 29, #2 (Feb): 114.

*American Forests*

1933 "Federal Conservation Agencies Reported Endangered by Reorganization." *American Forests*, Vol. 39, #5 (May): 224.

1934 "Nation-Wide Opposition to Forest Service Transfer." *American Forests*, Vol. 40, #12 (Dec): 584.

1937a "[President Franklin D.] Roosevelt Recommends a Department of Conservation." *American Forests*, Vol. 43, #2 (Feb): 74, 92.

1937b "Trees is Trees [Re: Reorganization to a Dept. of Conservation]." *American Forests*, Vol. 43, #6 (June): 293.

1937c "Secretary [Henry A.] Wallace and Reorganization [Open Letter from Herman H. Chapman to Secretary Wallace]." *American Forests*, Vol. 43, #12 (Dec): 603.

1939 "Transfer of Forest Service not Contemplated: President Roosevelt so Asserts in Letter to Senator Pittman of Nevada." *American Forests*, Vol. 45, #7 (July): 360.

1940 "Transfer of Forest Service Again Threatens." *American Forests*, Vol. 46, #3 (March): 130.

1940 "Agriculture Retains the Forest Service: Reorganization Plans for Present Session of Congress Leave Forestry Agency Untouched." *American Forests*, Vol. 46, #5 (May): 209.

1949 "Straight Ahead, Mr. Hoover." *American Forests*, Vol. 55, #3 (March): 48.

1950 "People's Land: Should Uncle Sam Relinquish His Stewardship of 400,000,000 Acres of Public Lands...." *American Forests*, Vol. 56, #1 (Jan): 12-14, 40-42.

*American Forests and Forest Life*

1925a "The Stockmen's Claim to Uncle Sam's Forage." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 31, #11 (Nov): 666.

1925b "Stockmen Would Quarter the National Forests." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 31, #11 (Nov): 667-668.

1926 "Enlarged National Forest Program Assured." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 32, #5 (May): 302, 304.

1927 "A Department of Conservation." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 33, #4 (April): 227.

1929a "Reorganizing Conservation." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 35, #6 (June): 357-358.

1929c "The President and the Public Lands." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 35, #10 (Oct): 645-646.

1929d "Transfer of Forest Service to Department of Interior Proposed." *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 35, #10 (Oct): 656.

Baden, Jon  
 2002 "Charter Forests Could be a Model Concept." Column dated February 15, 2002, in Headwaters News, an electronic news medium.

Bailey, Fred G.  
 1951 "Closer Look at Agriculture's Reorganization." *American Forests*, Vol. 57, #7 (July): 18-19.

Barker, Rocky  
 2001 "Forest Chief Vows to End Project Deadlock: Dale Bosworth Explains Goals to Boiseans." *Idaho Statesman*, December 13, 2001.

Barney, Daniel R.  
 1972 *The Last Stand: The Nader Study Group Report on the U.S. Forest Service*. Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Responsive Law.

Baser, Nort  
 1949 "The Hoover Report on Interior." *American Forests*, Vol. 55, #5 (May): 28, 46.

Bassman, Robert  
 1974 "The 1897 Organic Act: A Historical Perspective." *Natural Resources Lawyer*, Vol. 7, #3 (Summer): 503-520.

Behan, Richard W.  
 1985 "Public Land Management: A Case of Institutional Lunacy (and a Few Modest Prescriptions)." *Western Wildlands: A Natural Resource Journal*, Vol. 11, #2 (Summer): 29-31.  
 1988 "A Plea for Constituency-Based Management: No More Arm's-Length Oversight, Says This Educator. Let's Run Each National Forest According to the Desires of Those Who Know and Care About it." *American Forests*, Vol. 94, #7/8 (July/Aug): 46-48.  
 1992 "The Irony of the Multiple Use/Sustained Yield Concept: Nothing is so Powerful as an Idea Whose Time has Passed." Pp. 95-106 in *Multiple Use and Sustained Yield: Changing Philosophies for Federal Land Management?* Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session. Committee Print No. 11. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.  
 2001 *Plundered Promise: Capitalism, Politics, and the Fate of the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Binkley, Clark S.  
 1999 "Forestry in the Next Millennium: Challenges and Opportunities for the USDA Forest Service." Discussion Paper 99-15. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Bjork, Gordon C.  
 1984 "Ownership and Outcome—An Economic Analysis of the Privatization of Land Tenure on Forest and Rangeland." Pp. 181-192 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Bolduan, Linda M.  
 1990 "The [Senator Mark] Hatfield Riders: Eliminating the Role of the Courts in Environmental Decision Making." *Environmental Law*, Vol. 20, #2: 329-385.

Bosworth, Dale  
 2001a "A Process in Need of Change." Speech at the Forest Policy Summit, Rapid City, SD, August 15.  
 2001b "Working Together for the Health of the Land." Speech at the Natural Resources Summit, Sacramento, CA, September 28.

Bowes, Michael and John V. Krutilla  
 1989 *Multiple-Use Management: The Economics of Public Forestlands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Buford, Robert F. and R. Max Peterson  
 1985 "The Great Land Swap." *American Forests*, Vol. 91, #9 (Sept): 10, 59-61. Also see the John Melcher article in the same issue.

Brubaker, Sterling  
 1984 "Issues and Summary of Federal Land Tenure." Pp. 1-32 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Brubaker, Sterling (ed.)  
 1984 *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Buford, Robert F. and R. Max Peterson  
 1985 "The Great Land Swap." *American Forests*, Vol. 91, #9 (Sept): 10, 59-61. Also see the John Melcher article in the same issue.

Butler, Ovid McOuat  
 1925 "Shall the Stockmen Control the National Forests?" *American Forests*, Vol. 31, #9 (Sept): 519-522, 574-575.  
 1932 "Conservation Sidelights on Reorganization." *American Forests*, Vol. 38, #11 (Nov): 585-586.  
 1937 "Conservation at the Forks: Proposed Reorganization of the Federal Government Raises Questions Vital to Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Fields of Conservation." *American Forests*, Vol. 43, #3 (March): 109-110, 143.  
 1939 "Editor's Log: Reorganization." *American Forests*, Vol. 45, #6 (June): 292-293.

Butterick, P.L.  
 1928 "Politics and Perpetual Rights—Some Aspects of Grazing on the National Forests." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 26, #1 (Jan): 34-56.

Cameron, Jenks  
 1928 *The Development of Governmental Forest Control in the United States*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Reprinted in 1972 by the Da Capo Press.

Carhart, Arthur Hawthorne  
 1947 "Who Says Sell Our Public Lands in the West? This Proposal...Stems from a Small Group of Stockmen...." *American Forests*, Vol. 53 (April): 152-155.  
 1948a "Our Public Lands in Jeopardy." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 46, #6 (June): 409-416.  
 1948b "Land Grab: Who Gets Our Public Land? [Livestock Industry Attempt to Gain Control of the Public Grazing Lands]" *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 182 (July): 57-61.  
 1953 "They Still Covet Our Lands: They've Rewritten the Script, But the Plot's the Same in This Latest Assault on the Public Domain." *American Forests*, Vol. 59, #4 (April): 11-12.

Carstensen, Vernon R.  
 1963 *The Public Lands: Studies in the History of the Public Domain*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Cawley, R. McGregor  
 1993 *Federal Land, Western Anger: The Sagebrush Rebellion & Environmental Politics*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

*Century Magazine*  
 1913 "A Wrong Application of State Rights: The Danger of Losing Much That Has Been Gained by Conservation [by Transferring NFs to States]." *Century Magazine*, Vol. 85 (April): 954-955.

Chapman, Herman Haupt  
 1917 "Shall the National Forests be Turned Over to the States?" *American Forestry*, Vol. 19 (Feb): 77-87.  
 1926 "The Future Disposition of Our Remaining Public Lands [Argues that the USDA, not the USDI, Should Have Control]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 24, #5 (May): 493-499.  
 1929 "National and State Forests: A Compilation of the Opinions of State Forestry Officials of Forty-Eight States." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 27, #6 (Oct): 622-655.  
 1930 "Conservation or Departmental Jealousy--Which?" *American Forests and Forest Life*, Vol. 36, #4 (April): 211-212, 230.  
 1932 "Conservation, and the Department of the Interior." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 30, #5 (May): 544-553.  
 1934 "Editorial: The Threatened Transfer of the Forest Service to the Department of Interior." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 32, #9 (Dec): 927-929.  
 1935a "Press Release [Dated June 24]: Foresters Review Protest Against Ickes Bill [H.R. 7712 to Change the Name of USDI to US Dept. of Conservation]." Washington, DC: Society of American Foresters.

Chapman, Herman Haupt (continued)

1935b "Foresters Challenge Conservation Claims of Department of the Interior: Press Release of June 24, Prepared by Professor H. H. Chapman, President, Society of American Foresters, Washington, D. C." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #8 (Aug): 713-718.

1935c "Shall the Department of the Interior Become the Department of Conservation and Works?" *Science (NS)*, Vol. 82 (Aug. 2): 101-102.

1935d "The Case Against the Ickes Bill Restated [Change the Department of Interior to the Department of Conservation and Works]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #10 (Oct): 834-842.

1935e "Why Senate Bill 2665 to Change the Name of the Department of [the] Interior Should Not Pass." Washington, DC: Society of American Foresters.

1937a "A Policy to Coordinate National Parks and National Forests." Reprint of an article published on June 1, 1917. New York, NY: Society of American Foresters.

1937b "Reorganization and the Forest Service." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 35, #5 (May): 427-434.

Chapman, Herman Haupt and Henry Wallace

1938 "Correspondence [Between Chapman & Wallace on S.B. 2970 to Reorganize the Agencies of Government]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 36, #1 (Jan): 86-90.

Clapp, Earle Hart

1968a "Ramifications of Reorganization: The Land, the Sea, and the Air." *American Forests*, Vol. 74, #9 (Sept): 16-19, 44-47.

1968b "Ramifications of Reorganization: The Land, the Sea, and the Air. Part II." *American Forests*, Vol. 74, #10 (Oct): 24-27, 56, 58-60.

Clawson, Marion

1951 *Uncle Sam's Acres*. New York, NY: Dodd, Mead & Co.

1965a "A Public Land Review: Should Public Lands Pay Taxes?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #3 (March): 10-13, 52-57.

1965b "A Public Land Review-Part II: How Much Should Users of Public Lands Pay?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #4 (April): \_\_\_\_.

1965c "A Public Land Review-Part III: Do We Want Efficiency in Public Land Management?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #5 (May): \_\_\_\_.

1965d "A Public Land Review-Part IV: What Can Land Exchanges Accomplish?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #6 (June): \_\_\_\_.

1965e "A Public Land Review-Part V: Is Reorganization of Federal Resource Agencies a Miracle?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #7 (July): \_\_\_\_.

1965f "A Public Land Review-Part VI: What is the Future of Public Lands?" *American Forests*, Vol. 71, #8 (Aug): \_\_\_\_.

1975 *Forests for Whom and for What?* Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

1984 "Major Alternatives for the Future Management of the Federal Lands." Pp. 195-234 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

1987 "Achieving Agreement on Natural Resource Use." Horace M. Albright Conservation Lectureship, Berkeley, CA, April 2, 1987.

1995 "Old Timber and new Growth: An Interview with Marion Clawson." *Resources* 121 (Fall 1995). Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Clawson, Marion and Burnell Held

1957 *The Federal Lands: Their Use and Management*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press for Resources for the Future.

Collingwood, G. H.

1949 "Conservation and the Hoover Report: An Analysis of Proposals to Consolidate Forest and Range Management in the Department of Agriculture." *American Forests*, Vol. 55, #4 (April): 12-13, 45-46.

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government

1949 "Reorganization of Department of [the] Interior: A Report to Congress by Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government, March 1949." Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

Congressional Research Service

1992 *Multiple Use and Sustained Yield: Changing Philosophies for Federal Land Management?* Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup>

Session. Committee Print No. 11. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Cooper, Arthur W.

1999 "The Second Committee of Scientists: Moving Forward While Looking Backward [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 16-18. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

Craig, James B.

1955 "What's on the Horizon? As the Forest Service Moves from a Custodial to a Land-Manager Status on its Lands, it Faces the Greatest Challenge in its 50-year History - How to Intensively Manage More than 180 Million Acres of Forested Area." *American Forests*, Vol. 61, #3 (March): 24-27, 91.

Crafts, Edward C.

1971 "The President's Reorganization Proposals and the Forest Service." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 69, #4 (April): 210-211.

Crafts, Edward C. with Amelia R. Fry (interviewer)

1975 *Congress and the Forest Service, 1950-1962*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Bancroft Library, Regional Oral History Office.

Crafts, Edward C. with Susan R. Schrepfer (interviewer)

1972 "Congressional Liaison in the Forest Service." *Forest History*, Vol. 16, #3 (Oct): 12-17.

Cramer, Lori A.; James J. Kennedy; Richard S. Krannich; and Thomas M. Quigley

1993 "Changing Forest Service Values and Their Implications for Land Management Decisions Affecting Resource-Dependent Communities." *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 58, #3 (Fall): 475-491.

Crowell Jr., John B.

1985 "Deficits, Compound Interest and the Forest Service." The S.J. Hall Lectureship in Industrial Forestry, Berkeley, CA, November 21, 1985.

Culhane, Paul J.

1981 *Public Lands Politics: Interest Group Influence on the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press for Resources for the Future.

1984 "Sagebrush Rebels in Office: Jim Watt's Land and Water Policies." In N. Vig and M. Kraft (eds.) *Environmental Policy in the 1980s*. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.

Czolgosz, Leon

1985 "The Great [FS-BLM] Exchange." *Earth First!*, Vol. 5, #4 (Mar 20): 19.

Dambach, Charles A.

1960 "On the Consolidation of Resource Departments." *American Forests*, Vol. 66, #4 (April): 32, 60-66.

Dana, Samuel Trask

1929 "Where Does the Forest Service Belong?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 27, #8 (Dec): 901-903.

1956 *Forest and Range Policy - Its Development in the United States*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Dana, Samuel Trask and Sally K. Fairfax

1980 *Forest and Range Policy: Its Development in the United States*. Second edition of the Dana 1956 book. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Daniels, Steven E. and Karren Merrill

1992 "The Committee of Scientists: A Forgotten Link in National Forest [NFMA] Planning History." *Forest and Conservation History*, Vol. 36, #3 (July): 108-110. See the symposium participants views under Sabatier, as well as the Daniels rejoinder in the same issue and a comment by Robert E. Wolf in the January 1993 issue.

DeBoer, S. R.

1922 "Against Transfer: Forest Service Should Remain Where It Is." *Parks and Recreation*, Vol. 5, #3 (Jan/Feb): 227-230.

DeVoto, Bernard

- 1947 "The Easy Chair [Concerning the Assault on the Public Lands by Grazing Interests]." *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 194 (June): 543-546.
- 1952 "The Easy Chair: An Old Steal Refurbished [Grazing and Range Management on the NFs]." *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 205 (Oct): 65-68.
- 1953 "The Easy Chair: Heading for the Last Roundup [Stockmen Attempt to Control Federal Grazing Lands]." *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. 207 (July): 49-52.

Dixon, Joseph M.

- 1929 "Plans for the Public Domain." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 27, #6 (Oct): 656-666.

Dobbin, Jay H.

- 1913 "Why State Control of Forests is Impractical." *National Wool Grower*, Vol. 3 (March): 19-21.

Dobra, John L. and George A. Unimchuck

- 1981-2 "Property Rights, Legal Efficiency and the Political Economy of the Sagebrush Rebellion." *Nevada Review of Business and Economics*, (Winter): 2-12.

Douglas, Lynn H.

- 1948 "Why Public Land Controversies Arise in the West." *American Cattle Producer*, Vol. 30 (July): 17-18.

Dowdle, Barney

- 1983 "The Case for Privatizing Government Owned Timberlands." Pp. 71-83 in Phillip N. Truluck (ed.) *Private Rights & Public Lands*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.
- 1984a "The Case for Selling Federal Timberlands." Pp. 21-46 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Forests*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.
- 1984b "Why Have We Retained the Federal Lands? An Alternative Hypothesis." Pp. 61-73 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Drake, George L.

- 1955 "U.S. Forest Service, 1905-1955: An Industry Viewpoint." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 53, #2 (Feb): 116-120.

Durant, R.

- 1987 "Public Lands, the BLM and the Reagan Administration." *Public Administration Review*, (March/April): 180-189.
- 1992 *The Administrative Presidency Revisited: Public Lands, the BLM and the Reagan Revolution*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Emmerich, Herbert

- 1950 *Essays on Federal Reorganization [See the Chapter on Conservation Agencies Entitled 'Unfinished Business' Beginning on Page 123]*. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Fairfax, Sally K.

- 1999 "Lessons for the Forest Service from State Trust Land Management Experience." Discussion Paper 99-16 January 1999. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Fairfax, Sally K. and Barbara T. Andrews

- 1979 "National Forests and Reserved Water Rights in the Western United States." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 77, #10 (Oct): 648-651.

Farnham, Timothy J.

- 1995 "Forest Service Budget Requests and Appropriations: What do Analyses of Trends Reveal?" Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 253-267.

Farnham, Timothy J. and Paul Mohai

- 1995 "National Forest Timber Management Over the Past Decade: A Change in Emphasis for the Forest Service?" Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 268-280.

Farnham, Timothy J., Cameron Profitt Taylor, and Will Callaway

- 1995 "A Shift in Values: Non-Commodity Resource Management and the Forest Service." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 291-295.

Fedkiw, John

- 1989 "The Evolving Use and Management of the Nation's Forests, Grasslands, Croplands, and Related Resources [A Technical Document Supporting the 1989 USDA Forest Service RPA Assessment]." GTR-RM-175. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- 1997 "The Forest Service's Pathway Toward Ecosystem Management." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 95, #4 (April): 30-34.
- 1998 "National Forests and the Organic Act of 1897 at 100 Years." *History Line*, Spring: 8-19 This article was adapted and reprinted as "National Forests and the Performance of the Organic Act of 1897." *Forest History Today*, 1998: 12-17.
- 1999 *Managing Multiple Uses on National Forests, 1905-1995: A 90-year Learning Experience and It Isn't Finished Yet*. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service.

Floyd, Donald W. (ed.)

- 1999 *Forest of Discord: Options for Governing Our National Forests and Federal Public Lands*. Bethesda, MD: Society of American Foresters. Forest Service, BLM, & Congress.

Floyd, Donald W., et al.

- 1999 "Choosing a Forest Vision [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 44-46. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

Forest Options Group

- c2000 "Options for the Forest Service 2<sup>nd</sup> Century: A Report to the American People by the Forest Options Group." From the Thoreau Institute website. 26 pages.

Forester, The

- 1898a "War on the Forest Reservations." *The Forester*, Vol. 4, #5 (May): 96-101.
- 1898b "War on the Forest Reservations." *The Forester*, Vol. 4, #6 (June): 117-121.
- 1898c "The Forest Reserves." *The Forester*, Vol. 4, #12 (Dec): 235-236.
- 1899a "Object of Forest Reservations." *The Forester*, Vol. 5, #2 (Feb): 27-29.
- 1899b "Opposition to [Forest] Reservation Policy." *The Forester*, Vol. 5, #2 (Feb): 34-36.

Forestry and Irrigation

- 1904a "The National Forest Reserves: The Purpose of Their Establishment - How They Have Grown and the Important Ends They Will Conserve." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Vol. 10, #11 (Nov): 520-521.
- 1904b "Private Rights in Forest Reserves: What They Are and How They Were Affected by the Establishment of the Forest Reserves." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Vol. 10, #12 (Dec): 563-564.
- 1905 "Forest Reserve Management Transferred: Control of the Reserves Passes from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Vol. 11, #2 (Feb): 60-61.
- 1908 "National Forests Redistricted." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Vol. 14, #8 (Aug): 428-431.

Forestry Quarterly

- 1911 "Comment [on Reorganization]." *Forestry Quarterly*, Vol. 9, #4 (Dec): 654.

Forests Today & Forever

- 1996 Entire issue is devoted a proposed transfer of BLM O&C lands from the federal government to the state government. *Forests Today & Forever*, Vol. 10, #1.

Foss, Phillip O.

- 1960 *Politics and Grass: The Administration of Grazing on the Public Domain*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Foster, Ellery

- 1946 "Federal Timber Owning Departments' [re: Placing all Federal Timber Lands in One Department]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 44, #8 (Aug): 601-602. Reprinted from the *International Woodworker*.

Fritz, Emanuel

- 1938 "A Plea for a Fair Appraisal of Federal Forestry Reorganization." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 36, #3 (March): 271-275. A comments by Samuel A. Dana on pages 276-277.
- 1946 "A Proposal for Reorganizing and Realigning Federal Forest, Forage, Park, and Game Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 44, #4 (April): 278-281.

Gamache, Adrien E. (ed.)

1984 *Selling the Federal Forests*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Gardner, B. Delworth

1984 "The Case for Divestiture [of Public Lands]." Pp. 156-180 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Gates, Paul W.

1968 *History and Public Land Law Development*. Prepared for the Public Land Law Development Commission. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

1984 "The Federal Lands—Why We Retained Them." Pp. 35-60 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Giltmier, James W.

1998 "Evolution of an Agency [Changes in FS Policies in 20<sup>th</sup> Century]." *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy*, Vol. 13: 6-10.

Goldstein, Ed

2000 Untitled paper about People and the Land. Arlington, VA: The Nature Conservancy.

Gorte, Ross W. and Betsy A. Cody

1995 "The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management: History and Analysis of Merger Proposals." Report 95-117 ENR. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Graves, Henry Solon

1912 "Shall the States Own the Forests?" *Outlook*, Vol. 102 (Dec. 28): 935-944.

1921 "New Menace to Forestry; Reorganization of Forest Service Under Proposed Department of Public Works." *American Forestry*, Vol. 27 (Oct): 645-647.

1926 "The New Public Lands Controversy." *American Forests & Forest Life*, Vol. 32 (Jan): 3-8, 63-64.

1932 "Government Reorganization." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 30, #5 (May): 539-543.

1934 "A Dangerous Proposal [Transfer of Forest Service from USDA]." *American Forests*, Vol. 40, #11 (Nov): 507-508.

Greeley, William Buckhout

1925 "Forest Management on Federal Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 22, #3 (March): 223-235.

1927 "Shall the National Forests be Abolished?" *Mining Congress Journal*, Vol. 13, #8 (Aug): 594-597. Reprinted by the *Forest History Today*, 1997: 12-16.

1938 "Common Sense in Conservation: Comment on the Bill for Reorganization of the Federal Departments." *American Forests*, Vol. 44, #1 (Jan): 28, 46-47.

Greeley, William B. and Gifford Pinchot

1920 "Greeley and Pinchot Discuss State Versus National Control of Forests." *Southern Lumberman*, Vol. 1311 (Nov. 6): 41-42.

Gulick, Luther Halsey

1951 *American Forest Policy: A Study of Government Administration and Economic Control*. New York, NY: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

Hage, E. Wayne

1989 *Storm Over Rangelands: Private Rights in Federal Lands*. Bellevue, WA: Merril Press.

c.1994 "The Development of County Government in the West and Federal Lands." Printed by the author.

Hagenstein, Perry R.

1984 "The Federal Lands Today—Uses and Limits." Pp. 74-107 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

1992 "Some History of Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Concepts." Pp. 31-43 in *Multiple Use and Sustained Yield: Changing Philosophies for Federal Land Management?* Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session. Committee Print No. 11. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Haines, Lynn

1913 "How Idaho Views Federal Control of Our Unappropriated Forest Areas." *Lumber World Review*, Vol. 25 (Sept. 10): 28-30.



Hall, William L.  
 1920 "Private Lands in National Forests." *Timberman*, Vol. 21 (Sept): 48K-48L.

Hanke, Steve H.  
 1984 "On Privatization [of the National Forests]." Pp. 84-92 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Hanson, Chad  
 1999 "End Logging on National Forests: The Facts." *Earth Island Journal*, Summer Insert: 1-16.

Harlan, Bill  
 2002 "Gov. Warns Against Forest Bill." *Rapid City Journal*, January 28, 2002.

Harvey, D. Michael  
 1984 "Uses and Limits of the Federal Lands Today—Who Cares and How Should the Current Law Work?" Pp. 108-122 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Hays, Samuel P.  
 1959 *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920*. Harvard Historical Monographs, No. 40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Healy, Robert G. and William E. Shands  
 1989 "A Conversation with Marion Clawson: How Times (and Foresters) Have Changed." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 87, #5 (May): 18-24.

Hibbard, Benjamin Horace  
 1965 *A History of the Public Land Policies*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hrubes, Robert J.  
 1981 "The USDA Forest Service in the Environmental Era: Institutional and Programmatic Change." Ph.D. dissertation. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Hyde, William F.  
 1981 "Compounding Clear-Cuts: The Social Failures of Public Timber Management in the Rockies." Pp. 186-202 in *Bureaucracy vs. Environment - The Environmental Costs of Bureaucratic Governance*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyde, William F. and James L. Chamberlain  
 1995 "Who Would Gain from Privatizing the National Forests?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 93, #8 (Aug): 22-25.

Ise, John  
 1915 "A Chapter in the Early History of the United States Forest Policy." *The Ames Forester*, Vol. 3: 33-66.  
 1920 *The United States Forest Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Reprinted in 1972 by the Arno Press, Inc., New York, NY.

Johnson, K. Norman, et al.  
 1999 "Sustaining the People's Lands: Recommendations [from the Second Committee of Scientists Working on Regulations for the NFMA] for Stewardship of the National Forests and Grasslands into the Next Century." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 6-12.

Jones, Elsie S. and Will Callaway  
 1995 "Neutral Bystander, Intrusive Micromanager, or Useful Catalyst?: The Role of Congress in Effecting Change Within the Forest Service." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 337-350.

Jones, Elsie S. and Paul Mohai  
 1995 "Is the Forest Service Keeping up with the Times?: Interest Group and Forestry School Perceptions of Post-NFMA Change in the United States Forest Service." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 351-371.

Jones, Elsie S. and Cameron P. Taylor  
 1995 "Litigating Agency Change: The Impact of the Courts and Administrative Appeals Process on the Forest Service." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 310-336.

Jones, J. M. (Casey)

1951 "Our Federal Lands [on the Transfer of the BLM to USDA]." *National Wool Grower*, Vol. 41 (Nov): 5-6.

*Journal of Forestry*

1921 "Hands Off the National Forests[ re: Transfer of National Forests to the Department of the Interior]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 19, #8 (Dec): 946-947.

1927 "Forest Service Eliminated from Proposed Department of Public Works and Domain." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 25, #4 (April): 504-505.

1929a "Editorial: A Dangerous Proposal [re: President Hoover's Proposal to Reorganize the Federal Land Management Agencies]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 27, #8 (Dec): 901-903.

1929b "Editorial: Where Does the Forest Service Belong?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 27, #8 (Dec): 901-903.

1931a "Editorial: The Public Land Report a Threat to Conservation." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 29, #5 (May): 649-651.

1931b "Report of the [Society of American Foresters] Committee on the Conservation and Administration of the Public Domain." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 29, #5 (May): 815-821.

1932 "Editorial: Critical Times Ahead for Forestry." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 30, #5 (May): 537-538.

1934 "Foresters Warn of Danger That U.S. Forest Service May be Transferred." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 32, #9 (Dec): 1032-1033.

1935a "Editorial: A New Issue Under an Old Name[ re: Forest Service to the Department of the Interior]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #7 (July): 645-647.

1935b "Society [of American Foresters] Opposes Granting National Forest Lands to States for Parks, Parkways, and Recreation Areas." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #9 (Sept): 816-817.

1936a "Correspondence: Comments on the Ickes-Chapman Correspondence [re: Government Reorganization]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 34, #2 (Feb): 187-188.

1936b "Editorial: An Issue that Will not Down [Reorganization of FS into Interior]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 34, #6 (June): 551-553.

1936c "Editorial: Reorganization Objectives [Regarding a New Dept. of Conservation]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 34, #7 (July): 645-647.

1938a "Correspondence [Between H.H. Chapman, Society of American Foresters, and Henry Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture, Regarding Agency Reorganization]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 36, #1 (Jan): 86-89.

1938b "Editorial: The Reorganization Bill in Retrospect." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 36, #7 (July): 641-643.

1940 "More Important Question [Proposed Transfer of FS from USDA]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 42, #5 (May): 377-378.

1946 "Editorial: Administration of the Public Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 44, #4 (April): 235-236.

1949 "A Bold New Look at Government [re: Hoover Commission]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 47, #8 (May): 610-611.

1954 "Effect of USDA Reorganization on Forest Service." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 52, #3 (March): 227.

1970 "Summary of Public Land Law Review Commission's Recommendations." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 68, #8 (Aug): 468-474.

Kaufman, Herbert

1960 *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Kemmis, Daniel

2000 "Rethinking Public Land Governance for the New Century." Pinchot Institute for Conservation Distinguished Lecture, Presented on February 11, 2000, at The Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C. Series. Milford, PA: Grey Towers Press.

2001 *This Sovereign Land: A New Vision for Governing the West*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

2002 "Can We Restart the Missing Dialogue on Public Lands?" Perspective articles in the *Denver Post*, March 3, 2002.

Kenworthy, Tom

1995 "Dueling With the Forest Service: Western Ranchers Have Launched a Revolt Over Federal Public Land Policies." *Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, Vol. 12, #17 (Feb 27-March 5): 31.

Kirkmire, Nicholas J.

1984 "Selling the Federal Forest: The Intermingled Owner's View." Pp. 236-242 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Kittredge, William

1996 *Who Owns the West*. San Francisco, CA: Mercury House.

Klyza, Christopher McGrory

1996 *Who Controls Public Lands? Mining, Forestry, and Grazing Policies, 1870-1990*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kneipp, L.F.

1933 "Uncle Sam as a Buyer of Forest Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 31, #7 (Nov): 778-782.

Krutila, John V. and Michael D. Bowes

1990 "Economics and Public Forestland Management." *Natural Resources Journal*, Vol. 29 (Summer): 737-750.

Krutila, John V. and John A. Haigh

1978 "An Integrated Approach to National Forest Management." *Environmental Law*, Vol. 8, #2 (Winter): 374-415. Also reprinted by the Resources for the Future, reprint 156.

Kubler, Hans

1991 "State Takeover of National Forests: The Benefits of Efficiency and Proximity." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 89, #7 (July): 56.

Lacayo, Richard

1995 "This Land is Whose Land?: From Out of the West Comes a Strike Force of Congressmen and Senators Who Think Natural Resources Ought to be Exploited, not Coddled." *Time*, Vol. 146, #17 (Oct. 23): 68-71.

Lamb, John

1913 "The States' Rights Question." *American Forestry*, Vol. 19 (March): 172-174. (Re: States rights and NF land acquisitions.)

Lamm, Richard D. and G. Michael McCarthy

1982 *The Angry West: A Vulnerable Land and Its Future*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Lekachman, Robert

1984 "Public Timber and the Public Interest." Pp. 76-83 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Forests*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Leman, Christopher K.

1981 "The Forest Ranger Revisited: Administrative Behavior in the U.S. Forest Service in the 1980s." Paper presented at the Political Science Association meeting in New York, NY.

1984 "The Revolution of the Saints: The Ideology of Privatization and its Consequences for the Public Lands." Pp. 93-162 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

LeMaster, Dennis C.

1984 *Decade of Change: The Remaking of Forest Service Statutory Authority During the 1970s*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

LeMaster, Dennis C. and Luke Popovich

1977 *Crisis in Federal Forest Land Management: Proceedings of a Symposium*. Washington, DC: Society of American Foresters.

Lancaster, John

1991 "Public Land, Private Profit: A Modern Version of an Old-Fashioned Range War." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 89, #11 (Nov): 18-20. (Article reprinted from the *Washington Post*.)

Leonard, George M.

1992 "Dialogue: Forest Service Is Responsive to Change." *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy*, Vol. 7, #2 (Summer): 120-121.

Leshy, John D.

1984 "Sharing Federal Multiple-Use Lands—Historic Lessons and Speculations for the Future." *Sterling Brubaker (ed.) Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

1992 "Is the Multiple Use/Sustained Yield Management Philosophy Still Applicable Today?" Pp. 107-119 in *Multiple Use and Sustained Yield: Changing Philosophies for Federal Land Management?* Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session. Committee Print No. 11. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Lynch, Dennis L. and Stephen Larrabee

1991 "Private Lands Within National Forests: Origins, Problems, and Opportunities [1840s-1910s]." Pp. 198-216 in Harold K. Steen (ed.) *The Origins of the National Forests: A Centennial Symposium*. Durham, NC: Forest History Society.

McCarthy, Michael

1991 "The First Sagebrush Rebellion: Forest Reserves and States Rights in Colorado and the West, 1891-1907." Pp. 180-197 in Harold K. Steen (ed.) *The Origins of the National Forests: A Centennial Symposium*. Durham, NC: Forest History Society.

MacCleery, Douglas W.

1982 "Response to Environmentalists' 'Indictment' Report." Report dated April 26, 1982. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

1984 "The U.S. Department of Agriculture's Asset Management Program." Pp. 176-183 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

McCracken, Joseph W.

1984 "The Asset Management Program: Perspective of the Public Buying Sector of the Forest Products Industry." Pp. 243-249 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

MacDonnell, Lawrence J. and Sara F. Bates

1993 *Natural Resources Policy and Law: Trends and Directions*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

McQuillan, Alan G.

1990a "Is National Forest Planning Incompatible with a Land Ethic?" *Western Wildlands: A Natural Resource Journal*, Vol. 15, #4 (Winter): 7-11.

1990b "Is National Forest Planning Incompatible with a Land Ethic?: Defining a Purpose for the Forest Reserves." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 88, #5 (May): 31-37. Reprint of above.

1994 "National Public Tree Farms [on NFs]: Toward a Spectrum of Designations." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 92, #1 (Jan): 14-19.

McTigue, Maurice

c2000 "The New Zealand Solution." From the Thoreau Institute website.

McWilliams, Ruth and Fred Patten

1995 "Sustainability: Building on USDA's Historic Commitment to Rural Economic Development, the Forest Service Reshapes Its Approach to Rural Communities." *Women in Natural Resources*, Vol. 16, #4 (June): 4-7, 53.

Malone, Rita

1985 "Washington Lookout [re: FS/BLM Interchange]." *American Forests*, Vol. 91, #3 (March): 8.

Manning, Richard D.

1990 "Fixing the Forests: The U.S. Forest Service is Besieged with Change, but Congress Isn't Helping." *Buzzworm: The Environmental Journal*, Vol. 2, #6 (Nov/Dec): 50-55.

Marshall, Robert

1936 "Correspondence [re: A Department of Conservation]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 34, #7 (July): 737-738.

Marston, Ed  
 1993 "The Forest Service Clings to an Outmoded Ideology." *High Country News*, Vol. 25, #21 (Nov. 15): 13.

Mead, Elwood  
 1898 "Practical Objections to the Forest Reservation Policy." *The Forester*, Vol. 4, #2 (Feb): 32-34.

Melcher, John  
 1985 "The Great Land Swap." *American Forests*, Vol. 91, #9 (Sept): 11, 76-78. Also see the Robert Buford and Max Peterson article in the same issue.

Merriam, Melinda  
 1992 "Groups Seek to De-Nationalize the Public Lands." *High Country News*. (Feb. 24).

Messing, John  
 1966 "Public Lands, Politics, and Progressives: The Oregon Land Fraud Trials, 1903-1910." *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. 35, #1 (Feb): 35-66.

Miller, Leslie A.  
 1949 "The Case for a Department of Natural Resources." *American Forests*, Vol. 55, #11 (Nov): 24-25, 46-47.

Mitchell, John G.  
 2001 "The Big Open: Going Public with the [BLM] Public Lands." *National Geographic*, Vol. 200, #2 (Aug): 2-29.

Mohai, Paul  
 1995 "The Forest Service Since the National Forest Management Act: Assessing Bureaucratic Response to External and Internal Forces for Change." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 247-252.

Mohai, Paul (ed.)  
 1995 "Change in the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service and Its Consequences for National Forest Policy." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 245-371.

Mohai, Paul and Pamela Jakes  
 1996 "The Forest Service in the 1990s: Is It Headed in the Right Direction?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 94, #1 (Jan): 31-37.

Mohai, Paul and Phyllis Stillman  
 1993 *Are We Heading in the Right Direction? A Survey of USDA Forest Service Employees, Executive Summary*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Environment.

Mohai, Paul; Phyllis Stillman; Pamela Jakes; and Chris Liggett  
 1994 *Change in the USDA Forest Service: Are We Heading in the Right Direction?* NC-GTR-172. St. Paul, MN: USDA Forest Service, North Central Experiment Station.

Mondell, Frank W.  
 1909 "Shall the People of the Bureaus Rule?" Speech in the House of Representatives, Monday, December 20, 1909, on the Control of the Waters of Non-navigable Streams. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

1927 "Future Disposition and Control of Our Public Lands...." *Mining Congress Journal*, Vol. 13 (Feb): 95-97. Author wants Federal control to end.

Moore, Barrington  
 1930 "Society Affairs: Progress Report of Forest Policy Committee [w/Plan for Reorganizing the Conservation Work of the Federal Government]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 28, #8 (Dec): 1184-1193.

Morrill, W.J.  
 1931 "United States Public Land Policy: A Point of View of a State." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 29, #3 (March): 322-327.

Muench Jr., John  
 1966 "Impact of Public vs Private Ownership of Timber Land on a Rural Economy." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 64, #11 (Nov): 721-727.

Mulford, Walter

1938 "Our Conservation Department: Agriculture [re: Transfer of the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 36, #3 (March): 278-279.

Nelson, DeWitt

1946 "Public Ownership of California Forests [on the Need to Keep Federal, State, and Private Ownerships]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 44, #8 (Aug): 575-578.

Nelson, Robert H.

1984 "Ideology and Public Land Policy—The Current Crisis." Pp. 235-298 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

1995 *Public Lands and Private Rights*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

1998 "Rethinking Scientific Management." Discussion Paper 99-07 dated November 1998. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

2000 *A Burning Issue: A Case for Abolishing the U.S. Forest Service*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Nixon, Edgar B. (ed.)

1957 *Franklin D. Roosevelt and Conservation, 1911-1945*. Two volumes. Hyde Park, NY: General Services Administration.

O'Callaghan, Jerry A.

1983 "Forest Service Placement [in the Federal Bureaucracy]." Pp. 252-254 in Richard C. Davis *Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History*. Vol. 1. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

O'Toole, Randal

1986 "Privatizing the Public Trust: John Baden--A 'Free Market Environmentalist'." *Forest Watch*, Vol. 7, #4 (Oct): 26-30.

1987 "Reforming the Forest Service: Part Two, Forming a Tentative Diagnosis." *Forest Watch*, Vol. 7, #10 (June): 8-13.

1988a *Reforming the Forest Service*. Covelo, CA: Island Press.

1988b "Reforming the Forest Service." *The Southern Willamette Alliance*, Vol. 8, #4 (April): 5-6. Newsletter published in Eugene, Oregon.

1995 "The Forest Service Has Already Been Reinvented [Since the late 1970s]." *Different Drummer*, Vol. 2 (Spring): 39-53.

1999 "Reforming the Forest Soviet [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 34-36. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

c2000a "Better Incentives for Public Lands." From the Thoreau Institute website. 6 pages.

c2000b "Reforming Public Land Management with New Incentives." From the Thoreau Institute website. 6 pages.

c2000c "Run Them Like Business: Natural Resource Agencies in an Era of Federal Limits." From the Thoreau Institute website. 12 pages.

Patton, Thomas W.

1994 "Franklin [Delano] Roosevelt and American Forestry." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 92, #2 (Feb): 14-17.

1995 "FDR: Presidential Forester." *The View From Hyde Park*, Vol. 9 (Winter): 5-7.

Pearl, Milton A.

1967 "Anatomy of a Public Land Study [Public Land Law Review Commission]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 65, #3 (March): 174-175.

Peffer, E. Louise

1951 *The Closing of the Public Domain: Disposal and Reservation Policies, 1900-1950*. Stanford University Food Research Institute Misc. Publication 10. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pendley, William Perry

1995 *War on the West: Government Tyranny on America's Great Frontier*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing, Inc.

Perry, James P.

2001 "History and Causes of, and Options for Addressing, 'Process Gridlock' Related to NFS [National Forest System] Management." Testimony dated October 25, 2001, for the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Pfleger, Katherine

2001 "Forest Service Wants to Streamline Environmental Regulations." Associated Press article.

2002 "Bush Lobbies for 'Charter Forests'." Associated Press article.

Pinchot, Gifford

1920 "National or State Control of Forest Devastation." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 18, #2 (Feb): 106-109.

1937a "Old Evils in New Clothes [Reorganization of FS into Interior]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 35, #5 (May): 435-438.

1937b "How Conservation Began in the United States." *Agricultural History*, Vol. 11, #4 (Oct): 255-265.

1941 "The Public Good Comes First [re: Government Control of Private Forests]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 39, #2 (Feb): 208-212.

1947 *Breaking New Ground*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Company. Reprinted in 1972 by the University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA and 1998, with an introduction by Char Miller and V. Alaric Sample.

Pinkett, Harold T.

1965 "The Keep Commission, 1905-1909: A Rooseveltian Effort for Administrative Reform." *Journal of American History*, Vol. 52, #1 and 2 (Sept): 297-312.

Polenberg, Richard

1965 "Conservation and Reorganization: The Forest Service Lobby, 1937-1938." *Agricultural History*, Vol. 39, #4 (Oct): 230-239.

1966 *Reorganizing Roosevelt's Government, 1936-1939: The Controversy Over Executive Reorganization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

1967 "The Great Conservation Contest [FDR Reorganization Attempt 1936-39]." *Forest History*, Vol. 10, #4 (Jan): 13-23.

Potter, Albert F.

1921 "Keep the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture!" *Producer*, Vol. 3, #5: 9-10.

Public Land Law Review Commission

1970 *One Third of the Nation's Land: A Report to the President and to the Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

Puter, Steven A. Douglas and Horace Stevens (collaborator)

1908 *Looters of the Public Domain [Documents Decades of Land Fraud in the Far West]*. Portland, OR: Portland Printing House.

Redington, Paul G.

1932 "Address of the President [of the Society of American Foresters]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 30, #3 (March): 255-262.

Reed, Franklin

1935a "Shall There be a Federal Conservation Department?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #7 (July): 648-657.

1935b "The Lewis Bill [to Transfer the Forest Service to the Department of the Interior] (Progress of Events to Date—August 5, 1935)." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 33, #9 (Sept): 815-816.

1936 "The Question of Conservation Jurisdiction to Date [Status of Several Bills in Congress]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 34, #7 (July): 724-725.

Reidel, Carl

1992 "A Public/Private Cooperative Paradigm for Federal Land Management." Pp. 145-168 in *Multiple Use and Sustained Yield: Changing Philosophies for Federal Land Management?* Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 102<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session. Committee Print No. 11. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

Resler, Rexford A.

1984 "The Future of Federal Forest Lands: Why the Public Will Retain Ownership of the Federal Forest and Rangelands." Pp. 47-62 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Rey, Mark

2000 "Collaborative Stewardship: A New Environmental Ethic for the West." The S.J. Hall Lectureship in Industrial Forestry, Berkeley, CA, October 13, 2000.

Richardson, Elmo R.

1962 *The Politics of Conservation: Crusades and Controversies, 1897-1913*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Ricketts, A.H.

1913 "The Truth About 'Pinchot's Doughnuts' [Attack on administration of the NFs]." *Mining and Engineering World*, Vol. 39 (July 26): 161-163.

Robbins, Jim

1995 "Target Green: Federal Land Managers Under Attack." *Audubon*, Vol. 97, #4 (July/Aug): 82-85. Wise use movement and violence.

Robbins, Roy M.

1942 *Our Landed Heritage: The Public Domain, 1776-1936*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Robbins, William G.

1984 "Federal Forestry Cooperation: The Fennow-Pinchot Years." *Journal of Forest History*, Vol. 28, #4 (Oct): 164-173.

1985 *American Forestry: A History of National, State, and Private Cooperation*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Robertson, F. Dale

1991 "100 Years of Public Land Conservation in America." *National Woodlands*, Vol. 14 (April): 5-7.

Robertson, F. Dale with Neil Sampson (interviewer)

1992 "Pivot Point for Public Forests: *American Forests* Interviews the Chief About a Major Change in Forest Management, Testifies on the Tinderbox State of Western Woodlands, and Proposes a Legislative Solution." *American Forests*, Vol. 98, #9/10 (Sept/Oct): 13-16.

Robinson, Glen O.

1975 *The Forest Service: A Study in Public Land Management*. Baltimore, MD: Resources for the Future, Inc. and The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rohrbough, Malcolm

1968 *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Roth, Dennis M.

1980a "The Public Domain, States' Rights, and the National Forests." Report to the WO Policy Analysis Staff regarding the "Sagebrush Rebellion." Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, History Unit.

1980b "Public Lands, States' Rights, and the National Forests." *The Forest Service History Line*, (Fall): 2-3 and 8-11.

Roth, Dennis M. and Frank Harmon

1995 "The Forest Service in the Environmental Era." FS-574. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service.

Roth, Filibert

1902a "Administration of U.S. Forest Reserves." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Part I, Vol. 8, #5 (May): 191-193; Part II, Vol. 8, #6 (June): 241-244; and Part III, Vol. 8, #7 (July): 279-282.

1902b "The Future of Our Public Forest Lands: A Suggestion for the Consideration of the American Association for the Advancement of Science." *Forestry and Irrigation*, Vol. 8, #12 (Dec): 498-500.

Runte, Alfred

1991a "National Forests, National Identity: As We Celebrate a Landmark Year for These Great American Proving Grounds, it is Well to Look Thoughtfully Behind so that We May See More Clearly Ahead." *American Forests*, Vol. 97, #5/6 (May/June): 22-24, 64-66.

1991b *Public Lands, Public Heritage: The National Forest Idea*. Niwot, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers in cooperation with the Buffalo Bill Historical Center.

Sabatier, Paul A.; Alan I. Marcus; Luke Popovich; Arthur Cooper; William E. Towell; Charles R. Hartgraves; and Steven E. Daniels

1992 "A Symposium on the [NFMA] Committee of Scientists [with Six Papers and a Rejoinder]." *Forest & Conservation History*, Vol. 36, #3 (July): 117-131.

Sampson, R. Neil

1988 "National Forests in the 21st Century." *American Forests*, Vol. 94, #5/6 (May/June): 17-20.

Sargent, Charles S.

1897 "The Administration of the Forest Reserves." *Garden and Forest, a Journal of Horticulture, Landscape Art and Forestry*, Vol. 10, #492 (July 28): 291-292.

Sawyer, Robert W.

1953 "The Whole Story: 'Not Supported by Facts,' Says a Western Editor of Arguments that Extensive Federal Land Ownership is Bringing Only Burdens-No Benefits-to States." *American Forests*, Vol. 59 (March): 10-12, 39.

Sax, Joseph L.

1984 "The Claim for Retention of the Public Lands." Pp. 125-148 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Schlecht, Eric V. (National Taxpayers Union)

1999 "Not Seeing the Forest for the Trees [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 29-31. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

Schultz, Timothy

1984 "Selling the Federal Forests: A Local Perspective." Pp. 189-194 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Lands*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Science

1901 "The New Bureau of Forestry." *Science (NS)*, Vol. 14 (July 19): 115-116.

Science and Policy Associates

1994 "Improving Public Participation in Resource Management Decision Processes." Research project sponsored by the Siuslaw National Forest, Corvallis, OR. October 1994.

Scientific American

1913a "State Versus Federal Control of the National Forests." *Scientific American*, Vol. 108 (Feb. 8): 134.

1913a "State Versus National Control of Public Forests." *Scientific American*, Vol. 109 (Sept. 6): 176.

Sedjo, Roger A.

1983 *Governmental Interventions, Social Needs, and the Management of U.S. Forests*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future and The Johns Hopkins University Press.

1998 "Forest Service Vision: or, Does the Forest Service Have a Future." Discussion Paper 99-03 October 1998. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

1999a "Marion Clawson's Contribution to Forestry." Discussion Paper 99-33 April 1999. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

1999b "Mission Impossible [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 13-14. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

2000 "Does the Forest Service Have a Future?" *Regulation*, Feb: 51-55. Revised version of Chapter 8 from his book *A Vision for the U.S. Forest Service: Goals for Its Next Century* (2000).

2001 "The National Forests: From Whom and for What?" PERC Policy Studies, Issue PS-23. Bozeman, MT: PERC-The Center for Free Market Environmentalism.

Sedjo, Roger A. (ed.)

- 1983 *Governmental Interventions, Social Needs, and the Management of U.S. Forests*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- 2000 . Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.

Seehorn, Monte E.

- 1990 "Timber Harvesting: A Viable Management Option on National Forests?" Pp. 101-113 in *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Hardwood Symposium of the Hardwood Research Council: Present and Future Timber and Non-Commodity Demands on Eastern Hardwood Forests in the 1990s, Cashiers, North Carolina, May 6-9, 1990*. Memphis, TN: The Council.

Selin, Steven W.; Michael A. Schuett; and Deborah S. Carr

- 1997 "Has Collaborative Planning Taken Root in the National Forests?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 95, #5 (May): 25-28.

Shands, William E. and Robert G. Healy

- 1977 *The Lands Nobody Wanted, Policy for the National Forests in the Eastern United States: A Conservation Foundation Report*. Washington, DC: The Conservation Foundation.

Shors, Benjamin

- 2001 "USFS in 'Process Gridlock': Agency Chief Says Rules, Paperwork Keeping Personnel Out of Woods, in the Office." *Spokesman Review*, December 14, 2001.

Sirmon, Jeff M.

- 1991 "Changing Values--Changing Institutions in Forestry: The Forest Service. There is a Ranking of Needs and Some Can't be Sought Until Others are Satisfied." Pp. 13-18 in J.R. Boyle and S.L. Arbogast (compilers) *Changing Values--Changing Institutions--1991 Starker Lectures*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University, College of Forestry.

Smith, Darrell Hevenor

- 1930 *The Forest Service: Its History, Activities and Organization*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Reprinted in 1974 by AMS Press, New York, NY.

Smith, Frank E.

- 1966 *The Politics of Conservation*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Soffar, Allen J.

- 1974 "Differing Views on the Gospel of Efficiency: Conservation Controversies Between Agriculture and Interior, 1898-1938." Ph.D. dissertation. Lubbock, TX: Texas Technological University.

Souder, Jon and Sally Fairfax

- 1996 *State Trust Lands: History Management, and Sustainable Use*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.
- c2000 "The State Trust Lands." From the Thoreau Institute website. Excerpts from their 1996 book *State Trust Lands: History Management, and Sustainable Use*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press. Nine pages.

*Southern Lumberman*

- 1910 "National Conservation Congress: Big Meeting at St. Paul of Much Importance in National Politics--Contest Over Federal or State Control of Public Lands...." *Southern Lumberman*, Issue 781 (Sept. 10): 27-28.
- 1911a "Westerner Attacks Conservation: Colorado Cattleman Appeals to the United States Supreme Court, on the Grounds that the Federal Forest Reservations in the West are Unconstitutional...." *Southern Lumberman*, Issue 800 (Jan. 21): 24.
- 1911b "[Senator Weldon B.] Heyburn Attacks the National Forest System: Senator from Idaho...Gets Amendment Passed in the Senate that Will Eliminate a Third of the Area of the National Forests and May Utterly Destroy Their Continuity." *Southern Lumberman*, Issue 806 (March 4): 31.

Stahl, Andy

- 1999 "The New Question [Re: 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee of Scientists Report About NFMA Changes]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 97, #5 (May): 23. See the Johnson, et al. 1999 article in the same issue of the *Journal of Forestry*.

Steen, Harold K. "Pete"

1976 *The U.S. Forest Service: A History*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

1987 "What Prompted the Nation's Conscience About Its Forests?" Pp. 170-174 in 1987 Yearbook of Agriculture. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

1991a "The Beginning of the National Forest System." FS-488. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service. Reprinted on pp. 49-68 in Char Miller (ed.) *American Forests: Nature, Culture, and Politics*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1997.

1991b "Changing Values--Changing Institutions in Forestry: One of the Many Things We Learn from History is that People at a Given Time Often do not Understand what is Happening or What the Real Issues Are." Pp. 19-26 in J.R. Boyle and S.L. Arbogast (compilers) *Changing Values--Changing Institutions--1991 Starker Lectures*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University, College of Forestry.

Stewart, George

1930 "Who Should Control the Public Domain?" *American Forests & Forest Life*, Vol. 36 (March): 156-160, 166.

Stroup, Richard L.

1984 "Weakness in the Case for Retention [of Public Lands]." Pp. 149-155 in Sterling Brubaker (ed.) *Rethinking the Federal Lands*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, Inc.

Stuart, Robert Y.

1931 "Relation of the National Forests to a Policy for the Unappropriated Public Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 29, #3 (March): 316-321.

Swain, Donald C.

1963 *Federal Conservation Policy, 1921-1933*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Taylor, Serge

1984 *Making Bureaucracies Think: The Environmental Impact Statement Strategy of Administrative Reform*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Uses the Forest Service and Corps of Engineers as examples.

Taylor, Steven T.

1994 *Sleeping with the Industry: The U.S. Forest Service and Timber Interests*. Washington, DC: The Center for Public Integrity.

Thayer, Alfred L.

1908 "The Fraudulent Homesteader." *Conservation*, Vol. 14, #11 (Nov): 579-584.

Thayer, Alford F. and Eliene F. Thayer

1909 *The Forest Empire, a Story of the Land Frauds in the West*. New York, NY: International Company.

Thayer, J.A.

1927 "Shall the States Own and Control the National Forests?" *Oregon Agricultural College, Forestry Club Annual Cruise*, Vol. 8: 22-24, 92, 94, 96, 98.

Thomas, Jack Ward

1994 "Trends in Forest Management in the United States." *Forestry Chronicle*, Vol. 70 (Sept/Oct): 546-549.

1995 "U.S.D.A. Forest Service Directions." Pp. 86-90 in *Proceedings of the Symposium: Ecosystem Management of Natural Resources in the Intermountain West, April 20-22, 1994, Eccles Conference Center, Utah State University*. Logan, UT: Utah State University, College of Natural Resources.

1997 "Forest Service Needs a Bipartisan Effort to Clarify its Mission." *Forests [California Forestry Association]*. Vol. 1, #2 (Mar/Apr): 6-7.

2001a "Forest Service as Steward and Neighbor: Past, Present, and Future." Draft talk presented at the conference "Communities Engaged in Public Land Planning: Setting the Course for the Future" held September 19, 2001, in Montrose, Colorado.

2001b Undelivered testimony dated October 17, 2001, for the Hearing on "Conflicting Laws and Regulations--Gridlock on the National Forests." October 25, 2001.

Thomas, Jennifer C. and Paul Mohai  
 1995 "Racial, Gender, and Professional Diversification in the Forest Service from 1983 to 1992." Special symposium issue. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 23, #2 (Summer): 296-309.

Thoreau Institute  
 c1996 "National Forest Reform Act of 1996." From the Thoreau Institute website. 5 pages.  
 c2000a "Should States Take Over the Federal Forests?" From the Thoreau Institute website. 2 pages.  
 c2000b "State Lands and Resources: Conclusions and Recommendations." From the Thoreau Institute website. 5 pages.  
 c2000c "Will There be a Forest Service in Five Years?" From the Thoreau Institute website. 4 pages.

Tipple, Terence J. and J. Douglas Wellman  
 1991 "Herbert Kaufman's Forest Ranger Thirty Years Later: From Simplicity and Homogeneity to Complexity and Diversity." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 51, #5 (Sept/Oct): 421-428.

Toumey, James W.  
 1901 "Our Forest Reservations." *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. 59 (June): 115-128.  
 1913 "Who Should Own the Forests?" *Yale Review*, Vol. 3, #1: 145-156.  
 1921 "Re-Shaping Our Forest Policy." *Science Monthly*, Vol. 12, #1 (Jan): 18-35.

Tribble, Bob  
 1976 "The Monongahela Decision - Silvicultural Prescription by Legislation?" *California LOG [USFS Region 5 Newsletter]*, Vol. 7, #6 (April 23): 1, 4.

Truluck, Phillip N. (ed.)  
 1983 *Private Rights and Public Lands*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

U. S. Congress, House Committee on Public Lands  
 1902 "Forest Reserves Administration, etc.: Report on Bill to Transfer Certain Forest Reserves to the Control of the Department of Agriculture and for Other Purposes." House Document 968, 57th Congress, 1st Session. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys  
 1925 "National Forests and the Public Domain: Hearings Before a Subcommittee Pursuant to Senate Resolution 347, to Investigate all Matters Relating to National Forests and the Public Domain and Their Administration." Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

USDA Forest Service  
 1952 "Fact Sheet on the Hoover Commission (COEB) Recommendations on Forestry and Related Renewable Natural Resources." Four-page briefing paper dated December 16, 1952. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service.  
 1972 "Response to Nader Report [Nader Study Group]." Report of limited distribution dated December 6, 1972.  
 1994 *Reinvention of the Forest Service: The Changes Begin*. Report dated December 6, 1994. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, Reinvention Team.

USDI Bureau of Land Management and USDA Forest Service  
 1986 *Legislative Environmental Impact Statement for the Bureau of Land Management-Forest Service Interchange*. LEIS dated February 1986. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

U. S. General Accounting Office  
 1978 *Need to Concentrate Intensive Timber Management on High Productive Lands*. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.  
 1984 *Report to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior: Program to Transfer Land Between the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service*. GAO/RCED-85-21. December 27, 1984. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.  
 1997a "Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service: Information on the Time Spent on Major and Significant Rules." Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.  
 1997b "Financial Management: Forest Service's Progress Toward Financial Accountability." Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.  
 1997c *Forest Service Decision-Making: A Framework for Improving Performance*. Report dated April 1997. Publication #GAO/RCED-97-71. Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.

Van Name, Willard G.

1929 *Vanishing Forest Reserves: Problems of the National Forests and National Parks*. Boston, MA: R. G. Badger.

Voigt Jr., William

1949 "Can We Beat Back the Attack on the Public Lands." Pp. 136-142 in *Transactions of the Fourteenth North American Wildlife Conference*. Washington, DC: Wildlife Management Institute.

1953 "Multiple Use." Pp. 178-180 in *Proceedings of the Fourth American Forest Congress*, 1953. Washington, DC: American Forestry Association.

1976 *Public Grazing Lands: Use and Misuse by Industry and Government*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Waggener, Thomas R.

1966 "The Federal Land Grant Endowments: A Problem in Forest Resource Management." Ph.D. dissertation. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

1977 "Community Stability as a Forest Management Objective." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 75, #11 (Nov): 710-714.

1984 "Federal Commercial Forest Lands: Origins, Status, and Issues." Pp. 1-20 in Adrien E. Gamache (ed.) *Selling the Federal Forests*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, College of Forest Resources.

Walker, Tommy

1994a "The Land Debate [How the Forest Service Came into Being]." *Timber Processing*, Vol. 19 (July/Aug): 14, 16-20.

1994b "Origins of an Argument [Timber Harvest Policy 1910s to 1950s]." *Timber Processing*, Vol. 19 (Sept): 24-28, 30-31.

1994c "Decades of Decision [FS Policy from 1940s to 70s]." *Timber Processing*, Vol. 19 (Oct): 18-25.

1994d "A Lost Agency [FS Challenges During 1980s and 90s]." *Timber Processing*, Vol. 19 (Nov): 14-15, 17-18, 21-22, 24, 33, 35.

1995 "Origins of an Argument: For Four Decades Industry Asked the Forest Service to Limit Timber Sales Because of a Flood of Cheap Timber Already on the Market. But as Private Timber Supplies Dried Up, Industry Changed Its Tune." *Forest History Today*: 12-15.

Wall, Brian R. (ed.)

1971 *The Future, Forest Policy & the 1970 National Timber Review*. Portland, OR: Society of American Foresters, Columbia River Section, Portland Chapter.

Watts, Lyle F.

1933 "Public Domain and Other Federal Forest Land." Pp. 637-650 in *A National Plan for American Forestry*, Senate Document 12, 73rd Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 1. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

1944 "Do People Really Want Forest Conservation?" *The Living Wilderness*, Vol. 9, #10 (May): 3-9.

1949 "A National Program for Forestry." Pp. 757-760 in *Yearbook of Agriculture 1949*. Washington, DC: U.S.G.P.O.

Weaver, Diane

1984 "Criteria Conditioning and Control: The Forest Service's Hierarchical Structure Creates Rigidity and Inflexibility." *Forest Planning*, Vol. 5, #4 (July): 17-19.

Weddell, D.J.

1944 "Who Should Control the Forests? An Historical Study of Governmental Regulation." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 44, #4 (April): 278-281.

Welch, Craig

2002 "Proposal for 'Charter Forests' Aired." *Seattle Times*, February 12, 2002.

Wengert, Norman; A. A. Dyer; and Henry A. Deutsch

1979 *The "Purposes" of the National Forests - A Historical Reinterpretation of Policy Development*. Fort Collins, CO: Colorado State University.

West, Allan J.

1989 "Healthy Forests: The Agenda for the National Forests and the States." Pp. 52-54 in *Healthy Forests, Healthy World: Proceedings of the 1988 Society of American Foresters National Convention, Rochester, New York, October 16-19*. Bethesda, MD: The Society of American Foresters.

Whitaker, John C.

1976 *Striking a Balance: Environment and Natural Resources Policy in the Nixon-Ford Years*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

White, Slaton L.

1999 "New Directions at the Forest Service [an Interview with Chief Mike Dombeck]." *Field & Stream*, Vol. 104, #5 (Sept): 54, 56-57.

White, Stewart F.

1908 "The Fight for the Forests: On One Side the Destructive Greed of the Few--On the Other the Splendid Work of the Government...." *American Magazine*, Vol. 65 (Jan): 252-261.

White, W.E., et. al.

1947 "Who Shall Own America's Forests?" Pp. 120-128 in *American Forest Congress, Proceedings, 1946*.

*Wilderness*

1983 "Toward the Twenty-First Century: A Wilderness Society Agenda for the National Forests." *Wilderness*, Vol. 47, #161 (Summer): 32-35, 38.

Wilkinson, Charles F.

1984 "The Forest Service: A Call for a Return to First Principles." *Public Land Law Review*, Vol. 5 (Spring): 1-30.

1992 *Crossing the Next Meridian: Land, Water, and the Future of the West*. Covelo, CA: Island Press.

Williams, Florence

1992 "Sagebrush Rebellion II: Some Rural Counties Seek to Influence Federal Land Use." *High Country News*, (Feb. 24): 6-7.

1993 "The Compensation Game: Should Ranchers, Loggers, Miners, and Others be Paid for Not Being Allowed to do Whatever They Want to do With That Which They do Not Own?" *Wilderness*, Vol. 57, #202 (Fall): 28-33.

Williams, Gerald W. and Stephen R. Mark (compilers)

1995 *Establishing and Defending the Cascade Range Forest Reserve from 1885 to 1912: As Found in Letters, Newspapers, Magazines, and Official Reports*. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service and USDI National Park Service.

Wilson, Francis C.

1932 "The Evans Bill, H.R. 5840, to Transfer Title of the Public Lands to the States: An Address Before...the National Wool Grower's Association...." *National Wool Grower*, Vol. 22 (Feb): 41-44, 50-51.

Wilson, J.B. and J.M. Jones

1948 "[National Wool Grower's] Association Opposes H.R. 6054 [a National Land Policy Act]: Joint Statement by J.B. Wilson and J.M. Jones Before the House Agricultural Committee, May 17, 1948." *National Wool Grower*, Vol. 387 (June): 8-9.

Wolf, Robert E.

1993 "Correspondence [on the July 1992 articles on the NFMA Committee of Scientists - see the Daniels and Merrill article above]." *Forest and Conservation History*, Vol. 37, #1 (Jan): 46-47.

Wolf, Robert E., with Dick Manning and Dan Hall (interviewers)

1990 "Robert Wolf Oral History Project, Nixon 10 Standard Regions and Related Issues." Oral History 227-50 dated November 28, 1990. Missoula, MT: University of Montana, Mansfield Library.

Wolff, Meyer H.

1933 "Objectives in Handling Federal Forest Lands." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 31, #1 (Jan): 85-87.

Wolke, Howie

1988 "Save Our National Forests! A Citizens' Primer to Stop the U.S. Destruction." *Earth First!*, Vol. 8, #4 (March 20): 1-9.

1990 "The National Forests: A Modest Biocentric Proposal." *Trilogy*, Vol. 2, #1 (Spring/Summer): 184-186.

Wood, Christopher A.

1995 "Counties Have no Claim on Federal Lands in West." *Washington Post*, May 21.

Woodruff, George W.

1905 "The Disposal of Public Lands [Land policy used to create NFs]." *Society of American Foresters, Proceedings*, Vol. 1 (Nov): 53-61.

1906 "Agricultural Settlement in Forest Reserves: Important Law [Forest Homestead Act of 1906] Enacted by Congress Affecting Settlers in Reserves." *Forestry & Irrigation*, Vol. 12, #6 (June): 267-271.

Woolsey Jr., Theodore S.

1908 "Managing a National Forest from the Business Standpoint." *Proceedings of the Society of American Foresters*, Vol. 3, #1 (Oct): 41-53.

Wright, John B.

1993 *Rocky Mountain Divide: Selling and Saving the West*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Wyant, William K.

1982 *Westward in Eden: The Public Lands and the Conservation Movement*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yandle, Bruce (ed.)

1995 *Land Rights: 1990's Property Rights Rebellion*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Young, Don

1995 "Private Property Rights Must Be Protected." *Mining Voice*, Vol. 1, #2 (May/June): 42-43.

Zaslawsky, Dyan

1982 "Public Lands and Private Longing." *Wilderness*, Vol. 46, #158 (Fall): 6-11, 16.

Zhang, Daowei

1996 "State Property Rights Laws: What, Where, and How?" *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 94, #4 (April): 10-15.

Zichella, Carl A.

1990 "What Does the Public Expect?" Pp. 39-40 in *Proceedings National Workshop on Monitoring Forest Plan Implementation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 14-17, 1990*. Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, Land Management Planning.

Zon, Raphael

1951 "Forestry Mistakes and What They Have Taught Us [Eight Major Errors Since 1900]." *Journal of Forestry*, Vol. 49, #2 (Feb): 179-183.

Zon, Raphael and Earle H. Clapp

1908 "Cutting Timber on the National Forests and Providing for a Future Supply." Pp. 227-288 in the *1907 Yearbook of Agriculture*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mike:

The simplest way for you to come up to Nacogdoches is to get on U.S. 290 East past Elgin until it intersects with Texas Hwy 21 East. Stay on 21 thru Bryan. If you want to take a break after driving a couple of hours, just as you approach Bryan, there is an Exxon Station on the right side at a traffic light and is in a good location. Stay on 21 through Bryan to Madisonville, to Crockett. At Crockett you will come to a traffic light at their loop (304). There are several signs, at least one of which directs you to Nacogdoches. From experience I have found that it is simpler if you just turn right there at the light on loop 304. Stay on the loop as it curves around the city. You will cross Hwy 19, U.S. 287 and Hwy 7, but stay on the loop past 7. There is a lot of construction on 7, so soon after you pass 7 you will see on your right a McDonald's; just past this will be the intersection for Hwy 21 again. Turn right on 21; You are about 53 miles from Nacogdoches. Stay on 21 through Alto all the way to Nacogdoches. As you approach Nac., you will see an overpass that is our loop (224); go straight on under (don't get on it) it into town. Douglas Hwy (21) merges into Main Street. Within a mile you will go down a steep hill into Nac. After crossing railroad tracks, you'll see two traffic lights a block apart. The second light is the intersection of Business Hwy 59 (North St.). Turn left on North St.

After the first block, there will be a traffic light at Hospital Ave.; turn right on to Hospital and go about two blocks to the second (I think) traffic light at Church Street. As you approach Church St., you will see on your left a large church (First Methodist). Just past this is Church Street and the Fredonia Hotel is at the corner of Church and Hospital. TURN LEFT on to Church St. Go past the Hotel to the first street. The Hardeman House is at that corner - on the SW corner (there should be a sign there). You have to turn right, go past the house to their driveway on the east side of the house, and turn in to their parking lot. The phone number for the Hardeman House is 936.569.1947. The owner's name is Mr. Dave Dutton. He'll be expecting you.

After you are settled, call me at my home phone 569-1762. If you arrive in Nacogdoches by 9 pm or earlier, Trudy and I would be happy to take you and Pat out to dinner if you feel like it after a long drive. Just let me know.

Everything is very casual here in Nacogdoches, so don't worry about dressing up for dinner. If you incur any expenses along the way (food, taxi, etc.), just save the receipts.

Mike, Tuesday morning at 10:50 am to 12 noon my Aquatic Biologist, Dr. Alexander Karatayev, teaches "Pollution of Aquatic Environments". He is new this year and this is the first time for the course to be taught. I am sitting in on all of the lectures because this is very interesting and I don't know a thing about it. Alex was the Team Leader for the group of Aquatic Biologists sent in by the Belarusian Government to assess the impact of the Chernobyl Disaster on the lakes and streams in a 50 mile radius. He is relaxed and a laid-back individual, a lot like you! Anyway, Alex has asked me to invite you to come to his class (about 30 students) and talk to them about anything you want to discuss. I thought you might enjoy getting back into the class room. This could be as structured or unstructured as you wish. Most are Biology majors, though not all are aquatic biologists (less than half).

We will discuss the details of the evening's events (that begin at 6:00 pm) after you get here.

Have a safe trip.

Don