
Mr. Chairman, members of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association.

At the outset, let me acknowledge a great debt to you. I was bold enough to accept your General Manager's invitation to appear on this panel because I've had a love for the wood business since I practiced law largely in that field in Idaho, and because I had recently developed some thoughts about "political forestry" which professional foresters in Washington had accepted without audible adverse reaction.

Preparing myself to be a middleman between such distinguished statesmen as Ed Cliff and Ira Gabrielson, leaders in the resources management field, has required me to fill in some big gaps in my own education. I'm glad I've had to do it, and I thank you for giving me the occasion. When you hear me mention I. F. Eldredge in what I say today, you'll know it was a thrill to discover him.

Somewhat arbitrarily, this opportunity for self-education on Southern forestry problems for me has taken the form of concentration on small private forest ownerships. Most of the total number of these, as you know, are in the South. Since the subject is "Multiple Use of Forest Land", I've chosen to discuss the applicability of multiple-use to such owners.

If that seems to you, or to my colleagues on the panel, to be a strawman, I can only say that "multiple use" has been held out as a panacea for virtually every ill in the land management business, including the forest management deficit of the small private owners.

I could easily devote myself entirely to the multiple-use management practices followed by the members of this association on their own land holdings. For I've been tremendously impressed with the revolutionary rebuilding you've accomplished, and the status you've given the profession of forestry. Trees as a crop is a slogan still in the Northwest; in the South it's a way of life.

Even within the topic as I've redefined it, your association is deserving of credit for fine work. In your dealings with small forest owners, you have a most impressive program of information and assistance directed at the private landowners. Your Pilot Forests, on-the-ground demonstration work, direct service to landowners, and work with schools, public agencies, and the information media, are all impressive.

In both of these areas, management of your own lands and education of the small owners with whom you deal, you recognize the principle that sound management takes into account the so-called multiple-use values of wildlife, recreation, and watershed protection, as well as growing cellulose for sale.
You frankly concede your dependence on the individual owner of small forest units, because even when your own lands reach their full yield, they will only produce about half your requirements. Put another way, it has been estimated that small forest ownership by the year 2000 should bear responsibility of sustaining a net growth greater than the current growth on all ownerships in the United States.

Multiple-use is a highly desirable concept—particularly where forestry is one of the significant uses. This is so because the competing demands for land as our population increases simply will not permit us the luxury of a sole use which involves a crop cycle of twenty years and upward.

But recognition of the principle of multiple-use, and acknowledgement of dependence on small woodland owners do not make the concept of multiple-use management necessarily meaningful as to small owners.

Indeed I think it can't be made meaningful. As applied to this fact of economic life, what we recognize as a laudable objective can be little more than an ideal which will continue to elude our grasp until there is an incentive not currently available to us.

Management of the small woodlot for its recreation and watershed values holds little hope to the owner as a practical means of closing the economic gap, the margin by which he is unable to carry out even basic silvicultural work. Those who hold out recreation and water as economically attractive to the small owner are guilty, I think, of fuzzy thinking. Sure, shooting preserves, put-and-take fish ponds, "trespass fees" and the like will put dollars in some pockets. But consider how few pockets and whose. The State Forester of Virginia put the matter into focus. He said recently that "considerable land is now rented by the larger owners to hunting clubs."

He opined that it might be advisable and profitable for the small owners to get together to negotiate hunting rights.

There's the nub—if the small landowners could get together we would be at the central issue and could talk about good forest practices, including fire, insect and disease control, stand improvement, reforestation, marketing, and the whole gamut—not just hunting rights, or recreation generally.

Dean Garrett of Yale said recently that "multiple use is largely applied to managed lands." Many in this room can attest the accuracy of this statement out of their own experience. To cite only one example, which may cause pain to some, there was a basic conflict between grazing use and forestry use in the naval stores belt prior to the application of intensive management techniques. Efficient grazing meant burning in those days; uncontrolled burning resulted in extensive fire damage to the very trees for which the land was primarily useful. We can expand even further on the Garrett truism: "managed lands" exist only in tracts of large acreage. The technology that goes into fire, disease and insect control and advanced silvicultural practices are just not economically feasible for farm woodlots or even small forest holdings. It is for this reason that multiple-use forest management comes easiest where there are ample public forests. President Herbert Hoover's forest task force, the Copeland Commission, discussed the multiple-use concept in justification of its recommendations for more publicly
owned forests. In 1933 the members suggested that there ought to be about a hundred million Southern acres transferred to public ownership, a far cry from the total of sixteen million acres now in Federal, State, or other public ownership in the South.

"Public" of course doesn't mean only "federal", even though those of us from public land States and those of us in government land management work tend sometimes to think so. Cap Eldredge in 1947 deplored that the States of the South hadn't done more to acquire logged-over land and plant it to forest, emphasizing that government ought to enter not the economically strategic locations, but the areas calling for heavy capital expenditures to rebuild the forest stand, and requiring long periods of waiting with little or no intermediate cash returns. He recommended such work as a sound business venture for the States, not just as a socially desirable course of public action.

Both Dean Garrett and the authors of the Copeland Report agree that the forest owner's citizenship responsibilities for the growing crop on his land transcends that of owners of some other types of land. The 1933 group said the owner was "actually a custodian of the land; to him his ownership may seem permanent, but after all it lasts only for a very brief period of time as reckoned in the life of the Nation. During his custodianship he has no moral right to destroy the land's permanent productivity." In 1961, the equivalent sentiment was that "it is now clear beyond question that decades or even centuries of private ownership will not operate to convey absolute rights to private forest land..."

The Copeland Commission, created out of the maelstrom of revolutionary land dislocation, saw clearly that the private landowner could not by fiat be given the responsibility for forestry measures based upon his ownership alone. The lack of incentive, the lack of money, and the overriding duty of others to pay for some of the indicated management uses were recognized as limiting factors. "The owner may be entirely unable to benefit from certain values that his property holds for others, or for the public in general, in which case the other beneficiaries may reasonably be expected to share the responsibilities, or perhaps to relieve him altogether of them," they said.

You all have a much more vivid mental image of the private landowner in this region than I have. I know him statistically to own a tract of not much over fifty acres; he has only a fifty-fifty chance of being a farmer, and if he isn't a farmer only your lawyers can find him. He may be an Atlanta lawyer himself, a retiree, a minor ward of some probate court.

To get the forest land into management of any kind, much less "multiple use management" you've got first to find the owner, and get through to him that there's something in it for him.

An intelligent job of "getting through" is being done by a number of agencies and groups, public and private. Your own publications, the "Busy Acres" of the APPI, and the work of the Extension Service, the Forest Service, and the Agricultural Conservation Program in the Department of Agriculture, the State Universities and the State Foresters, and the Soil Conservation Districts—all these are fine, and ought to continue.
But I somehow sense that you and the others in this effort are plowing the same field over and over.

The Interior Department has a management responsibility for seven thousand or so small woodland owners (yours number in the hundreds of thousands) very much like many in the South. Privately owned Indian allotments support commercial stands of timber, varying in size from eight to a hundred-sixty acres, which timber is managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

A lot of things we in the Department experience in this management effort must be comparable: sustained yield on units of this size is academic; the income from allotted timber, by itself, is insufficient to support the owner, however it is paid; present financial needs tend to be of overriding importance.

If a governmental manager with legal authority has such troubles, what kind of management multiple-use or otherwise can we expect from similarly situated economic groups in the private sector?

James Yoho of North Carolina has said, truly I think, that the economic profitability of timber growing probably varies more with the economic class of the owner than with the per acre biological potential of his forest.

In other words, ownership of timber is economically meaningful, by itself, or in conjunction with an established farm operation, only as there can be capital and management effort committed to it to match its growth cycle. The established farmer is a stable guy and can be patient; but he will apply good management to his timber only as he knows what good management is, and as he sees its application as benefitting his children, if not himself. In this context, the soil conservation district and the extension agent, as well as the representatives of the Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association are doing an important and necessary job. It isn't the whole job.

In New England, the economic class of the owner as the significant factor in good forest management also justifies Professor Yoho. Connwood, Inc., and the New England Forestry Foundation have organized relatively well-to-do small tract owners, largely absentee, into cooperative associations for management and operating services. NEFF in 1957 handled only 8 million feet—a dribble, but at least recognizable economically. Almost two thousand owners were involved, and their relative superiority as an economic class came to bear upon the problem of good forest management in the fact of organization, not in their individual efforts.

A couple of years ago I toured Sweden with a Congressional group interested in forestry practices. The small woodlot owner there is almost universally organized into a giant cooperative which controls very nearly half the commercial forests of the country. The very size of the cooperative denies it social utility in the context of our system, but I was struck with one feature of its work—research at the unit level.

What we don't know about the characteristics of the woodland owner, the volume of timber cut from this class of ownership, what motivates him, what can
be really meaningful as a program to bring him into the picture of meeting our future needs as we know we will have to--these are gaps in our knowledge, at least as I've been able to look into it. Increased research activity is particularly indicated, I think, on these things.

We also need research in testing and devising new equipment and modifications of existing equipment to meet the special requirements of small forest ownerships and small operators.

In highly industrialized and mechanized Sweden, I saw intensive research in practical one-horse logging methods. I don't know how it is in the South, but in my own State of Idaho I've seen healthy logging operations become very sick indeed simply because the owner couldn't resist the temptation to get a newly introduced D-9 or TD-24 to brag about or to play with--without really examining whether the increased cost justified a changeover from D-7's.

The farm-boy who jumps on the tractor to drive a hundred yards to the barn doesn't fall in readily with the notion that logging of the mature trees on 37 acres of woodland may mean money to him only if he can log it as his grandfather did, in the slack season, and without special equipment.

But this is digression; let's return to multiple-use.

The Busy Acre pamphlets have little sections entitled "Wildlife, Water and Recreation" which express good citizenship ideas in small woodland forest management. But they contain the explicit statement that "the product from your woodland that gives you the most income should receive first consideration, and other uses should be secondary."

Multiple-use as defined for the Forest Service contains the phrase "and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return..."

Business corporations, members of your association, would have to put an adjective in that phrase before they could justify to their stockholders its acceptance--they would have to say "not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest immediate dollar return."

The individual small owner is lost at the first turn. The conspiracy against him is simply too awesome. Forget water and recreation and start just with simple forest practices--the capital gains provisions mean nothing to him for he never gets to the 25 percent bracket in his personal income. Suppose you convince him he ought to build the timber asset, defer the immediate profit by waiting for maturity--do your State inheritance tax laws and the Federal estate tax give his children the option of waiting, too?

Until you have silvicultural management, there is no base for multiple-use management. But we shouldn't tell ourselves, the Congress, or the public that our efforts to sell good citizenship to small forest owners are a solution to the dilemma of lack of management. Multiple-use is no panacea.

I've identified a problem, and have indicated that multiple-use is not an answer to it. Since it is fashionable to recommend solutions to problems of this
kind, I've reviewed some of the answers others have suggested. In doing so, I've been interested to see how the recommended courses of action mirror the social and economic thinking of the time.

For example, the Copeland Commission's indicated action, boiled down to its essentials, was a program of public ownership. It grew out of the serious dislocations of the late twenties and early thirties, when huge acreages were passing willy-nilly into public ownership through tax sales.

As the Depression eased, alternative solutions less radical in their orientation, were put forward--but still based upon an overriding consideration that only the Government could accomplish the necessary improvements. There was the proposal of 1939, for example, joined in by the then Senator James F. Byrnes, which would authorize the Federal Government to acquire easements to the small timber holdings for the purposes of management.

Most recently, a somewhat abortive task force of the Forest Service, headed by Leonard Barrett, came up with twelve program measures for small ownerships which were explicitly formulated upon a guideline that the public portion of the program would be developed around a State-Federal cooperative pattern similar to that which exists in fire protection and technical services. The Barrett paper estimates the cost of its recommendations at about a half-billion dollars a year in shared costs with the States, and in substantial incentive payments to individual cooperators. [Let me hasten to explain that the Barrett study was never officially adopted or published by the Forest Service--I take my information from his paper of November 1960 to the Association of Consulting Foresters.]

The complexity of small forest ownerships defies purposeful programming but these ownerships are critical to your needs. They are important nationally for their cellulose, their recreation potential, their water conservation potential, and for the social objective of improving the economic status of the owners.

From all of this, it seems to me that for the presently unmanaged forest lands in the East and the South, multiple-use will come to mean something to you as new incentives become dominant. In other words, to place primary emphasis on timber production as the major land use, does not get management for other purposes on these ownerships.

If I envision the future of the South correctly, it portends a sharp increase in urban population, based on a new kind of industrialization. This means a rising demand for water resources and open space for recreation. Translated into land use terms, more and more acres must be allocated to watershed protection, parks and similar functions.

Why should the private owner dedicate his land to these values? Obviously, economic incentive is lacking and moralistic admonitions against waste have never been influential in governing our conduct. Watershed and recreation values are in the largest sense social values. They transcend property lines and individual pocket books. They warrant and demand public support.
The Copeland Commission's approach to multiple-use was couched in terms of the need for publicly owned forests. Obviously, it found little public support and no enthusiasm. Our society has changed drastically in the last thirty years. Public forestry on what are now private lands would, however, generate little more interest than it did in 1933. But other aspects of the public interest are demanding attention. Our cities cannot live without pure water, we cannot afford the economic loss of disastrous floods, our industrial system provides leisure time for travel and recreation.

These values may come to be dominant; to demand public management, if not ownership, of large land areas. Then it will be important to remember that trees are an integral part of the use of land for these purposes. These trees represent a crop which should not and need not be wasted. Indeed, they must be improved. It is in this fashion that I see multiple-use coming into being as a useful, indeed inevitable, concept, for the small holdings in the South and East.

We have been demanding good citizenship from small woodlot owners under circumstances that required too much of them in the way of economic contribution. We need to turn it around. Let's get a broader vista of good citizenship. When the whole public is forced to confront the realities of modern life we will allocate adequate land use to stream protection wilderness areas for public hunting and fishing and adequate national, State and community parks. Off these lands we can harvest the timber for the same burgeoning population that demands open space for other purposes.

I cannot see any realistic and progressive industry objecting to this kind of programming (call it multiple-use if you will) merely because wood production becomes the by-product beneficiary rather than the nucleus of the system.

In summary:

As to the small forest ownerships, multiple-use is no panacea.

These ownerships do need better forest management, but there is a lot we must learn about them before we can do much along this line that we aren't already doing.

It is appropriate that we examine some of the assumptions which we have made in specifying the need for improved management on small forest ownerships—assumptions that we can motivate the small forest owner with the dollar sign; that we ought to so motivate him; that the Federal Government ought to build a big program around improving production from this class of ownership.

We are moving toward public programs built around water and recreation. We ought to look to the cellulose by-product of management of lands set apart primarily for such purposes.

I've appreciated being here, and I feel that I've profited greatly from the inquiry. I hope it means something to you, also. I concluded my talk to the "political foresters" with a sentence I'd like to repeat here: "All of us must look beyond the trees to the forest, beyond the forest to the land and all its uses, and the water and its uses, and beyond all of these to our duty as citizens of a free country to provide, as near as may be, for a good life, and an environment in which we can enjoy our freedom."