

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

NATIONAL CONVENTION - SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

Washington, D.C.

October 1, 1975

The Society of American Foresters represents 18,000 professional foresters in the United States, and from the look of things all of you showed up for this 75th annual meeting but Smokey. I hope you left him behind to keep watch in the fire tower.

Your convention theme -- "America's Renewable Resource Potential -- 1975: The Turning Point --" is certainly most appropriate.

You may ask what business a politician has in giving advice to professional resource managers.

But if you think about me as a professional public policy manager -- along with my other Congressional colleagues -- we can begin to think together here today as professionals.

You formulate policies and operate programs to assure that renewable resources are sensibly cared for.

Those of us who are the elected public policy makers have a different task, dealing with many complex inter-relationships between governments and people.

The nice thing about your job is that if you make a few mistakes, the penalties are not quite so severe as they are for us public policy makers. The voters see to that.

The very long-term nature of growing trees has permitted you to look over the horizon of each day's looming crisis to do some planning for many tomorrows.

I cannot claim this virtue for the Federal Government, where we often seem to operate on a purely ad hoc, day to day basis.

Sometimes I think the Federal establishment ought to give itself one of its own planning grants.

However, history shows us that we can change directions if need be, and I believe we are at that turning point right now.

Unfortunately we don't always have the information we need, and that's why we must be prepared to change course when we see we are headed for the shoals.

Even our Founding Fathers of 200 years ago reached a number of their conclusions by muddling through, waffling and deferring decisions. But as a result of their wisdom and foresight, we are the beneficiaries of a flexible system for achieving change.

I mention this as a prelude to my comments about resource policy.

John Heron once said:

"Nature has been at work for a great many millions of years to get things as they are. Cause and effect are tied together like stones in a well-built wall. Without careful investigation you can never tell which is the keystone -- the removal of which will bring down a large section of the structure in ruin."

That quote brings me to my first point. If you as resource managers try to look at the future through a knothole, forest policy will be badly splintered.

Forestry is not just making boards!

As Heron says, "The forested lands of our nation are not just agglomerations of trees. They are ecological units made up of discrete and interrelated parts."

Therefore, the art of devising systems of land management must be guided by certain biological facts.

There are limits to the extent you can fool Mother Nature, and you all know how she reacts when we try.

Strip the forest improperly, and she will wash away soil.

Disrupt the food chain by destroying a species of animal labeled as a predator, and she will produce a new menace lower down in the chain because the control is gone.

Our understanding of ecological relationships is greater than it has ever been. Therefore, if we fail, it will be difficult for us to blame it on ignorance.

You have demonstrated in the past 75 years a refreshing willingness to examine fundamental propositions and refit policies to facts.

A prime example is the evolution of the concepts of multiple use and sustained yield.

It was my good fortune to serve on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee when the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield bill was enacted in 1960. And that was a classic example of professional resource managers' efforts to enunciate policy.

That Act -- which was the forerunner of the environmental movement -- sought to establish the ways and means to relate ecological requirements to social and economic interests.

The 1960 Multiple Use Act and the 1964 Wilderness Act were principal building blocks used by professional resource managers, the public, and policy makers to fashion the structure that would improve the relation between man and his environment.

My 1974 Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act seeks to close the gap left in the process of reaching decisions.

You will recall that in 1959 the Department of Agriculture proposed a "Program for the National Forests." In 1961 President Kennedy expanded that to a Forest Service Program covering research and aids to state and private owners.

By 1972, with the pressure of other priorities, the objectives were almost forgotten.

The problems, however, were magnifying and multiplying. The lack of policy implementation and budget development machinery seemed to many in Congress to be a major gap. Efforts -- known as "Timber Supply" Bills -- had been made to launch attacks on the situation.

In early 1973 a number of people contacted me to discuss the situation and the needs. I had several analyses made to identify the underlying problems.

My conclusion was that we needed to treat the cause of the situation and not the symptoms.

Next we asked the American Forestry Association's "Area of Agreement Committee" and others to see what ought to be done. An important consideration was the work of the Congress to reform the budget process itself.

Reviewing the various options, we concluded that we needed to create a vehicle for assembling resource data, and a vehicle for designing a program.

It seemed equally important that the procedure be flexible and that it incorporate a budgetary follow-through. Equally important was to assure public involvement in the entire process.

Developing and enacting the Resources Planning Act took barely a year. And it found wide support within the entire spectrum of the resource community.

It equips the public and the Congress to take a more active role in developing goals and directions. And the Act also tries a new approach to the annual budget process.

Recognizing that the Executive must weigh his course of action on many scales, the President is required to tell how the budget for each year relates to the Renewable Resource Program and Policy Statement.

The law contains evaluation machinery so that we will have an early warning of failure as well as success.

The dialogue over priorities equips you, as professional resource managers, with better ways to explain where we are and where we are heading with our resources.

The Act also is designed to have a catalytic and instructive effect on the states and on private owners. The Assessment and the Program along with the Statement of Policy will, hopefully, cause others to take complementary steps, thus enhancing the National effort.

The Act also encourages public debate and discussion so that more rational and less emotional decision making can be achieved.

And, as you know all too well, there is probably no present forestry topic that excites more anger in the public breast than that of clear cutting.

As proof of this, I need only cite the closest example at hand. The Forest Service permitted a clear cut adjacent to a golf course in the Monongahela National Forest. This made a prominent golfing member of the West Virginia Izaak Walton League angry, and the suit was filed that has you all concerned today.

I am convinced that many people in the conservation movement believe that the Monongahela case was only to restrict clear cutting.

But as you know, it caused much more mischief than that, potentially eliminating some sound conservation practices.

Now as I see it, the loss of this suit by the government says nothing bad about the Forest Service, clear cutting, or the Izaak Walton League.

It is a reflection on the Organic Act for the Forest Service.

The law prescribes some pretty questionable forest practices. They are inflexible, and obviously resource managers need flexibility to do those things which are economically and ecologically sound at a given time and place.

But as you know, the very term "Clear Cutting" has a negative sound and connotation.

I'll never forget a letter I once received from an 87 year old woman in Boston. I went something like this:

"Dear Senator Humphrey, I hope you will vote to preserve 800,000 acres in Alaska for Wilderness. I have never been to Alaska, but when I go I want to know those trees are still standing."

Obviously this fine lady doesn't care if you fellows never cut another tree -- even for the best of reasons.

Yet as we all know, there are some species of trees that thrive in shade, and others that thrive in sunlit clearings. Clear cutting, managed properly, is a sound management practice -- not only for the trees, but in Eastern forests for the preservation of many wildlife species.

But I have some strong convictions or principles about clear cutting.

If the soil, slope or other watershed conditions are fragile -- don't do it.

If there is no reasonable assurance that clear cut areas cannot be restocked, or will fail to regenerate within a few years of cutting -- don't do it.

If aesthetic values outweigh economic values -- don't do it.

If it is done merely because it will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output -- don't do it.

However, if clear cutting is determined to be essential to accomplish relevant forest management objectives -- do it.

If the size of clear cuts are kept at the minimum necessary to accomplish multiple-use forest management objectives -- do it.

If a multi-disciplinary review has been made of the potential environmental, biological, aesthetic, engineering and economic impacts on each sale area, and the decision is to go -- then do it.

If clear cut areas are shaped and blended with the natural terrain -- then do it.

If these guidelines sound familiar they are right out of the book -- the recommendations made in March of 1972 by the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands.

But notice, my friends, that no one on the Subcommittee asked that these recommendations be spelled out in law. And I don't either. That would put the public policy managers into prescribing to the professional resource managers.

And, I have had enough experience at Humphrey's Pharmacy to know that the pharmacist doesn't tell the doctor how to practice medicine.

Reviewing the issues brought forth by the Monongahela case, I would suggest that we must decide whether to practice forestry in the courts or in the woods.

Laws are subject to change, but they should not be changed for transient reasons. The recent Court of Appeals Decision noted that the 1897 guides to the sale of timber "... will have serious and far-reaching consequences..." The court went on to observe "... it may well be that this legislation enacted over seventy-five years ago is an anachronism which no longer serves the public interest."

The Court also said that the place to "resolve this complex and controversial issue is not the courts but the Congress."

When we began to work on the Resources Planning Act, I proposed a new organic authority for the sale of timber that would have avoided the current mess we find ourselves in. Unfortunately, that provision was later removed.

But you can count on me to give careful consideration to remedial legislation that will give technical flexibility to Federal forest managers.

As you know, there are those who think of human beings as alien to the ecosystem, as if we all had been dumped here by a space ship.

Rene Dubos suggested in 1972, "It is true that many ancient civilizations have ruined their environment, and that a similar process is going on now in highly industrialized areas, but this is not inevitable."

"Intensive agriculture has been practiced for a thousand years in certain lands without decreasing their fertility or ruining their scenery. Man can create artificial environments from the wilderness and manage them in a manner that they remain ecologically stable, economically profitable, aesthetically rewarding, and suited to his physical and mental health."

We know more about how to live in harmony with nature than ever before.

We know how to grow all the trees we need and still have plenty of land left over for wilderness and other uses.

Hopefully, we now have developed the mechanism through which we can make our natural resources investments when they are needed to take care of backlogs and gaps in the system.

In other words we have the opportunity to serve man and nature in a complete and balanced manner.

And, my friends, we need your support and help in making this system work. I pledge my best effort in this endeavor.

# # # # #

Mixed 750  
Supplies

X Seeds from Trees  
planted by GAO  
Washington  
at Mt  
Vernon

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

NATIONAL CONVENTION - SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

OCTOBER 1, 1975

X Ed Cliff  
John MacGwire  
Richard MacArdle  
Arthur Greeley  
George Wm Greeley  
1920 28

YESTERDAY YOU DEDICATED THE 35 ACRE GROSVENOR PROPERTY AS THE CENTER  
FOR RENEWABLE RESOURCES. 11 CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS WILL HEADQUARTER  
THERE. YOUR SOCIETY'S BUILDING HAS BEEN DEDICATED TO GIFFORD PINCHOT.  
I THINK THAT THIS COMING TOGETHER OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION ASSOCIATIONS  
IN THE INTEREST OF COORDINATED RENEWABLE RESOURCE PLANNING REPRESENTS  
THE BRINGING TO FRUITION OF THE DREAMS AND HOPES OF PINCHOT. A RECOGNITION  
THAT ALL OF THESE RENEWABLE RESOURCES ARE RELATED AND INTERRELATED.

\*\*\*\*\*

President Beale

-1-

THE SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS REPRESENTS

20,700  
~~2,000~~

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS IN THE UNITED STATES, AND FROM THE

LOOK OF THINGS ALL OF YOU SHOWED UP FOR THIS 75TH ANNUAL

MEETING BUT SMOKEY <sup>sub</sup> I HOPE YOU LEFT HIM BEHIND TO KEEP

WATCH IN THE FIRE TOWER.

YOUR CONVENTION THEME -- "AMERICA'S RENEWABLE RESOURCE

POTENTIAL -- 1975: THE TURNING POINT --" IS CERTAINLY MOST

← APPROPRIATE, -

Yesterday etc

YOU MAY ASK WHAT BUSINESS A POLITICIAN HAS IN GIVING

ADVICE TO PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE MANAGERS.

↳ BUT IF YOU THINK ABOUT ME AS A ~~PROFESSIONAL~~ PUBLIC

market overseer  
POLICY ~~MANAGER~~ -- ALONG WITH MY OTHER CONGRESSIONAL

COLLEAGUES -- WE CAN BEGIN TO THINK TOGETHER HERE TODAY AS

PROFESSIONALS.

↳ YOU FORMULATE POLICIES AND OPERATE PROGRAMS TO ASSURE THAT RENEWABLE RESOURCES ARE SENSIBLY CARED FOR.

↳ THOSE OF US WHO ARE THE ELECTED PUBLIC POLICY MAKERS HAVE A DIFFERENT TASK, DEALING WITH MANY COMPLEX INTER-RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN GOVERNMENTS AND PEOPLE.

↳ THE NICE THING ABOUT YOUR JOB IS THAT IF YOU MAKE A FEW MISTAKES, THE PENALTIES ARE NOT QUITE SO SEVERE AS THEY ARE FOR US PUBLIC POLICY MAKERS. ↳ THE VOTERS SEE TO THAT.

↳ THE VERY LONG-TERM NATURE OF GROWING TREES HAS PERMITTED YOU TO LOOK OVER THE HORIZON OF EACH DAY'S LOOMING CRISIS TO DO SOME PLANNING FOR MANY TOMORROWS.

↳ I CANNOT CLAIM THIS VIRTUE FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHERE WE OFTEN SEEM TO OPERATE ON A PURELY AD HOC, DAY TO DAY BASIS.

↳ SOMETIMES I THINK THE FEDERAL ESTABLISHMENT OUGHT TO  
GIVE ITSELF ONE OF ITS OWN PLANNING GRANTS.

↳ HOWEVER, HISTORY SHOWS US THAT WE CAN CHANGE DIRECTIONS  
IF NEED BE, AND I BELIEVE WE ARE AT THAT TURNING POINT RIGHT  
NOW.

↳ UNFORTUNATELY WE DON'T ALWAYS HAVE THE INFORMATION WE  
NEED, AND THAT'S WHY WE MUST BE PREPARED TO CHANGE COURSE  
WHEN WE SEE WE ARE HEADED FOR THE SHOALS.

↳ EVEN OUR FOUNDING FATHERS OF 200 YEARS AGO REACHED A  
NUMBER OF THEIR CONCLUSIONS BY MUDDLING THROUGH, WAFFLING  
AND DEFERRING DECISIONS. ↳ BUT AS A RESULT OF THEIR WISDOM  
AND FORESIGHT, WE ARE THE BENEFICIARIES OF A FLEXIBLE SYSTEM  
FOR ACHIEVING CHANGE.

↳ I MENTION THIS AS A PRELUDE TO MY COMMENTS ABOUT  
RESOURCE POLICY.

↳ JOHN HERON ONCE SAID:

"NATURE HAS BEEN AT WORK FOR A GREAT MANY MILLIONS  
OF YEARS TO GET THINGS AS THEY ARE. CAUSE AND EFFECT ARE  
TIED TOGETHER LIKE STONES IN A WELL-BUILT WALL. WITHOUT  
CAREFUL INVESTIGATION YOU CAN NEVER TELL WHICH IS THE  
KEYSTONE -- THE REMOVAL OF WHICH WILL BRING DOWN A LARGE  
SECTION OF THE STRUCTURE IN RUIN."

↳ THAT QUOTE BRINGS ME TO MY FIRST POINT. IF YOU AS  
RESOURCE MANAGERS TRY TO LOOK AT THE FUTURE THROUGH A  
KNOTHOLE, FOREST POLICY WILL BE BADLY SPLINTERED.

↳ FORESTRY IS NOT JUST MAKING BOARDS!

↳ AS HERON SAYS, "THE FORESTED LANDS OF OUR NATION ARE  
NOT JUST AGGLOMERATIONS OF TREES. THEY ARE ECOLOGICAL  
UNITS MADE UP OF DISCRETE AND INTERRELATED PARTS."

↳ THEREFORE, THE ART OF DEVISING SYSTEMS OF LAND  
MANAGEMENT MUST BE GUIDED BY CERTAIN BIOLOGICAL FACTS.

↳ THERE ARE LIMITS TO THE EXTENT YOU CAN FOOL MOTHER  
NATURE, AND YOU ALL KNOW HOW SHE REACTS WHEN WE TRY.

↳ STRIP THE FOREST IMPROPERLY, AND SHE WILL WASH AWAY  
SOIL.

↳ DISRUPT THE FOOD CHAIN BY DESTROYING A SPECIES OF  
ANIMAL LABELED AS A PREDATOR, AND SHE WILL PRODUCE A NEW  
MENACE LOWER DOWN IN THE CHAIN BECAUSE THE CONTROL IS GONE.

↳ OUR UNDERSTANDING OF ECOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIPS IS  
GREATER THAN IT HAS EVER BEEN. ↳ THEREFORE, IF WE FAIL, IT  
WILL BE DIFFICULT FOR US TO BLAME IT ON IGNORANCE.

↳ YOU HAVE DEMONSTRATED IN THE PAST 75 YEARS A REFRESHING  
WILLINGNESS TO EXAMINE FUNDAMENTAL PROPOSITIONS AND REFIT  
POLICIES TO FACTS.

A PRIME EXAMPLE IS THE EVOLUTION OF THE CONCEPTS OF

MULTIPLE USE AND SUSTAINED YIELD.

↳ IT WAS MY GOOD FORTUNE TO SERVE ON THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE WHEN THE MULTIPLE USE-SUSTAINED YIELD

BILL WAS ENACTED IN 1960. ↳ AND THAT WAS A CLASIC EXAMPLE OF PROFESSIONAL RESOUC MANAGERS' EFFORTS TO ENUNCIATE POLICY.

↳ THAT ACT -- WHICH WAS THE FORERUNNER OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT -- SOUGHT TO ESTABLISH THE WAYS AND MEANS TO RELATE ECOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INTERESTS.

↳ THE 1960 MULTIPLE USE ACT AND THE 1964 WILDERNESS ACT WERE PRINCIPAL BUILDING BLOCKS USED BY PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE

MANAGERS, THE PUBLIC, AND POLICY MAKERS TO FASHION THE STRUCTURE THAT WOULD IMPROVE THE RELATION BETWEEN MAN AND HIS ENVIRONMENT.

My 1974 FOREST AND RANGELAND RENEWABLE RESOURCES PLANNING  
ACT SEEKS TO CLOSE THE GAP LEFT IN THE PROCESS OF REACHING  
DECISIONS.

You WILL RECALL THAT IN 1959 THE DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE PROPOSED A "PROGRAM FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS." IN  
1961 PRESIDENT KENNEDY EXPANDED THAT TO A FOREST SERVICE PROGRAM  
COVERING RESEARCH AND AIDS TO STATE AND PRIVATE OWNERS.

By 1972, WITH THE PRESSURE OF OTHER PRIORITIES, THE  
OBJECTIVES WERE ALMOST FORGOTTEN.

THE PROBLEMS, HOWEVER, WERE MAGNIFYING AND MULTIPLYING.

THE LACK OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND BUDGET DEVELOPMENT  
MACHINERY SEEMED TO MANY IN CONGRESS TO BE A MAJOR GAP.

EFFORTS -- KNOWN AS "TIMBER SUPPLY" BILLS -- HAD BEEN MADE  
TO LAUNCH ATTACKS ON THE SITUATION.

h IN EARLY 1973 A NUMBER OF PEOPLE CONTACTED ME TO DISCUSS  
THE SITUATION AND THE NEEDS. I HAD SEVERAL ANALYSES MADE TO  
IDENTIFY THE UNDERLYING PROBLEMS.

h MY CONCLUSION WAS THAT WE NEEDED TO TREAT THE CAUSE OF  
THE SITUATION AND NOT THE SYMPTOMS.

h NEXT WE ASKED THE AMERICAN FORESTRY ASSOCIATION'S "AREA  
OF AGREEMENT COMMITTEE" AND OTHERS TO SEE WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE.

h AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION WAS THE WORK OF THE CONGRESS TO  
REFORM THE BUDGET PROCESS ITSELF.

h REVIEWING THE VARIOUS OPTIONS, WE CONCLUDED THAT WE NEEDED  
TO CREATE A VEHICLE FOR ASSEMBLING RESOURCE DATA, AND A VEHICLE  
FOR DESIGNING A PROGRAM.

h IT SEEMED EQUALLY IMPORTANT THAT THE PROCEDURE BE FLEXIBLE  
AND THAT IT INCORPORATE A BUDGETARY FOLLOW-THROUGH. EQUALLY  
IMPORTANT WAS TO ASSURE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE ENTIRE PROCESS.

RICHARD McARDLE , CHIEF OF THE FOREST SERVICE WHEN THE MULTIPLE~~A~~ USE ACT WAS ENACTED IN 1960 , CAME OUT OF RETIREMENT TO HELP US GET THE PLANNING ACT TOGETHER AND PASSED. HE HAS BEEN ILL RECENTLY BUT I UNDERSTAND THAT HE IS NOW BACK IN GOOD HEALTH AND HERE. ON BEHALF OF MYSELF AND HIS MANY FRIENDS IN CONGRESS, WITH WHOM HE HAS WORKED SO CONSCIENTIOUSLY OVER THE YEARS ON THE WORK OF RESOURCE CONSERVATION, I WANT TO SAY THANKS AND GOOD HEALTH.

*Trustees Rangeland renewable*

DEVELOPING AND ENACTING THE RESOURCES PLANNING ACT TOOK  
BARELY A YEAR AND IT FOUND WIDE SUPPORT WITHIN THE ENTIRE  
SPECTRUM OF THE RESOURCE COMMUNITY.

IT EQUIPS THE PUBLIC AND THE CONGRESS TO TAKE A MORE  
ACTIVE ROLE IN DEVELOPING GOALS AND DIRECTIONS, AND THE ACT  
ALSO TRIES A NEW APPROACH TO THE ANNUAL BUDGET PROCESS.

RECOGNIZING THAT THE EXECUTIVE MUST WEIGH HIS COURSE OF  
ACTION ON MANY SCALES, THE PRESIDENT IS REQUIRED TO TELL HOW  
THE BUDGET FOR EACH YEAR RELATES TO THE RENEWABLE RESOURCE  
PROGRAM AND POLICY STATEMENT.

THE LAW CONTAINS EVALUATION MACHINERY SO THAT WE WILL  
HAVE AN EARLY WARNING OF FAILURE AS WELL AS SUCCESS.

THE DIALOGUE OVER PRIORITIES EQUIPS YOU, AS PROFESSIONAL  
RESOURCE MANAGERS, WITH BETTER WAYS TO EXPLAIN WHERE WE ARE  
AND WHERE WE ARE HEADING WITH OUR RESOURCES.

↳ THE ACT ALSO IS DESIGNED TO HAVE A CATALYTIC AND  
INSTRUCTIVE EFFECT ON THE STATES AND ON PRIVATE OWNERS. ↳ THE  
ASSESSMENT AND THE PROGRAM ALONG WITH THE STATEMENT OF  
POLICY WILL, HOPEFULLY, CAUSE OTHERS TO TAKE COMPLEMENTARY  
STEPS, THUS ENHANCING THE NATIONAL EFFORT.

↳ THE ACT ALSO ENCOURAGES PUBLIC DEBATE AND DISCUSSION  
SO THAT MORE RATIONAL AND LESS EMOTIONAL DECISION MAKING CAN  
BE ACHIEVED.

↳ AND, AS YOU KNOW ALL TOO WELL, THERE IS PROBABLY NO PRESENT  
FORESTRY TOPIC THAT EXCITES MORE ANGER IN THE PUBLIC BREAST  
THAN THAT OF CLEAR CUTTING.

↳ AS PROOF OF THIS, I NEED ONLY CITE THE CLOSEST EXAMPLE AT  
HAND. THE FOREST SERVICE PERMITTED A CLEAR CUT ADJACENT TO A  
GOLF COURSE IN THE *Mo-non-gahela* MONONGAHELA NATIONAL FOREST. ↳ THIS MADE A

a PROMINENT GOLFING MEMBER OF THE WEST VIRGINIA IZAAK WALTON

LEAGUE ANGRY, AND THE SUIT WAS FILED THAT HAS YOU ALL CONCERNED

TODAY.

L I AM CONVINCED THAT MANY PEOPLE IN THE CONSERVATION MOVEMENT

BELIEVE THAT THE <sup>MO-NON-GAHELA</sup> MONONGAHELA CASE WAS ONLY TO RESTRICT CLEAR

CUTTING.

L BUT AS YOU KNOW, IT CAUSED MUCH MORE MISCHIEF THAN THAT,

POTENTIALLY ELIMINATING SOME SOUND CONSERVATION PRACTICES.

L NOW AS I SEE IT, THE LOSS OF THIS SUIT BY THE GOVERNMENT

SAYS NOTHING BAD ABOUT THE FOREST SERVICE, CLEAR CUTTING, OR

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE.

L IT IS A REFLECTION ON THE ORGANIC ACT FOR THE FOREST

SERVICE.

↳ THE LAW PRESCRIBES SOME PRETTY QUESTIONABLE FOREST PRACTICES. THEY ARE INFLEXIBLE, AND OBVIOUSLY RESOURCE MANAGERS NEED FLEXIBILITY TO DO THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE ECONOMICALLY AND ECOLOGICALLY SOUND AT A GIVEN TIME AND PLACE.

↳ BUT AS YOU KNOW, THE VERY TERM "CLEAR CUTTING" HAS A NEGATIVE SOUND AND CONNOTATION.

↳ I'LL NEVER FOREGT A LETTER I ONCE RECEIVED FROM AN 87 YEAR OLD WOMAN IN BOSTON. I WENT SOMETHING LIKE THIS:

"DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY, I HOPE YOU WILL VOTE TO PRESERVE 800,000 ACRES IN ALASKA FOR WILDERNESS. I HAVE NEVER BEEN TO ALASKA, BUT WHEN I GO I WANT TO KNOW THOSE TREES ARE STILL STANDING."

↳ OBVIOUSLY THIS FINE LADY DOESN'T CARE IF YOU FELLOWS NEVER CUT ANOTHER TREE -- EVEN FOR THE BEST OF REASONS.

L YET AS WE ALL KNOW, THERE ARE SOME SPECIES OF TREES  
THAT THRIVE IN SHADE, AND OTHERS THAT THRIVE IN SUNLIT  
CLEARINGS. CLEAR CUTTING, MANAGED PROPERLY, IS A SOUND  
MANAGEMENT PRACTICE -- NOT ONLY FOR THE TREES, BUT IN EASTERN  
FORESTS FOR THE PRESERVATION OF MANY WILDLIFE SPECIES.

L BUT I HAVE SOME STRONG CONVICTIONS OR PRINCIPLES  
ABOUT CLEAR CUTTING.

L IF THE SOIL, SLOPE OR OTHER WATERSHED CONDITIONS  
ARE FRAGILE -- DON'T DO IT.

L IF THERE IS NO REASONABLE ASSURANCE THAT CLEAR CUT  
AREAS CANNOT BE RESTOCKED, OR WILL FAIL TO REGENERATE  
WITHIN A FEW YEARS OF CUTTING -- DON'T DO IT.

L IF AESTHETIC VALUES OUTWEIGH ECONOMIC VALUES -- DON'T  
DO IT.

L IF IT IS DONE MERELY BECAUSE IT WILL GIVE THE GREATEST  
DOLLAR RETURN OR THE GREATEST UNIT OUTPUT -- DON'T DO IT.

L HOWEVER, IF CLEAR CUTTING IS DETERMINED TO BE ESSENTIAL  
TO ACCOMPLISH RELEVANT FOREST MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES -- DO IT.

L IF THE SIZE OF CLEAR CUTS ARE KEPT AT THE MINIMUM NECESSARY  
TO ACCOMPLISH MULTIPLE-USE FOREST MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES -- DO IT.

L IF A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY REVIEW HAS BEEN MADE OF THE POTENTIAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL, BIOLOGICAL, AESTHETIC, ENGINEERING AND ECONOMIC  
IMPACTS ON EACH SALE AREA, AND THE DECISION IS TO GO -- THEN DO IT.

L IF CLEAR CUT AREAS ARE SHAPED AND BLENDED WITH THE NATURAL  
TERRAIN -- THEN DO IT.

L IF THESE GUIDELINES SOUND FAMILIAR THEY ARE RIGHT OUT OF  
THE BOOK -- THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN MARCH OF 1972 BY THE  
SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

h BUT NOTICE, MY FRIENDS, THAT NO ONE ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE ASKED  
THAT THESE RECOMMENDATIONS BE SPELLED OUT IN LAW. / AND I DON'T  
EITHER. THAT WOULD PUT THE PUBLIC POLICY MANAGERS INTO PRESCRIBING  
TO THE PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE MANAGERS.

h AND, I HAVE HAD ENOUGH EXPERIENCE AT HUMPHREY'S PHARMACY TO  
KNOW THAT THE PHARMACIST DOESN'T TELL THE DOCTOR HOW TO PRACTICE  
MEDICINE.

L REVIEWING THE ISSUES BROUGHT FORTH BY THE MONONGAHELA CASE,  
I WOULD SUGGEST THAT WE MUST DECIDE WHETHER TO PRACTICE FORESTRY  
IN THE COURTS OR IN THE WOODS.

h LAWS ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE, BUT THEY SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED  
FOR TRANSIENT REASONS. / THE RECENT COURT OF APPEALS DECISION NOTED  
THAT THE 1897 GUIDES TO THE SALE OF TIMBER "... WILL HAVE SERIOUS  
AND FAR-REACHING CONSEQUENCES..." THE COURT WENT ON TO OBSERVE

"... IT MAY WELL BE THAT THIS LEGISLATION ENACTED OVER SEVENTY-FIVE  
YEARS AGO IS AN ANACHRONISM WHICH NO LONGER SERVES THE PUBLIC  
INTEREST."

↳ THE COURT ALSO SAID THAT THE PLACE TO "RESOLVE THIS COMPLEX  
AND CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE IS NOT THE COURTS BUT THE CONGRESS."

↳ WHEN WE BEGAN TO WORK ON THE RESOURCES PLANNING ACT, I  
PROPOSED A NEW ORGANIC AUTHORITY FOR THE SALE OF TIMBER THAT WOULD  
HAVE AVOIDED THE CURRENT MESS WE FIND OURSELVES IN. ↳ UNFORTUNATELY,  
THAT PROVISION WAS LATER REMOVED.

↳ BUT YOU CAN COUNT ON ME TO GIVE CAREFUL CONSIDERATION TO REMEDIAL  
LEGISLATION THAT WILL GIVE TECHNICAL FLEXIBILITY TO FEDERAL FOREST  
MANAGERS.

↳ AS YOU KNOW, THERE ARE THOSE WHO THINK OF HUMAN BEINGS AS  
ALIEN TO THE ECOSYSTEM, AS IF WE ALL HAD BEEN DUMPED HERE BY A  
SPACE SHIP.

RENE DUBOS SUGGESTED IN 1972, "IT IS TRUE THAT MANY ANCIENT  
CIVILIZATIONS HAVE RUINED THEIR ENVIRONMENT, AND THAT A SIMILAR  
PROCESS IS GOING ON NOW IN HIGHLY INDUSTRIALIZED AREAS, BUT THIS  
IS NOT INEVITABLE."

L "INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE HAS BEEN PRACTICED FOR A THOUSAND  
YEARS IN CERTAIN LANDS WITHOUT DECREASING THEIR FERTILITY OR  
RUINING THEIR SCENERY. MAN CAN CREATE ARTIFICIAL ENVIRONMENTS  
FROM THE WILDERNESS AND MANAGE THEM IN A MANNER THAT THEY REMAIN  
ECOLOGICALLY STABLE, ECONOMICALLY PROFITABLE, AESTHETICALLY  
REWARDING, AND SUITED TO HIS PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH."

L WE KNOW MORE ABOUT HOW TO LIVE IN HARMONY WITH NATURE THAN  
EVER BEFORE.

L WE KNOW HOW TO GROW ALL THE TREES WE NEED AND STILL HAVE  
PLENTY OF LAND LEFT OVER FOR WILDERNESS AND OTHER USES.

L HOPEFULLY, WE NOW HAVE DEVELOPED THE MECHANISM THROUGH  
WHICH WE CAN MAKE OUR NATURAL RESOURCES INVESTMENTS WHEN THEY  
ARE NEEDED TO TAKE CARE OF BACKLOGS AND GAPS IN THE SYSTEM.

L IN OTHER WORDS WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE MAN AND  
NATURE IN A COMPLETE AND BALANCED MANNER.

AND, MY FRIENDS, WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT AND HELP IN MAKING  
THIS SYSTEM WORK. I PLEDGE MY BEST EFFORT IN THIS ENDEAVOR.

#####



# Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)