

SOCIETY AFFAIRS

THE NEW POLICY FOR THE SOCIETY

The letter which Mr. Detwiler has sent to the Executive Council and which was published in the May-June number of the Journal has clarified an issue which has been before the Society for several years. My own attitude has probably been typical of many other members'. Not being entirely clear as to what exactly was involved in a broader policy for the Society and a more centralized machinery for carrying it out, I was disposed to let things go on as they were. That this could not safely be done, Detwiler's analysis of the situation has, to my mind, conclusively proved. His general analysis of the situation, the present status of forestry and the relation of the profession to the public can not, at this stage of the proceedings be amended or improved upon. It may be possible, however, to emphasize still more or to present new angles of what seem to me the main reasons why the Society must now boldly adopt a more vigorous and far-seeing policy and support a really competent paid secretary to carry it out. Just as in most cases the individual forester must largely create his own job, so the profession, as a whole, must create forestry as a public and a business policy. Not a few foresters individually have brought about substantial improvements in the handling of particular forest ownerships or localities, but the broader function which the Society might be fulfilling has not been realized. Without belittling the very notable achievements which forestry in the United States has made in its short life, I think it is fair to say that the profession, as a whole, has not the standing and influence which its professed function in our national life would seem to require. As a profession, and speaking in the broadest sense, we have to deal with science and scientific methods in the solution of our fundamental problems; we have to deal with public policy in the constant succession of federal or state legislation that is proposed or enacted; and finally, we must deal with employers, actual or prospective, the owners of the lands we expect to manage. In all of these three contacts, I believe we have fallen short of real effectiveness. Perhaps it is fairer to say that from now on we will fall short of real effectiveness unless we amend our policy and perfect our organization.

I should like, therefore, not only to endorse Detwiler's proposals most heartily, but also to make some practical contribution toward the solution of the financial difficulty. Personally, I do not believe that

the raising of the dues will result in more than a temporary reduction of revenue. Nevertheless, last winter as a small offset to a possible loss of income, I offered to start an endowment fund with a nest egg of \$200. This offer was intended to be anonymous, but it seems now to have leaked out. In addition, I should like to make one more of the 25 senior members whose promise is required to validate Detwiler's check of \$20. This makes two who undertake to pay \$25 a year for five years in dues if a total of 25 such pledges can be secured.

The time is past for being over-cautious. There may be some risk in the new policy and the paid secretary, but unless the Society is willing to take this risk, it may fail in the next decade to achieve the progress to which its past achievements and its present opportunities entitle it.

R. T. FISHER,

Director of the Harvard Forest.

WHY A PAID SECRETARY?

By the Man on the Job

The times have changed. The Society of American Foresters has grown from a small group with a relatively small resident membership to a large organization with national and international contacts. It has 14 sections, and others will doubtless be organized in the near future. Our subscription list at this date is 1,730 copies. The capacity for furthering the profession has increased with membership.

With the increasing membership, with a widely scattered Executive Council, with a large number of sections, standing committees, etc., there has been an enormous increase in the duties of the Secretary; and while he is given clerical assistance, he is under the necessity of "farming out" a number of duties. It has become increasingly difficult to secure a candidate for the position of Secretary, and this work is only undertaken by a member who is willing to assume the responsibility on account of loyalty to the Society as he does it with a distinct feeling that all of the things which should be done can not be accomplished. I believe that many members of the Society actually refrain from referring matters to the Secretary, knowing the burdensome nature of the work. This, of course, should not be the case, and every day's mail brings opportunities for new contacts, and opportunities for assistance to members are frequent.

If the Society is to advance, there must be provision for the adequate handling of the Secretary's work under favorable conditions of

time, office equipment and facilities. By this I mean that the work of the Secretary should not be conducted at the fag end of a hard day's work, after office hours and frequently disassociated from records of the Society. He should have opportunity to function in the capacity of a leader rather than finding himself overwhelmed with correspondence in regard to the Journal and other routine matters. The paid Secretary should take over many burdensome details from the President and thus permit him to give more time to the broader aspects of the profession.

Surveying the job as a whole, the paid Secretary will have ample opportunity for the fruitful use of all his time, and the Society will benefit in direct proportion to the ability of the man whom they are able to employ.

CLINTON G. SMITH, *Secretary*.

SOCIETY COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

Various Society committees and representatives as appointed to June 10, exclusive of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Forestry, are as follows:

*Committee on Standardization of
Forest Fire Control Measures*

R. Y. Stuart, Chairman
H. R. Flint
R. C. Hawley
S. B. Show
E. O. Siecke
C. P. Wilber

Committee on Forest Education

Hugo Winkenwerder, Chairman
N. C. Brown
Committee not yet full organized

Committee on Forest Taxation

L. S. Murphy, Chairman
J. H. Foster
C. R. Pettis

Committee on History of Forestry in America

R. S. Hosmer, Chairman
P. W. Ayres
J. P. Kinney
L. S. Murphy
P. G. Redington
W. N. Sparhawk
P. P. Wells

Committee on Utilization of Forest Products

C. P. Winslow, Chairman
Other members to be appointed

Committee on Classification

C. F. Korstian, Chairman
J. M. Briscoe
A. B. Recknagel

Committee on International Relations in Forestry

S. T. Dana, Chairman
 R. C. Bryant
 R. S. Hosmer
 R. S. Kellogg
 W. N. Sparhawk
 Raphael Zon

Committee on Charles Lathrop Pack Prize

Barrington Moore, Chairman
 J. A. Ferguson
 G. A. Peirson

Committee on Meetings

R. Y. Stuart, Chairman
 Aldo Leopold
 T. C. Spaulding

Committee on the Revision of the Constitution

E. H. Frothingham, Chairman
 Other members to be appointed

Member of Executive Council in Charge of Admissions, E. H. Frothingham. *Representative on Council of American Association for the Advancement of Science*, R. D. Forbes. *Representative on National Research Council Division of Biology and Agriculture*, R. C. Hall. *Division of States Relations*, F. W. Besley. *Representatives on Council of Union of American Biological Societies*, I. W. Bailey, Ward Shepard. *Representatives on Board of Control of Botanical Abstracts*, E. P. Meinecke, Raphael Zon. *Representatives on General Council of National Conference on Outdoor Recreation*, H. S. Graves, Franklin Moon. *Representative on Executive Committee of International Congress of Plant Science*, R. S. Hosmer. *Representative (Vice-President) on Washington Academy of Sciences*, G. B. Sudworth. *Representatives on Sectional Committees of American Engineering Standards Committee*. *Committee to Prepare Safety Code for Logging and Sawmill Ma-*

Committee on Standardization of Growth and Yield

H. H. Chapman	}	Society
T. S. Hansen		
D. T. Mason		
E. N. Munns, Chairman	}	Forest Service
C. E. Behre		
Donald Bruce		
J. F. Illick	}	State Forestry Department
M. B. Pratt		
E. O. Siecke		

Committee on Sections

A. A. Jaenicke, Chairman
 H. O. Cook
 Duncan Dunning
 C. F. Korstian
 Quincy Randles
 R. H. Weidman
 J. P. Wentling

chinery, E. T. Clark. *Committee for Standardizing Railway Tie Specifications*, J. R. Coolidge, III. *Committee for Standardizing Methods of Testing Wood*, G. R. Green. *Committee for Standardizing Wood Poles*, Russell Watson. *Representative on Inter-Society Committee Working for National Arboretum in the District of Columbia*, F. W. Besley. *Representative for Meeting of Southern Pine Association*, R. D. Forbes. *Representative for Meeting of National Conference on State Parks*, Edmund Secrest.

CALIFORNIA SECTION

Proceedings—Meeting of April 30, 1925

The meeting of April 30th was held in Hilgard Hall, Berkeley, and was attended by 12 members and six guests (seniors of the school of forestry).

This being the last meeting for the 1924-25 season, the following officers were elected for 1925-1926:

T. D. Woodbury, Assistant District Forester, U. S. Forest Service, *Chairman*.

Emanuel Fritz, Assistant Professor of Forestry, University of California, *Secretary*.

The Treasurer reported receiving dues at \$1.00 each from 27 San Francisco Bay members and at 50 cents each from 30 out-of-town members. Expenditures for postage, mimeographing, etc., totaled \$33.28, leaving a balance of \$12.32 as of April 30, from which must come current mimeographing and other expenses.

The principal topic of the evening was a discussion of what the policy should be toward white fir. This topic was suggested by a letter received from C. S. Smith, secretary of the California White & Sugar Pine Mfgs. Assn., and reproduced below:

Gentlemen:

I am enclosing copy of a letter to the District Forester with reference to the problem of species of lesser present value in connection with future forests. The questions raised are exceedingly important. A great deal of fundamental information bearing on the subject is lacking and it will be necessary for all organizations interested in forest resources to take an active part in investigating the matter. It is hoped that your organization can be of material assistance in this connection

It will be appreciated if you will notify me what phase of the problem interests you most particularly and what help you can furnish in connection with its solution.

Very truly yours,
C. STOWELL SMITH,
Secretary-Manager.”

The letter referred to in the above letter follows :

District Forester,
Dear Sir :

In further reference to the March 27 meeting of the Special Lumbermen's Committee, I want to formally present to the Forest Service of this district the question of species of less present value in connection with management plans. This matter was discussed at the annual stockholders' meeting of the Association as a result of the following statement :

“A problem assuming increasingly greater importance is that connected with the utilization of so-called ‘inferior species.’ White fir and incense cedar are good examples. The correct solution of this problem affects the entire future of the lumber industry on both private and public lands.

“A considerable percentage of lumber manufacturers in this region are operating partly or wholly on public lands and this will continue indefinitely.

“The present policy of the Government is to discriminate against white fir and incense cedar as major species in the forests of the future. An attempt is made to secure sugar and California white pine reproduction and to suppress the others. The method followed is to force the leaving of pine seed trees and to force the cutting of white fir even at a great financial loss. Originally sugar pine was especially fostered, but the intermittent seed years, attacks by squirrels, susceptibility to disease, etc., soon demonstrated its fallacy. Now California white pine is the dominant tree desired.

“Based on present values, this policy is doubtless sound. Based on values from 100 to 200 years hence, it is certainly open to question.

“The history of the lumber markets shows conclusively that with closer utilization necessitated by the growing scarcity of timber, the value of so-called inferior species is advancing more rapidly than that of more valuable species. White fir and cedar are generally regarded as species especially subject to decay. This impression is founded upon the fact that the old trees, of which we have a large percentage, are badly

infected. Extensive investigation has conclusively proven, however, that white fir trees below 84 years of age, have no appreciable decay and that trees not badly suppressed or severely wounded, up to 125 or 130 years of age, are sound. Cedar trees are not subject to damaging rot until they pass 165 years and some are sound up to 210 years. This, then, fixes the maximum time to be allowed these trees to grow in the future forests and nobody is optimist enough to believe that any such rotation will be followed. Therefore, it is apparent that sound timber can be produced from these species.

“These trees are the best and most prolific seed bearers in our forests. That ensures a rapid natural establishment of the new forest after the old is removed, a process which is not so fast with California white pine and practically impossible with sugar pine. In addition, white fir is about the fastest growing tree in our forests, especially during the period that it would be allowed to develop. It will stand considerable shade, and therefore, will produce a heavy volume of wood per acre on a short rotation.

“From a lumber standpoint, and judging largely by experience with hemlock in the Lake States, white fir has an assured future. When it is considered, however, that white fir is about the most valuable pulp wood in the United States and in view of the rapid encroachment of pulp products on lumber products, it would seem desirable to use every reasonable means to reproduce it. The same line of reasoning applies to cedar to a large extent.

“Nature has apparently given us the opportunity for producing ample future supplies of lumber through natural means which man is doing his best to upset.”

The Special Committee was instructed to thoroughly consider this problem and to make suitable recommendations to the Forest Service in connection with it. The question to be determined is whether the present Forest Service policy with reference to these species constitutes best forest management. It is realized that the answer is simply a question of fact and that possibly at the present time some data are lacking. It is proposed, however, that all interests involved give this subject most serious consideration and then each organization develop all possible information bearing on the following :

1. Comparison of cost and present returns of taking out these species.
2. The effect upon future stands if they are left.
3. The rate of growth of reproduction from these species.

4. The probable future value of product from these species, such as used for lumber, wood pulp, etc.

5. The effect of sales on small isolated areas where the conditions of private cutover lands will dominate the next stand.

The Committee will appreciate it if the Forest Service will include a thorough consideration of this problem as one of its immediate and necessary projects.

Very truly yours,

C. STOWELL SMITH,

Secretary-Manager.

Mr. Smith was called on by Chairman Hammatt to elaborate on the subject. He gave in brief the attitude of a number of lumbermen toward the policy of the Forest Service in apparently discriminating against the fir, burning it up or otherwise handling it so that it will not be a prominent member of the stand to grow up after logging. He said white fir should not be looked on as an inferior species, that it is not good policy to take out all of the fir and that it is worth more left standing. This he said applies to both private and public lands.

Woodbury, following Smith, said the lumbermen were laboring under some misapprehensions in this matter. The Forest Service in California, he said, is not burning up white fir. The object of the present generation is to put the forest land into the best possible growing (producing) condition. He called attention to the fact that the Forest Service takes account of the low value of white fir in its appraisals, that it takes a loss where it insists that the white fir be cut, and that it feels justified in such an investment. One case was cited where a prospective purchaser complained of the percentage of white fir that must be cut, but who cheerfully agreed to cut it when he learned that if the white fir were to be left the appraisal might bring the stumpage value of sugar pine up to \$9.00.

Dunning stated that data obtained by the Forest Service show that white fir does not yield as much as the pine on short rotations; this indicated that the belief that white fir yields more heavily than pine is incorrect. He called attention to the data available on growth; that much of it has been broadcasted to the lumber industry but that little of it is used.

Kotok stated that the Forest Service is not only leaving white fir seed trees where nothing better is available, but that it also seeks to protect white fir advance reproduction. The problem was referred to as an economic one and not a silvicultural one, a statement objected to by others who thought it was both.

The discrimination against white fir, where such exists, is based on its susceptibility to decay and not against it as a seed tree. The criticism of the Government's white fir policy is based on conditions that existed 12 years ago. The policy is quite different now.

In commenting on the lack of use being made of Forest Service growth data, it was suggested that the secretary of the Pine Association should take the responsibility in seeing that its members obtain it or learn about it. It was further suggested that the association, if it is interested in second growth crops, should take an active and leading interest in such particular cases as that in Plumas County, where immature second growth yellow pine is being cut into hewn cross ties with great waste of the trees and the production of a very inferior tie. Such destruction of the nucleus of a second crop should be discouraged.

Metcalf, commenting on the attitude toward cut-over lands, emphasized that the public's principal interest is in the question, "What is going on on the cut-over lands?" He quoted Show's statement that advance reproduction is the salvation of the forest in the pine region.

Someone quoted Prof. Roth of Michigan as saying that any kind of a tree is all right for the second crop. Mulford commenting on this said it does not go far enough, and that every acre of California timber land will have to produce increased value for the great population of the State of the future. It is not the function of the Government to make money. Question is, is pine enough better than fir to warrant any extra cost of getting more of it in the second crop. Emphasized the necessity of getting ample data on this to learn where we stand.

No conclusions were arrived at nor recommendations made by the meeting, but it was the feeling that there is much information on this topic already available that is not being used by lumbermen in determining their cutting policies if they are interested in the composition of second growth stands. It was also the general opinion that the policy toward white fir is an important question and should be studied carefully.

EMANUEL FRITZ, *Secretary*.

MINUTES OF THE WASHINGTON SECTION, APRIL 9, 1925,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

The last meeting of the year was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. Chandler, at 8:15 P. M.

The Secretary read a summation of minutes of meetings held throughout the year in view of the fact that the reading of minutes had been dispensed with at monthly meetings.

The chairman of the Membership Committee, Mr. George Collingwood, presented the name of Mr. Clark Hunn, editor in the Branch of Research, Forest Service, for Associate Membership in the Washington section. Mr. Hunn was unanimously elected. The chairman of the Nominating Committee, Mr. J. G. Peters, reported the following nominations:

For Chairman—George H. Collingwood.

Secretary-Treasurer—John B. Cuno.

Member of Executive Committee—Franklin W. Reed.

As no other nominations were made, the Secretary was instructed to cast a ballot unanimously electing the above named men.

Mr. Chandler mentioned that while the Committee on Research of which Mr. Clapp was chairman, had done a very constructive piece of work, they were not ready to present their report. Mr. Chandler showed how the meetings for the year had been given over primarily to Research subjects.

PROGRAM—“*Forest Economic Research*”

Mr. H. M. Dixon, Extension Representative of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, showed and explained some very interesting charts on prices for agricultural products. These charts yield information of direct value to the farmer in making price predictions and so regulating his crops.

Mr. C. W. Boyce, Pulp and Paper Specialist, showed and explained charts which revealed conditions in the pulp and paper industry in the United States and Canada.

JOHN B. CUNO,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Forest Management Plans.
Valuation Surveys.

Economic and Statistical Studies.
Studies in Industrial Resources.

BANZHAF & WATSON, INC.

Chamber of Commerce Building - MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN