Sierra Club Oral History Project

SIERRA CLUB REMINISCENCES

Francis P. Farquhar	Sierra Club Mountaineer and Editor
Joel Hildebrand	Sierra Club Leader and Ski Mountaineer
Bestor Robinson	Thoughts on Conservation and the Sierra Club
James E. Rother	The Sierra Club in the Early 1900s

Interviews Conducted By
Ann and Ray Lage
Susan Schrepfer

Sierra Club
History Committee

1974

Francis P. Farquhar

SIERRA CLUB MOUNTAINEER AND EDITOR

An Interview Conducted by
Ann and Ray Lage

Sierra Club
History Committee
San Francisco, California

1974

Sierra Club

San Francisco, California

Copyright © 1974 by Sierra Club

All rights reserved

PREFACE

Francis Peloubet Farquhar, honorary president of the Sierra Club, is clearly its most distinguished member in modern times. He started early, of course, just as he did on the first ascent of the Middle Palisade. Born in Newton, Massachusetts, on New Year's Eve of 1888, he graduated from Harvard in 1909 and joined the Sierra Club in California only two years later. That first summer on the High Trip, and later, he learned much of the lore of the Sierra from such leaders as John Muir, Will Colby, and Little Joe LeConte. California and its great natural resources fascinated Francis so much that he delved so deeply into its history that he became a high authority, and later president of the California Historical Society. His books, of great interest to club members, included _Place Names of the High Sierra_ (1919-26), _Up and Down California in 1860-1864, The Journal of William H. Brewer_ (1930), _History of the Sierra Nevada_ (1965), and many more. With his immense knowledge of the Sierra and the club, Francis was an excellent editor of the _Sierra Club Bulletin_ for twenty years.

Being so deeply involved in the Sierra Club he was, of course, soon elected to the board of directors and served with distinction for twenty-seven years. He was one of the rare leaders of the club chosen to serve twice as its president, first in 1933-35, then much later in 1948-49. Almost forty years after his first term as president, the July, 1972 _Sierra Club Bulletin_ carried an excellent contemporary cover photo of Francis and a charming interview. He expressed a fine balance between respect for the knowledge of the past and optimistic faith in our young folks for the future.

As one would expect, Francis was successful in many other fields. In his own profession he was president of the California Society of Certified Public Accountants and (at a different time) president of the State Board of Accountancy. He was generous in his contributions to a great variety of good causes, serving

on the board of directors of the Save-the-Redwoods League for several decades, and as a trustee and president of the century-old California Academy of Sciences.

In recognition of his long and outstanding service to California in a variety of intellectual fields the University of California at Los Angeles in 1967 awarded Francis Peloubet Farquhar the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters with this citation:

> "Born and educated in New England, he has shamelessly led a double life since coming to California. On the one hand he is a highly successful certified public accountant; on the other, he has won fame as a writer, historian and conservationist . . . . For his valuable contributions to the art of illuminating Western history, and for his vigorous efforts to preserve California natural heritage, we confer upon him honorary membership in the University of California."

RICHARD M. LEONARD
May 4, 1974

INTRODUCTION

This is the first of three interviews with Mr. Francis P. Farquhar, honorary president of the Sierra Club. Mr. Farquhar joined the Sierra Club in 1911 to pursue his interest in the Sierra Nevada. Since then he has explored this mountain range thoroughly and has several first ascents to his credit. He is also intimately acquainted with the history of the Sierra, having written the definitive work on this subject.

Mr. Farquhar's association with Sierra Club activities has brought him into close contact with several generations of club leaders. He was a director of the club from 1924 through 1951 and twice served as club president, from 1933 to 1935 and again in 1948 and 1949.

Perhaps his most notable contribution to the club was his editorship of the Sierra Club Bulletin for almost a quarter of a century, from 1925-1946. In 1965, Mr. Farquhar received the Fifth Muir Award, in appreciation of his outstanding contributions to conservation.

Although Mr. Farquhar is equally distinguished in his professional career of accountancy and as a historian of California and the West, this series of interviews will focus on his participation in the Sierra Club. This interview was recorded on October 16, 1971, and January 29, 1972, in the Farquhar home in Berkeley, California. The interviewers are Ray and Ann Lage, representing the Sierra Club History Committee.

Ann and Ray Lage
Sierra Club History Committee
March, 1974

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION v

MOUNTAINS TO CLIMB 1

The Sierra Club Outings of 1911 and 1912 . . . 1
Climb of Mt. Parnassus and Attempt of Mt. Olympus 7
Character of Club and Participants 12
Changes in Later Outings, 1917 to 1954 16
1921 Ascent of Middle Palisade 18
Mountaineering Companions 19
The John Muir Trail 21

THE SIERRA CLUB AND CONSERVATION CAMPAIGNS 23

Sequoia National Park 23
The Redwoods and Kings Canyon 31
California State Park Commission 32
Yellowstone Threatened by Dam 33
Sierra Club Leaders 34

CONSERVATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 36

The U.S. Forest Service 36
Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall 37
Park Service Director, Stephen Mather 39
Yellowstone Park Franchise Audit 41
Park Service Director, Newton Drury 43
Tioga Road 44
Private Lands in National Parks 45
Secretary of the Interior, John Barton Payne . 46
Harold Ickes and FDR 47
Warren G. Harding 48
Herbert Hoover 49
Congressman Martin Madden 50

HISTORY OF SIERRA CLUB LEADERSHIP 52

William Colby 52

William F. Badè 54
Joseph N. LeConte 55
Robert Price 57
Edward and Marian Randall Parsons 58
David Starr Jordan 59
Francis Tappaan 60
Ernest and Glen Dawson 60
Joel and Alex Hildebrand 62
Harold Crowe 62
Lewis and Nathan Clark 63
Bestor Robinson 63

EDITORSHIP OF SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN 65

Typography and Format 65
Subject Matter 66
Other Mountaineering Journals 68
Stuart Edward White 69

CHANGES IN SIERRA CLUB SINCE 1950 71

Chapter Expansion 71
David R. Brower 72
Loss of Tax Deductible Status 73
The John Muir Award for Conservation 76
Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters . 76
Future of Sierra Club and Conservation 78
Family Ties to the Sierra Club 78

INDEX 80

MOUNTAINS TO CLIMB

The Sierra Club Outings Of 1911 and 1912

Ann Lage: Why don't we start with your telling us how you became interested in the Sierra Club?

Francis Farquhar: Well, I came out from the East the year after I graduated from Harvard and was employed in Bancroft Whitney Company, law book publishers. During the first year I moved to a boarding house up on Franklin Street, and there were several fellows who had knowledge of the Sierra, including Jim Whitney, a nephew of J.D. Whitney. He had been on a Sierra Club trip and told me all about it, and I got interested.

Shortly afterwards, in the spring of 1911, I visited Jack Lyman at St. Helena, and he had been on several trips. By the end of the day I had decided that I would resign my job and go on the Sierra Club trip that summer if possible. So when I got back to San Francisco, I called up Miss Beatrice Vrooman whom I had met and I recalled that she had said that her brother-in-law had something to do with the Sierra Club. She said, "Surely, that was William E. Colby. Why don't you come up to dinner the day after tomorrow? I'll have him and Mrs. Colby, my sister, and we can talk about it."

So that is how I met William E. Colby, and by the time the evening was over I had no doubt that I wanted to go on the Sierra Club trip. The circular he gave me said that you had to have your applications in by May 1 and it was already May 10, but he said, "I think we can take care of that if you want to go." So that was the way it started. I left Bancroft Whitney and that committed me to the Sierra.

Shortly afterwards the Sierra Club had a local trip up to Mt. Diablo, and Colby invited me to go along as his guest. So I went up there and we spent the night on the summit of Mt. Diablo. I was initiated into the ritual of the Sierra Club

in that way.

The summer trip started to Yosemite with a special car at the Oakland Mole. There I met some of my fellow Sierrans, many of whom were to be my best friends later on. We spent the night on the train and arrived in Merced early in the morning and switched over to the Yosemite Valley Railroad and went up to El Portal. There at breakfast I found a friend of mine, an army officer whom I had met in San Francisco. He had an army wagon behind a couple of mules with a driver, and he invited me to go in with him. So I entered Yosemite in style. However, I joined the rest of the party by the shores of the Merced River and spent my first night in the Sierra, little realizing how intimately I would come to know Yosemite Valley later on.

I met several interesting people at the beginning, and with one of them I went up to Glacier Point. That same day the Sierra Club party started up by way of Vernal and Nevada Falls, and I joined them at Little Yosemite and spent my first night in the High Sierra. This was in June, 1911. I was invited to join a small party that was going on in advance over Vogelsang Pass to guard the cache of food and supplies in Tuolumne Meadows. So we went over Vogelsang and down to the Tuolumne River to the camp there, and the trip had really begun.

One of the first side trips that I took was with a small group up Unicorn Peak. Among the group was James Rennie, one of the foremost mountaineers of the Sierra Club. He and I climbed up to the highest point and brought the others up. When we came back to camp that night he recommended me to the leader of the Mt. Lyell party, as one of the leaders of a small group.

So a few days later we started for Mt. Lyell. Jim Rennie led the first party, the Lightening Express Party, it was called. I followed with a group of about ten, not so very fast but not so slow either. I brought my party up to the summit of Mt. Lyell intact. Some of the other parties--there were four parties in all--got pretty well spread out

before the climb was over. However, it was uneventful, and we had a wonderful time.

That was my first Sierra peak, over 13,000 feet, and the first time I had been up so high. I had had climbing experience only in the White Mountains of New Hampshire up until that time. I was a pretty good woodsman, and I knew my way around the woods, but I had never done any climbing on snow. This was the first time I had ever been on a snow covered glacier.

Ann Lage: They put you in a position of responsibility right away then.

Farquhar: Yes, well, I seemed to be satisfactory. Jim Rennie took me over as his companion after that, and we took a side trip down by the Waterwheel Falls of the Tuolumne River, down to Pate Valley. On that trip with Jim Rennie, we stayed pretty close to the river. The summer's trip wound up with a visit to Hetch Hetchy, which was then unspoiled but a little hot.

Ann Lage: How long was that trip?

Farquhar: It was four weeks. That was my initiation into the High Sierra and into the Sierra Club. From that time on I had no doubts where I belonged.

Ann Lage: Then your primary motive for joining the club was to get to know the Sierra rather than conservation.

Farquhar: Yes, conservation wasn't much of a topic in those days. In my boyhood I had been in the White Mountains of New Hampshire. I knew a lot about camping out and about woodsmanship, and I was very glad to have a chance to do it under different circumstances. From that time on I knew that I wanted to stay in California where I could be near Yosemite and the High Sierra.

Ann Lage: Was the Sierra Club familiar to you before you came out here?

Farquhar: No, I had never heard of it.

Ray Lage: Did the name John Muir mean anything to you?

Farquhar: No, I knew nothing about John Muir.

Ann Lage: Had you heard tales of Yosemite Valley?

Farquhar: I had never known anything about Yosemite or the High Sierra until I actually went in there.

Ann Lage: Could you give us some idea of the flavor of the club? You mentioned how quickly you became friends with these men.

Farquhar: Well, they were a very friendly group, and they were very kind to me.

Ann Lage: Could you generalize about what type of men and women were members?

Farquhar: Well, there were all ages. There were both men and women. I was one of the younger men, but there were a few about my age. In those days the costumes were quite different from what they are now. The women all wore skirts, fairly long. Some very daring ones had bloomers. When they were actually on the climb of Mt. Lyell, they took off their skirts and went up in their bloomers.

Rag Lage: At the time you joined the club do you recall the ratio of men to women?

Farquhar: No, I have no idea, but I would say that it was pretty nearly half and half. There were only about five thousand members of the club at that time, perhaps not as many as that. Will Colby was the leader of the club, of the outing party, and a very active and vigorous man at that time.

Ann Lage: Would you say the Sierra Club was a good place for liberated women in those days?

Farquhar: That wasn't really a matter of topic at that time.

Ann Lage: They seemed like more active women than you might expect.

Farquhar: Well, there were some pretty active women there. On that trip up Mt. Lyell they were not as active as they became a few years later.

Well, this trip was definitely a turning point in my life, and I had no doubt that I wanted to go on others. So the following year, 1912, I joined up to go on the trip into the Kern. We went in by way of the Tule River, and there I got my first glimpse of the Giant Sequoia, in one of the forests of the Tule River. We crossed the divide over into the Kern, and I was in the heart of the Sierra at that time.

The big events of that season were the climbs of Mt. Whitney. I went up with a small party--by that time I was a recognized leader of small parties--and in that party was one of my friends whom I still see frequently, Nelson Hackett.* There were others with whom I've been lifelong friends.

In the party that year was a very interesting fellow, a young Harvard graduate, a Greek named Aristides Phoutrides. He climbed Mt. Whitney and became very much interested in the Sierra, and he and I became good friends. A little later on that outing he joined me on a climb of Mt. Tyndall, and he said, "You better come over to our country, Greece. We have pretty good mountains over there, and I'd like to show them to you." Well, that seemed like a very dim dream at the time, but it resulted in a trip to Greece in 1914, where I spent a month with Phoutrides and climbed Mt. Parnassus and Mt. Olympus. So one thing has led to another in my Sierra Club experience and in my climbing, as I became more expert and went farther afield.

I mentioned the climb of Mt. Tyndall that Phoutrides and Elliot and I made. That mountain was written up by Clarence King in his book, <u>Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada</u>, in which he made quite a story of it. We found none of the difficulties that he described and went right up

---

*Interview with C. Nelson Hackett conducted by Mrs. Warren R. Harding, Sierra Club History Committee, on March 8 and 19, 1972.

it without difficulty and came down the other side.

Ann Lage: He had a vivid imagination, I understand.

Farquhar: Yes, well, of course, in his day it was all new, and there were no standards.

Ann Lage: Now all of these climbs took place in conjunction with a Sierra Club outing? So there were several small groups that would take off?

Farquhar: Yes, many other things were done during that period, and I roamed over the country pretty well.

Ann Lage: Did the outings ordinarily set up a base camp, and then spread out from there?

Farquhar: No, in those days we started in for four weeks with a pack train that took provisions right along with us. Sometimes the pack train would go out over to Owens Valley and get a new lot of supplies and rejoin us. Occasionally a few people took the trip for the first two weeks or the second two weeks, but most of the people went for the whole four weeks.

There was a very interesting woman along on that 1912 trip, Miss Mary Haskell, who had a girls' school on Marlborough Street, Boston, and she had made several trips in the Far West. She and Phoutrides and Tom Elliot and a fellow named Putnam and I left the Sierra Club party when we came out into Owens Valley. They went south and around by the railroad. We walked up to Lone Pine and Independence and came back into the Sierra over Kearsarge Pass. Some of the pack trains were going back that way and carried our sleeping bags. We joined them in Vidette Meadow in the South Fork of the Kings River.

Then the five of us left the Kings River for Giant Forest. There, as we came into Giant Forest, we approached the General Sherman tree, the largest standing tree at that time. Although we had seen wonderful things in the past four weeks, all five of us sat down and just looked at the tree. It was

a tremendous experience. We went into Giant Forest and had a good meal and then took the old Colony Trail down to the Middle Fork of Kaweah River and out of the park.

I remember the following morning we had just a very few supplies left over, and Tom Elliot cooked the breakfast. We had a breakfast food and a little corn meal left over, and Tom thought he would sweeten up the breakfast food by putting a little corn meal in it. Well, that just disintegrated everything and made it sort of uneatable [laughter]. But we managed to get by and came out at Three Rivers. Miss Haskell and Elliot and Putnam went north to San Francisco, and Phoutrides and I went to Los Angeles where I visited my brother. Well, that was the 1912 trip. My next trip was in 1914, but a lot had happened in the meanwhile.

Climb of Mt. Parnassus and Attempt of Mt. Olympus

That spring I went over to Europe and joined Phoutrides in Greece and spent four weeks with him. We went to Athens and then Delphi and climbed Parnassus and then went on over to the railroad and north up to Thessaly. We had heard of Mt. Olympus but we knew nothing of how to climb it or where you went in, but at Larisa in Thessaly we found that we were right close to it.

We hired a two-horse carriage, with a Turk for a driver, and he took us over Melouna Pass into a place called Elassona. This was definitely beyond the border of old Greece in what was Turkey up until 1912. It had been liberated by the Greek War against Turkey in 1912. In Elassona we were in the middle of a crowd of Greeks who were jabbering away, and I said to Phoutrides, "What are they doing, trying to decide when to hang us?" "No," he said, "They're arguing as to which hotel

we should go to." We chose one and had a very happy evening. In fact we spent the evening at the monastery there where we were cordially received. There we found two Greeks who were going hunting up on Mt. Olympus, and they offered to escort us on our way.

So the following morning we went pretty well up on one of the ridges of Mt. Olympus to a little monastery dating back to the twelfth century, called Hagiatrias; that means "Holy Trinity." The monks there were very cordial. None of them spoke English, but Phoutrides was there and was able to talk with them. They gave us a good meal, and we slept on benches there. It was a little hard, but we were tired and made it all right. The following morning at 4:30 we left the monastery.

I knew enough about mountains to know that you don't follow up the valleys; you get on to a ridge. So we got on to a ridge and kept climbing higher and higher until finally we came out on the rocks with snow patches. From there we could see four or five peaks in a sort of horseshoe arrangement. We chose the one that seemed to be the highest and made our way up through the snow field on to the top of this peak, which later we knew as Scholion. We looked over to some rocky crags not far away. We thought that they were probably the highest, but we were not sure. Later on it turned out that we had climbed within forty-nine feet of the highest peak on this first peak that we climbed. However, we went over towards the rocks, but found that there was a snow cornice there. As we had no rope we decided that it was inadvisable to try it, so we came back and went down to the monastery.

That night we slept. It didn't matter how hard the benches were. We were pretty tired, and we had a good sleep. We said good-bye to the monks the next morning and went back down into the valley, not quite knowing where we would go next, but we thought we could find our way. We spent that night at another little monastery called Hagios Antonius. The monks were very hospitable, and we had softer beds than before. In Greece the priests marry up until the time they become bishops. Then they set

aside their families and live more as the Roman Catholics do. Just before dinner time we heard quite a flurry out in the courtyard. The women were catching some chickens. We ate those chickens an hour or two later [laughter]. Well, we were hungry enough so that we managed to eat them.

The next day we set out on a long journey over the Sarantaparou Pass, which had been the pass between Greece and Turkey prior to the Balkan War. It was over this pass that the Greeks chased the Turks and went on to Salonika, mispronounced by readers of the New Testament as Salonika. We kept on over the pass and crossed a deep canyon to a place called Serbia.

There we were able to get a guide with a mule and went on over the next pass to a place called Verria, which is mistranslated in the Book of Acts as Berea and pronounced Berea. That is all wrong as Beta in Greek should be transliterated into V. I've been there twice, and I know the place is Verria, not Berea. At Verria we spent a comfortable night in a little inn, and the next morning took the train out to Saloniki. At Saloniki we went to the Olympus Palace Hotel, which was in the modern French style and was very comfortable. The next day we arranged passage on a Russian ship that was in port, bound for Constantinople.

On board the ship we met a bishop of the Greek church, an archbishop I think he was. He was pretty high up. Phoutrides engaged him in conversation and translated it to me as we went along. This Greek priest had been in charge of a little village in Macedonia, and when the Bulgarians attacked at the second stage of the Balkan War, he said they killed every man who spoke Greek in that village or cut out their tongues. He told of other atrocities, which were quite horrifying, but that was the nature of war in those days.

From the ship we could look across the gulf and see Mt. Olympus, snow-capped, gleaming in the distance. We went on around the peninsula to Mt. Athos, which contains a series of Greek monasteries going way up to the top of its 6,000 foot peak.

There Phoutrides left me, going ashore to spend some time at Mt. Athos, but I felt I better not take a chance to get off the beaten track so much and kept on to Constantinople.

On board the ship I met a German who spoke very good English. He was the secretary of the leading German electrical company, similar to our General Electric in America. He had been inspecting the wireless stations in the Levant and was on his way back to Constantinople. He helped me through the customs there and to find my hotel, and then invited me to dinner with his wife. At the end of the dinner he did some figuring and said, "You owe me so many piasters." That was my first encounter with Dutch hospitality. That was the custom of the land in those days; however, I cheerfully complied.

The next morning I went to see the procession of the Sultan of Turkey going to prayers, in the usual custom with his lancers on horseback out in front of his carriage. That was the last Sultan of Turkey. I had other interesting experiences in Constantinople during the next two or three days. I went to a dance of the Whirling Dervishes. Then I went up to the head of the Golden Horn to Eyoub, which was written up in the novel Disenchanté, by Pierre Loti.

Ann Lage: It sounds like a wonderful trip.

Farquhar: In the cemetery there were some interesting headstones. They were all Turkish, of course, and some of them had vines engraved on them. That meant that he had violated the Mohammedan rule of not drinking, and he carried that along with him to the grave. Some of the stones had carved fezzes on them, which meant that they were officials.

I took the Oriental Express from Constantinople to Budapest and Vienna. This was in the first week of May, 1914. I might go back and say that on the way from Saloniki to Constantinople we sailed through the Dardanelles. I was able to stand on the deck of the ship and take photographs as I went

through, the last time that would be possible for many years of history. Nobody paid any attention to that.

While on the railroad from Constantinople to Budapest, we came to Beograd, usually spelled Belgrade in English, and there we were on the borders of Hungary. As we crossed into Hungary the Hungarian customs official came through but did not open any packages at all. He just asked us, "Haben Zsie Schnapps?" "Have you liquor?" "Haben Zsie Tabak?" "Have you tobacco?" I said, "Keine" - "None." That was all there was to it.

That was where the first battle of World War I began just a few weeks later, to show you how rapidly things changed at that time. I went on to Budapest and then on from there to Vienna. That was the end of that particularly interesting phase for me, and I went on to western Europe.

Ann Lage: Did you have any idea then that the war was about to break out?

Farquhar: No. In Vienna I came by the Kriegsministerium, the War Ministry, and I wondered if they were plotting to reopen the Balkan War again because the Austrians had not succeeded in capturing Saloniki. It had been done by the Bulgarians and Serbians before the Austrians could get into it. Actually, that was what was happening. They were preparing for another war, but it came about, as you know, by other means, with the assassination of the Grand Duke. But there was no indication that a great war was about to begin and no police inspection or customs inspection anywhere, and yet, it was like going through a village and turning back and seeing it all in flames.

I got to Paris and decided that I wanted to get home. I had lost about thirty pounds by the diet I had been on for the past month, and I decided I wanted to get on the biggest ship in the world. There were two of them at the time, the Vaterland of the Hamburg-American Line, which was then the largest ship afloat, and the Olympic of the White Star Line, which was the next largest. I decided

on the Vaterland and went on to London, and then after a few days I got on board it at Southampton. There I shared a room with a young German from Hamburg. When we got to New York a friend of mine met us and took us to dinner, and the German offered to pay his share, according to the German custom. I said, "No, no, you're in America now," [laughter] which quite surprised him. He was a very pleasant fellow and spoke English very well.

Well, that was the year 1914 and a long way off from the Sierra. I was so anxious to get back into the Sierra that after a week in Boston, where my mother was, I headed straight for California and went on the 1914 Sierra Club outing.

Character of Club and Participants

Ann Lage: Were there a lot of travelers from the East or other countries on that Sierra Club outing?

Farquhar: There were quite a few from the East. There were a couple from Chicago and two or three from Boston on one of these trips, but most of them were from California, from the San Francisco region or Los Angeles.

The 1914 trip started in Yosemite Valley. We went up to Tuolumne Meadows, and there Rennie and I and a fellow named Bumstead decided to follow down the Tuolumne River through the canyon of the Tuolumne to Hetch Hetchy. We left the club and went around by a high road. We managed to go down not more than one hundred yards away from the river all the way, except for one place which was the Muir Gorge. The water was high and difficult to get into it, so we didn't go there, but I did that years later. So actually I followed the Tuolumne River close to the river from the summit of Mt. Lyell to Hetch Hetchy.

That summer of 1914 I also climbed Tower Peak,

which is the northern most peak in Yosemite National Park--not very high, but with a marvelous view from all around.

Ray Lage: What would you say were the purposes of the outings in a general way?

Farquhar: Well, Colby used to preside over evening campfire meetings and talk about the Sierra Club and its purposes. He said, "I wouldn't be willing to devote my time running these outings just to give you folks a good time. You are here to learn about the Sierra and to learn how to protect them. The more you know about them, the more eager you will be to see that they are not spoiled." He indoctrinated us a good deal on that subject.

Ray Lage: Do you recall if John Muir ever spoke to any of the outings?

Farquhar: John Muir had been on several of the outings just before. The last one was in 1909. He was not on the outings that I was on, but I met John Muir once and called his office after the 1912 trip. There was nothing special about it, just a brief conversation.

Ray Lage: Did he have what I suppose we would describe today as "charisma"?

Farquhar: Well, I wouldn't say, none in my experience.

Ray Lage: You mentioned that the outings were usually divided into smaller groups for purposes of climbing. What were the sizes of these groups?

Farquhar: All the way from two or three to ten or twelve or fifteen.

Ann Lage: As a whole, how large were the groups on the outings?

Farquhar: About two hundred on the outing.

Ann Lage: A large group.

Farquhar: It was a pretty large group to take through the mountains, and Colby did a wonderful job of organizing it. Nowadays it's not done because it's too heavy a wear on the campsites and the trails.

Ann Lage: Was that a problem then?

Farquhar: No, very few people, other than the Sierra Club, went into the High Sierra, mostly fishermen.

Ann Lage: Can you recall that the outings helped introduce any influential people to the wilderness?

Farquhar: Well, I think probably most of the influential or prominent people who were on the outings that I was on were Californians--professors from Stanford and California.

Ann Lage: Any politicians or publicists? People like that?

Farquhar: No, not that I recall.

Ray Lage: Do you have any personal experience in introducing anyone prominent to the wilderness through the outings?

Farquhar: No, I don't think so. Besides Colby, there were the prominent Sierra Club people I came to know and became very close to later on, like Joe LeConte, Walter L. Huber, Duncan McDuffie, and Clair S. Tappaan from Los Angeles.

Ann Lage: But the Sierra Club didn't use outings to invite people they may have wanted to interest in wilderness?

Farquhar: Not in my experience.

Ann Lage: I see.

Farquhar: Oh, yes, on two of these outings there was Professor Willis Jepson, a botanist from the University of California. I learned a lot from going around with him. I learned to tell the trees and the flowers.

Ann Lage: I would like to return for a minute if I could to the type of person that joined the Sierra Club. Would you say that they were predominantly professional or academic people?

Farquhar: Yes, I would say that they were predominantly that, but not all. There were business people, too.

Ann Lage: Were any of them outdoorsmen by trade, like say lumbermen, cattlemen, or miners?

Farquhar: Not that I recall.

Ann Lage: Mainly city folk?

Farquhar: Yes, mainly. Some ranch people.

Ann Lage: Can you recall anyone who might have been a laboring man or an artisan or small shopkeeper, that type of individual?

Farquhar: I can't recall if there were or not. There probably were some people like that.

Ray Lage: Do you have some recollection, Mr. Farquhar, about the membership's point of view toward politics? Were they of a particular political persuasion?

Farquhar: Well, that would never come up on the outings within my experience with the Sierra Club in those days. The question of conservation, of course, became prominent during the Hetch Hetchy dispute. I was never as warm on that subject as some of the others. I had twice spent the night in Hetch Hetchy --it was a pretty hot place during midsummer--and the idea that it was a second Yosemite, I did not quite agree with. It was nearly 1,000 feet lower than Yosemite and not as beautiful with its waterfalls. However, it was a delightful place and now as I look back on it, I realize it was a great shame that it was cut out of the park that way.

Ann Lage: What about your more recent outings?

Farquhar: Well, after 1914, of course, the World War began, and things were a little different. In

1915 the Sierra Club had a base camp up at Tuolumne Meadows. I visited that. By 1917 I was in the Navy, and I took a week off one time and joined the club in Yosemite. Then in 1919 I joined the Sierra Club outing for a short time, working independently; I was then working with Stephen Mather, the director of the national parks, and I conducted a trip for him over the John Muir Trail. In 1920 and 1921 I was back with the Sierra Club on its outings and also a few later years.

Changes in Later Outings, 1917 to 1954

Ray Lage: Have the outings changed much since that time?

Farquhar: Yes, there became more and more two week outings. People went for only two weeks.

Ray Lage: Were the purposes of the outings about the same?

Farquhar: Yes, the purposes of the outings were about the same, as far as I recall.

Ann Lage: What about your recent trips in the 1950s? Could you tell us something about them?

Farquhar: First, let's go back to 1930 when I went on a climbing trip in the Selkirks in the Canadian Rockies--my first experience with the proper use of the rope in rock climbing. I became enthusiastic about it and could hardly wait to get back to the Sierra Club in 1931. In Tuolumne Meadows I organized a little party to climb Unicorn Peak, and that was the first use of the rope in proper climbing conditions in the Sierra, as far as I know. A little later on that outing Robert Underhill of the Appalachian Club joined us. He was a much more skillful climber than I, and he continued that initiation of the use of the rope.

But on that Unicorn Peak trip, there were

five of us. As I recall, there was Glen Dawson* of Los Angeles, and a friend of his, and there was a red-haired girl. We all went straight up the face of the Unicorn. When we came down we had to go back through the woods to our car, which was on the Tioga Road. This red-haired girl followed me along, and she kept telling me that I was going too far to the left. I paid no attention to her, but just doubled the pace [laughter]. She said that she would never speak to me again; however, she has been speaking to me a good deal ever since.

Ray Lage: I take it that's Mrs. Farquhar.

Farquhar: Yes, that's Mrs. Farquhar. Well, she was along on the 1933 trip, and we became better acquainted.

Ann Lage: Was she a pretty good rock climber?

Farquhar: She's one of the best women rock climbers in the country, and she was the first woman to climb the east face of Mt. Whitney. She was the first woman to climb the Higher Cathedral Spire in Yosemite. She's still a pretty good rock climber.

Ann Lage: Were you actively involved in rock climbing after this 1931 experience?

Farquhar: Oh, yes, to a considerable extent. I eventually climbed all the 14,000 foot peaks in the Sierra; there are eleven of them. Then I climbed Mt. Shasta and Mt. Rainier, so I've climbed all the 14,000 foot peaks on the Pacific Coast, and I climbed a little in Canada.

On the Sierra Club trips, I don't recall very much about those in the 1940s and 1950s. By the 1950s my family was started, and my son, Peter, went along and became a very active mountaineer, and then my daughter, Suzanne, who enjoyed the

---

*Interview with Glen Dawson conducted by Richard Searle, Sierra Club History Committee, on September 23, 1972.

mountains--still does. Then the river trips began and the memorable river trip of 1954 when my two sons were along. At Echo Park, where the Yampa and the Green River join, we laid over for a day or two, and my son was down by the river. He fortunately had his life belt on--we always insisted on that if they were near the water--and a boy from another party was out in the middle of the river and calling for help. Roger finally saw that he was in great distress, and he swam out to him and got him on his back and brought him in. He saved the boy's life at the risk of his own. A former boy scout leader saw the thing, and he recommended him to the National Council to receive the award for heroism from the Boy Scout National Council. This was just before he was ten years old.

Ann Lage: Oh, my.

1921 Ascent of Middle Palisade

Ann Lage: You made another first ascent didn't you in the Middle Palisade?

Farquhar: Oh yes, that was 1921, with Ansel Hall of the National Park Service. He and I made a little reconnaissance of the region that we were trying to get into Sequoia National Park, and we made the first ascent of the Middle Palisade, which is a 14,000 foot peak.

Ann Lage: Was that a difficult climb?

Farquhar: Well, we used to think it was, but not by modern standards. Then I climbed the North Palisade with Will Colby and Walter Huber.

Ray Lage: When you say that you introduced the use of the rope to the club, this was not something that had been used very much previously?

Farquhar: No. Oh, once in a while somebody would carry along a piece of clothesline, something like that, but nothing in the way of a real mountaineering rope.

Ann Lage: Did they use the modern kind of belaying techniques after the 1930s?

Farquhar: Yes. Of course, they took it up and increased the use of it a great deal, with the first ascent of the east face of Mt. Whitney. I went along on that trip, but the morning we were to start up the east face, I had been overdoing it a little bit and I had a stomach upset. I decided not to join them. So I took an easier route up--what we call "the mountaineer's route"--and got up on top. There were some Boy Scouts up there, and I said, "Have you seen anyone coming up the east face here?" "Oh," they said, "Nobody ever did that." Just then Jules Eichorn appeared [laughter]. I climbed it later on with my wife and another party.

Ann Lage: Are there any other particularly memorable ascents that you made that you would like to tell us about?

Farquhar: Well, I don't seem to think of any. The North Palisade and the Middle Palisade were the best climbs that I made in the Sierra.

Mountaineering Companions

Ann Lage: Who were some of your mountaineering companions in those days?

Farquhar: Jules Eichorn, Bestor Robinson, Glen Dawson --let me think. Well, those were the ones I climbed with most in the early days on the outings.

Ann Lage: How about Ansel Hall? Wasn't he a good companion of yours?

Farquhar: Yes. He wasn't on the Sierra Club outings. I took this trip with him in 1921 through the Sierra.

Ann Lage: Would you want to share some of your recollections of these climbers with us?

Farquhar: Well, I don't think I have anything that would be interesting.

Ray Lage: In this connection, also, who were some of the outstanding mountaineers of the club at the time? Was Norman Clyde considered such?

Farquhar: Norman Clyde came into the picture, I forget the year, 1922 I think. It's in Dave Bohn's book on Clyde that is coming out soon. When Colby, Huber, and I were climbing North Palisade we were joined by Clyde, who characteristically carried a pistol and ammunition, which he gave up later on.

Ann Lage: That wasn't the common practice then among the Sierra Club, was it?

Farquhar: No, that was only with Clyde. But I got very familiar with him later on. He is a very fine person and has some attributes which are not ordinarily known. For instance, he has an honorary doctor's degree, and he once studied old English at the University of California, and he taught Latin and mathematics at high school.

Ray Lage: Was Walter Starr, Sr., familiar to you?

Farquhar: Yes, I think I was responsible for bringing Walter Starr into the Sierra Club. I knew that he was interested in the Sierra, and his sons were interested, and I persuaded him to join the club. He afterwards became the president of it.

Ray Lage: I see. That was a terrible tragedy.

Farquhar: His son, yes. I was at luncheon at the Bohemian Club one day, and Vincent Butler, who worked in one of the large law offices here, said that Pete Starr, who was a junior member in his

office, was reported overdue from a climb in the Sierra. We began to get on the telephone and found that he had last been seen around Shadow Lake or near Mt. Ritter in the Minarets. In fact, a ranger had found his camping equipment there, and it looked as though it had been deserted for a couple of days, so we decided that a search better be made.

Vincent Butler arranged through the Standard Oil Company to have their plane fly over, and I joined it as passenger and a lookout. We flew from San Francisco over Yosemite and over around the Minarets. I knew that the only hope of his being alive would be if he was near water. So I examined very carefully every water course, every snow field in the vicinity of the Minarets, but saw nothing there. Obviously, he had been in that area on account of his camping equipment. Norman Clyde and Jules Eichorn went up there the next day and found his body on a ledge on one of the Minarets, and then they brought it down.

Ray Lage: He was quite young yet, in his thirties.

Farquhar: Yes. Well, I became very intimate with the Starr family after that.

The John Muir Trail

Ray Lage: Could you tell us something about how the John Muir Trail was first conceived and built?

Farquhar: Yes. I think that's a matter of record in the _Sierra Club Bulletin_. After John Muir's death, I think it must have been in the summer of 1915 when the Sierra Club was camped up in Tuolumne Meadows, it was proposed--I think Colby probably proposed it--to construct a trail through the High Sierra and call it the John Muir Trail.

There was a man along, now let's see what was his name--it's a matter of record--from Los Angeles who had considerable political influence in the legislature. He got an appropriation through to begin that trail, and that was continued from time to time. They managed to keep it pretty well towards the crest of the Sierra, all the way from Yosemite in Tuolumne Meadows to Mt. Whitney.

Ann Lage: Was it difficult to get the appropriations through?

Farquhar: No. It seemed to be received very cordially by the legislature. The appropriation was renewed a year or two later.

Ray Lage: When were the trail maintenance and cleanup trips initiated, do you recall?

Farquhar: That was after my time. I had nothing to do with that.

Ann Lage: Did you find that there was any public criticism of the Sierra Club in terms of the damage they might have done to the wilderness?

Farquhar: Not in my time. That came later.

Ray Lage: Well, it seems as though we have something of the flavor of the Sierra Club in the early days and of your own experiences with the club. I believe we'll end this morning's interview now.

THE SIERRA CLUB AND CONSERVATION CAMPAIGNS

Sequoia National Park

Ann Lage: Perhaps we could discuss the Sierra Club conservation efforts over the years of your active leadership.

Francis Farquhar: Well, the Sierra Club was quite a different organization in the 1920s and 1930s, when I was active in it, than it is now. It was still the Sierra Club of California, and it had very few members outside; most of those were people who had been on Sierra Club outings in the High Sierra. But our principal activity at that time was in connection with the national parks.

We had long been interested in the enlargement of Sequoia National Park, which had saved the Big Trees of Giant Forest and a few other places. But it had been recognized that the Kern River country and the Kings River country should become part of the national park. These areas were, at that time, in the national forests, and the national forest people were rather reluctant to give up their territory to the parks. They thought that they could handle it just as well, and that was the big feud at that time--what should be in the national parks and what should be in the national forests.

There were fine people in the U.S. Forest Service. Stewart Show was regional director at this time, and he was a very fine man and had high ideals. But he was a devoted Forest Service man, and the Forest Service regarded their territory as primarily to preserve trees and see that they were harvested properly. The pressures of recreation were beginning to impress them a great deal, and other uses of the national forests were becoming prominent, but they were reluctant to give up their territory to the Park Service because they thought that they could handle it just as well. However, the Sierra Club people felt that we could do a better job by having it in the national parks. So that was the

big problem in the 1920s or up through 1921 and 1922, along in there.

Stephen Mather was director of the National Parks Service at that time, and I had been very close to him since 1918, when I was with the Navy in Washington. Horace Albright was there and introduced me to Stephen Mather, and Mr. Mather asked me to help him during the summer of 1919 when I got out of the Navy. So just as soon as I got relieved of active duty in the Navy, I came back to Washington. Mr. Mather had the idea of getting some prominent people interested in the Sierra, in the Sequoia country, and authorized me to invite them to visit the national parks, particularly Sequoia and Yosemite. So I called on people; one of them was Averell Harriman. He wanted to come out very much, but he was very heavily involved in other things at that time.

I tried to get my classmate, Ted Roosevelt, the son of the former President, but he was about to run for governor of New York. I tried to persuade him to give that up and come out West and follow in his father's footsteps, and he would be a national figure rather than just a local boy. He was very much tempted. I remember an evening I spent with him in his home in Washington. His sister, Alice, Mrs. Longworth, was there, and we discussed it a great deal. But he finally said, "No, I said I would run for governor, and I'm going to stick with it." Of course, he ran against Al Smith and was defeated, but I think he wishes that he had come out West.

Then I tried to get Kermit Roosevelt to come out, but he was otherwise engaged that summer. There were a number of others I called on. I finally ended up by getting a man by the name of Dr. Curtis, who was president of the Camp Fire Club in New York. He was an influential man, and he decided to come out. And Allen Chamberlain, a special writer for the Boston Transcript and prominent in the Appalachian Mountain Club, accepted the invitation. Henry Saylor, a congressman--I've forgotten where he came from, I think from New York--came out. I went on ahead to San Francisco

to organize the party and got a packer and a cook to go along. It was started in Jesse Agnew's place at Horse Corral Meadows in Kings River country. We had a fine trip along the John Muir Trail, all the way from Kings River Canyon to Yosemite.

We were particularly impressed with the devastation that had taken place during the war years when the sheep had been allowed to come back into that high country and just ruined all the meadows. It was quite an object lesson, and we used that as a very strong argument for taking it --the area--into the national park and eliminating the grazing. I wrote that up in the _Sierra Club Bulletin_, under "Northward Over the John Muir Trail."

Ann Lage: Did these men become strong supporters then of the Sequoia bill?

Farquhar: Yes. We all met at the Hume Lumber Company's place just above Kings River Canyon, and they saw what was being done there by overcutting in the forest. Then we went to Lake Tahoe and met there and then came south along the east side of the Sierra and over Tioga Pass to Yosemite. By that time we had added to our party. We had Harry Chandler, publisher of the _Los Angeles Times_, and a man named Murphy, who was a writer for the _San Francisco Chronicle_, and also Chester H. Rowell, the Fresno Republican.

I had pretty much charge of that group. We had two or three cars, and I was careful not to put Harry Chandler and Chester Rowell in the same car [laughter]. By the time the trip was over, they were pretty good friends. We came up over Tioga Pass to Tuolumne Meadows and then down to Yosemite. All this was very good education for people with influence, and we indoctrinated them with our ideas about enlarging Sequoia National Park.

A little later, after Theodore Roosevelt's death, Mr. Mather talked with William Boise Thompson, a prominent mining man who had been with Roosevelt in his early days, about getting Roosevelt's friends behind the movement. It was

suggested that we name it "Roosevelt Sequoia National Park." First, it was just the Roosevelt National Park, and then we added Sequoia to it and that enlisted a lot of good support. We had meetings in New York and Washington. Then we got Harry Barbour, the congressman from Fresno, to sponsor the bill, introducing it to Congress, and he went at it very enthusiastically.

At this time, a man named Robert Sterling Yard, was head of the National Parks Association, and he was working with Mr. Mather on many things. But he found out that the Barbour bill had not incorporated protection against filing with the Federal Power Commission for water power sites. When we had the hearings in December, 1921, before the House Public Lands Committee, Yard started to oppose the whole bill. But I had had a meeting with Mr. Breckenridge, vice-president of the Southern California Edison Company. He had promised that the Edison Company would support the bill and had no intention of filing claims for power in that area. We brought that out at the hearing, and it sort of pulled the rug out from under Mr. Yard. However, we did succeed in getting the bill amended to protect it against power applications.

I testified at the hearing on behalf of the Sierra Club and described the features of the country both at the Sequoia National Park region, the Kern River region, and south fork of the Kings River. In doing so, I mentioned the golden trout in the Mt. Whitney area, and I saw that one of the congressmen on the committee sort of pricked up his ears on that, so I enlarged on that story and was quite eloquent about the golden trout. As we adjourned for lunch, we walked down the corridor and Addison Smith, the congressman from Idaho, who we had suspected of being our principal foe on it in the Congress, asked me some more about the golden trout. So I expanded on that and told him I could take him up to that country and catch some golden trout. Well, when it came time to vote in the committee, Addison Smith voted for it. We thought the golden trout had probably saved it.

We had the bill introduced, but there were a good many things that delayed it. The Forest Service

worked against it, and it didn't pass at Congress at that time. There was still a lot of work to be done. But Mr. Mather was very active in that, and in the next few years we lined it up so that when the bill finally came up to vote, in 1926 I think it was, it went through. The whole Kern River country was added to Sequoia National Park. The Roosevelt part was dropped, and it just became an addition to Sequoia National Park. But there was still some opposition to putting in the Kings River country, and that was eliminated.

It was several years before we got another bill establishing the Kings Canyon National Park, which took in all of the South Fork of Kings River and even way up into the Evolution country in the South Fork of the San Joaquin. But eventually that too was added. They finally had the whole Sierra Nevada, the High Sierra, established in the national park.

Ann Lage: What was the main basis for the opposition there against the enlargement, besides the Forest Service?

Farquhar: The City of Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light was trying to find power sites in the Kings River country, and they worked against it. The grazing interests. There was a lot of backstage working, but gradually we overcame the whole thing.

Ray Lage: What was the stand that the newspapers in the state took toward the enlargement?

Farquhar: Harry Chandler was head of the Los Angeles Times, and he was a supporter of it. We gradually had most of the newspapers. The Sacramento, Fresno, and San Francisco papers supported it in the end.

Ann Lage: Even the Examiner?

Farquhar: I don't remember about the Examiner.

Ray Lage: Were there any compromises that had to be made to get the bill passed?

Farquhar: No, it finally came through even better than

we had originally planned.

Ann Lage: You mean the final Kings Canyon bill?

Farquhar: Yes, Kings Canyon National Park--when we finally got that.

Ann Lage: I'm curious about your cooperation with the eastern conservation organizations.

Farquhar: I was originally from the East, and I knew a lot of people back there, and through Allen Chamberlain, we got the Transcript of Boston and the Appalachian Mountain Club. I gave a lecture with colored slides for the Appalachian Mountain Club of Boston. In those days we didn't have Kodachrome slides. We had just black and white and hand colored, and I had a beautiful set of hand colored slides of the High Sierra, which I eventually turned over to the Sierra Club. They are in the Bancroft Library now. But those, of course, have been superceded in recent years by the Kodachrome slides.

Ann Lage: Are there any other organizations that you worked to get?

Farquhar: We had Chauncey Hamlin of Buffalo, a prominent man there and head of the Buffalo Society of Natural History, and I gave a lecture there, which is the one that was published in this pamphlet that I have shown you. Those are the only lectures that I gave at that time. Oh yes, later on I gave a lecture in Chicago. In the one in Boston, the president of the Appalachian Mountain Club introduced me, and he said I know the High Sierra as well as you people know the country around Mt. Washington. So when I opened up my lecture I said, "Well, I too know something about the country around Mt. Washington. I have climbed all the presidential mountains and pretty nearly every mountain in New Hampshire, but since then I have devoted my attention to the Sierra."

Ann Lage: What about the American Civic Association?

Farquhar: J. Horace McFarland was the head of that, and

he was very helpful in all of that, and his secretary, Miss James, who afterwards took over.

Ann Lage: Did these groups have influence in Congress?

Farquhar: Yes, they had. It showed Congress that this was a national idea and not just a local one. We got our point over pretty well by the time we got really going. In 1926, when the bill finally passed, Albright telegraphed Colonel White, the superintendent of Sequoia National Park, of its success. Meanwhile, just at that time, I was starting out on a trip in the High Sierra with a group of Eagle Scouts, organized from the San Joaquin Valley. I got the word at Mineral King, just as we started out, that the bill had passed and this was now part of the national park.

When we met the forest ranger over in Kern, I said, "What are you doing here?" and he said, "I'm the ranger here." "Well," I said, "Didn't you know that this is a national park now?" He said, "No, I never heard of anything like that." I said, "Well, I guess they will let you stay here, but this is a national park, since yesterday." So I broke the news to him.

Ann Lage: Did the Forest Service take the bill okay after it passed? Were there any hard feelings?

Farquhar: Oh no, the Forest Service are fine people. They had their own ideas as to what it should be and were reluctant to give up territory that they thought they could handle just as well as the park people. But there were people like Paul Reddington and Stewart Show, who were regional directors of the Forest Service and were very fine people, who cooperated with us as soon as the bill was passed. And Colonel Greeley, who was the head of the Forest Service in Washington, came out in favor of the bill and was very cooperative in the long run.

Ann Lage: How did Mineral King happen to be excluded?

Farquhar: Well, Mineral King was already not of national character. There was a lot of private land and mining claims there, and it was much easier to exclude

it from the park than to try to eliminate all those private holdings. It was by common consent that we let Mineral King stay out.

Ann Lage: As you look back over this campaign, and there were a number of years involved I guess, do you think there were any mistakes made in the strategy that the Sierra Club followed?

Farquhar: No, I think that temporarily we had some setbacks, but it all came out well in the long run. At one time we thought that we could get the bill through by eliminating the southern townships of Sequoia National Park and that that would bring the Forest Service over on our side. And in one of the bills, they were eliminated. The final bill restored them to the park. It all came out very much as we had hoped for, but it took a long time and a lot of work.

Ann Lage: Did the final bill incorporate protection against water power?

Farquhar: Yes, but the City of Los Angeles had made surveys along the South Fork of the Kings River, and for a long while they tried to get those through. That was what that hearing was in Fresno that I think we mentioned [1922] in which I represented the Sierra Club. We persuaded the Federal Power Commission not to give those power sites to Los Angeles.

Ann Lage: I guess there were other areas open to them to develop.

Farquhar: Yes. Also, the big division between the Bureau of Power and Light and the Southern California Edison Company. Those things were all gradually worked out. That was my principal contribution to the group of things called conservation, that we had in those days. The problems are quite different then from what they are now.

Ann Lage: Was that term used, conservation?

Farquhar: No, it wasn't used very much then. That has grown up later.

Ann Lage: Would you have some comments on other early campaigns that involved the Sierra Club?

Farquhar: I don't recall any others of consequence on that like the Sierra ones.

The Redwoods and Kings Canyon

Ann Lage: Can you recall the Sierra Club's interest in saving the coastal redwoods at all?

Farquhar: Well, or course, the Save-the-Redwoods League was formed back when I was active, and Mr. Mather was one of the originators of that. I became very much interested at that time and have been consistently ever since. I have been on the board of directors since I don't know when, but it's the last thing that I am a director of.

Ann Lage: Were other Sierra Club members active in Save-the-Redwoods League?

Farquhar: Oh yes, the Drury brothers, Aubrey and Newton Drury, were the ones. They had a publicity business, and they gradually were concerned mostly with saving the redwoods. Then Aubrey Drury was the leader of that for years, and Newton went to Washington. Then Aubrey died, and Newton took over.

Ray Lage: I would like to return again for just a moment to the Kings Canyon National Park campaign. This, of course, followed the enlargement of the Sequoia Park by some fifteen years or so, but I have some recollection that Secretary Ickes proposed a bill earlier.

Farquhar: Yes, he helped out on that.

Ray Lage: He hadn't consulted with the club as I understand it.

Farquhar: I don't recall. I didn't have very much to do with the Kings Canyon thing. Joel Hildebrand and Walter Starr were the active men in the Sierra Club on that.

Ray Lage: Do you recall who were the main opponents to the Kings Canyon?

Farquhar: No, I don't.

California State Park Commission

Ann Lage: I understand that the Sierra Club was active in working toward the state park system in California.

Farquhar: Oh, yes. Duncan McDuffie was the partner of Governor C.C. Young, and he got Governor Young's cooperation in organizing the State Park Commission. Being such a close friend of Governor Young, he wouldn't take the chairmanship himself, but he got Governor Young to appoint Will Colby as the first chairman of the State Park Commission.

Ann Lage: What were the duties of the State Park Commission? What was their goal?

Farquhar: Well, to take over parks that were not part of the national parks system in California. Big Basin was one of the first ones, and then the redwoods as they accumulated, particularly up north in Humboldt and Del Norte counties.

Ray Lage: How were the areas chosen as state parks? Do you recall?

Farquhar: Yes, Frederick Law Olmstead made a survey and made recommendations, and one by one those were acted upon.

Ann Lage: How about the campaign for the bond issue?

Farquhar: The Sierra Club was very active in that. I

don't remember all the details about that.

Ann Lage: Do you recall if it was a controversial campaign?

Farquhar: Not so very much; it went through with pretty general approval. I was active in the Sierra Club in other things than parks. I was editor of the Sierra Club Bulletin for twenty years, and we were fortunate in having it started by very able men, and we had a very fine printer in C.A. Murdock, who was one of the pioneers of fine printing in California. When he died, I was instrumental in getting the work transferred to Taylor & Taylor, who sort of carried on Murdock's idea. We kept very high standards of printing and made a fine publication of it.

Ray Lage: If I may suggest this, we hope to devote another entire recording session to your activities as editor of the Bulletin, because we know that there is a wealth of material there. I had a question, Mr. Farquhar, concerning the club's efforts in finding threats to existing parks. Were there a great many of those?

Farquhar: I don't recall that.

Ray Lage: There are one or two that come to mind.

Yellowstone Threatened by Dam

Farquhar: Oh well, Yellowstone, yes. The people in Idaho wanted to place a dam on the Bechler River, which would dam up the southwestern corner of Yellowstone National Park, and the Sierra Club was opposed to that. That is why congressman Addison Smith came in. It was one of his pet projects. That's why we were afraid that he would vote against us on the Sequoia bill, but he changed his mind.

Ann Lage: Was the Army Corps of Engineers involved in these various dam efforts? I remember reading about Yellowstone, and they wanted to dam Glacier Park.

Farquhar: They had a proposition for a dam that would interfere with Glacier National Park, and we had to work against that, but I don't recall the details.

Ann Lage: A lot of the threats seem to come from the water and power interests. Was there strong support in Congress for water and power?

Farquhar: Yes, they had a pretty good block of congressmen who were for them there. And, of course, much of what they did was very good, but when they started to invade national parks, we had to come out against it.

Ann Lage: Do you think there is much validity in the charge that you hear sometimes that the Sierra Club doesn't consider the legitimate needs of the people in the water and power controversy?

Sierra Club Leaders

Farquhar: Oh, I don't think so. I think that the water and power people were too ambitious. In the Sierra Club we had a very valuable man in Walter Huber, who was a civil engineer, and he was at one time the water expert for the Forest Service. Any application for power sites had to be reviewed by Walter Huber. He became president of the Sierra Club, but he was a very realistic person and was not overenthusiastic, very practical.

In those days, the 1920s, of which I was particularly concerned and in the 1930s, we had very able men in the Sierra Club like Will Colby and Walter Huber and later on Joel Hildebrand, Walter Starr, and Duncan McDuffie. In the south we had Ernest Dawson and Clair Tappaan. They were all

men of ability and prestige and did much to stabilize the Sierra Club and build up its influence. Then we had a very remarkable person in Miss Aurelia Harwood of southern California. She was the only woman president of the Sierra Club, and she was a very able person and highly respected.

Ann Lage: What was her background?

Farquhar: She had a natural interest in the same things that were objects of the Sierra Club. She was able to express herself very well, and she was a wealthy woman and able to devote her time to it. There was Robert Price of Reno, Nevada, who was an attorney with wide experience, and he was very helpful in many things in the Sierra Club.

CONSERVATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The U.S. Forest Service

Ray Lage: If you were asked to make a choice, which would you say were the main opponents to the wilderness, to conservation--mining interests, lumber, water, or power interests?

Francis Farquhar: I don't know that you could single out any one of them. They all had their own interests and didn't want to see them excluded from areas in which they felt that they could prosper. Of course, the mining law still stands. Mining takes precedence of almost anything else. That goes back to the middle of the nineteenth century.

The Forest Service and the lumber industry has an interesting history all by itself. In the early days in the East, the main object was to get rid of the forests and open it up for agriculture. In Maine, for instance, the white pine was a very valuable tree for ship masts, and the lumber interests cut nearly all the big tall white pines in Maine and New Hampshire. The whole character of the country was completely changed, and there was nobody interested in opposing them at that time.

From New England the lumber industries spread over into New York and Michigan and later on farther west. Some of the biggest lumber companies originated in Michigan. For instance, Stewart Edward White was originally in Michigan and his family was lumber people there. Then he came to California and began to see that we had to save some of the trees.

The whole lumber industry was finally brought more or less under control with the rise of the U.S. Forest Service, particularly under Gifford Pinchot, who was a forester interested in harvesting trees properly. He was not a conservationist in the sense that we use the word now. He was a forester first and last. He was not always helpful in preserving trees. He was interested in good forestry and did a great deal. He was followed by others who gradually

became a little more up to date.

Ray Lage: So there has always been this divergency of opinion between the Forest Service's views of the uses of the forest and the conservationists?

Farquhar: Yes. It has been a constant struggle to reconcile those two views so that both can live, and I think the Sierra Club has contributed a great deal to the understanding of that problem.

Ann Lage: Would you say that there were times when the Forest Service was maybe too sensitive to demands of these special interests, like grazing or mining?

Farquhar: During World War I they practically allowed the grazing to run riot in the Sierra. That destroyed the meadows of the Kern particularly. But there were some fine men in the Forest Service, and they loved the country. They began to see it more as we see it today, as something to preserve.

Ray Lage: You mentioned Colonel Greeley earlier.

Farquhar: He was a very broad-minded man. He was not hostile to the parks. In fact, he cooperated very well.

Ann Lage: Were the later chief foresters as easy to deal with?

Farquhar: Yes. They are all fine public servants. They just had different objectives.

Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall

Ann Lage: The Sierra Club and the National Park Service seem to have cooperated very closely.

Farquhar: The Park Service was organized by Stephen Mather and Horace Albright, who were close to the

Sierra Club. We have had various secretaries of the Interior who were not always cooperative. When Secretary Fall was appointed by President Harding in 1921, it looked pretty bad because he was, well, we know now that he was one of the worst high government officials we have ever had. When he took office he did not call in his bureau chiefs to get acquainted with them at all for the first few months. The Geologic Survey and the National Park Service did not see anything of him. He made decisions without conferring with them. Stephen Mather was then director of the Park Service.

Finally, in the summer of 1921, Fall said he was coming out to California and Mather came out ahead of him. I met Mr. Mather at the Ferry Building with his car. He had joined Fall on the Overland Limited at Benicia, and that was the first time they had met. When we got to the Ferry Building, Fall came in Mr. Mather's car over to the hotel, and I sat with him. He said, "We are fortunate in having such a fine man as Mr. Mather as director of the Park Service." That was the first good word we had ever heard from him [laughter].

Our job was to keep him in line and not lose him. We had a luncheon up in Yosemite at the Glacier Point Hotel for Fall. I helped Mr. Mather call all over the state to get the people we wanted. He had people up there like Harry Chandler of the Los Angeles Times, the president of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, prominent bankers, and such. We just surrounded Fall, and he couldn't do very much [laughter].

Ann Lage: How did he work out in his term of office?

Farquhar: He did not do any great damage to the Park Service. One critical thing was that Fall lived in southern New Mexico, and he owned a big ranch there, right near the Mescalero Indian Reservation. He decided it would be a fine thing to have a national park right next to his ranch. He sent Mr. Mather down there to make a report on it. Stephen T. went down and saw that it was an impossible situation, but he did not send in his report. He came back to Washington, and just at that time he had a breakdown and went to the sanitarium without rendering his report.

He never did render it.

The following year Fall announced he was going to retire as secretary. The day after he left office, Mr. Mather arrived in Washington. I shared a room with him at the time and was pretty close to him. A report adverse to the park came out shortly thereafter, but Fall was out of office and presently in trouble with his relations with Doheny and the oil interests.

Park Service Director, Stephen Mather

Farquhar: Stephen T. Mather was originally from Darien, Connecticut. That is the ancestral home. He had a beautiful house there that he had lived in as a young man. But he was a Californian by upbringing. He was a member of the class of 1887 at Berkeley and was a Californian all the time. He was familiar with the Sierra. I first met him in 1912, I think it was, in the Kern River country on a Sierra Club outing. He had a camp of his own and came over to visit the Sierra Club one evening, but I did not see any more of him until years later.

He had a very interesting round of experience. He was at one time a reporter for the *New York Sun* and was a very good journalist. Then he got interested in borax through Borax Smith, and he joined his organization. Mather invented the term "Twenty Mule Team Borax" for marketing borax for the Smith Company. Somewhere I have a biographical sketch that I wrote of Mr. Mather for the *Sierra Club Bulletin* at the time of his death. He found a borax deposit of his own, and with a man named Thorkilsen he formed the Thorkilsen Mather Company and marketed borax. They had a very rich find and became very well off. Finally he sold out to Thorkilsen and retired from the borax business for the time being.

Ray Lage: So he was independently wealthy, and he used

his great wealth also to assist in establishing some of the national parks, did he not?

Farquhar: Yes. He bought some of the private holdings in the national parks and turned them over to the government. He had ample means to do many things. Meanwhile, he had come to live in Chicago. That was the headquarters of the borax business, and he had many influential friends there.

Ann Lage: How did he happen to get into government service?

Farquhar: I don't know exactly how that came about. Probably through Franklin K. Lane, who was secretary of the Interior, and who got him interested in developing the national parks and forming the National Park Service. Lane made him the first director and Horace Albright was his assistant. After Mather became director in 1916, he came to live in Washington, of course.

I was in Washington with the U.S. Navy in the latter part of World War I, in the Navy Pay Corps, a lieutenent. I was working on what was then known as the Compensation Board, determining the cost of ship building--destroyers and submarines. I wrote a digest of decisions of the board; it was very useful. I had known Horace Albright slightly for a year or two. He brought me to luncheon with Stephen Mather one day. I became more and more closely associated with him that spring of 1919, after I got out of the Navy.

Ray Lage: Evidently you formed quite a strong friendship with him; apparently he relied considerably upon you.

Farquhar: Well, I was really very close to him. I admired him so much, and we got along very well. He lived in a place called the Garden Tea House, and when I came back to Washington in 1920, I think it was, I shared a room with him. Arthur Elston, the congressman from Berkeley, had a room adjacent to us. I was there one time when Arthur didn't show up for breakfast. We became alarmed and started a search for him. I went to Atlantic City to see if I could find him there. I got a telephone message

that they had found his clothes beside the Potomac River. Then they found his body.

Mr. Mather wanted me to come right back to Washington. So I took the night train back. I came up to our room and Mr. Mather said, "Well, I guess our trip to Utah is all off." I said, "Certainly not. You have an appointment with the governor there, and there is no reason why you shouldn't keep it. What's more, I will go with you." "Well," he replied, "if you will do that, then it will be all right." So we took the train for Utah the next day.

Ann Lage: I understand Mather had a very magnetic personality.

Farquhar: Oh, yes. He was a very vivid personality, and he got along wonderfully with people.

Ann Lage: That must have been a big help to the National Park Service.

Farquhar: Of course it was. And it was always perfectly clear that he was never looking for anything for himself. He was always giving rather than receiving. And he had a very wide acquaintance.

Ann Lage: The Sierra Club, then, was pretty much in agreement with his leadership.

Farquhar: Oh, yes. He was a member of the Sierra Club. In fact, he went on a Sierra Club trip in 1905 to climb Mount Rainier.

Ann Lage: Was he introduced to the wilderness through the Sierra Club?

Farquhar: That I don't recall.

Yellowstone Park Franchise Audit

Ann Lage: How was the cooperation with the National Park

Service after Mather?

Farquhar: Mather was succeeded by Albright, whom he had indoctrinated pretty well. Horace Albright was superintendent of Yellowstone National Park for ten years, and he became the field assistant to the director and followed all the problems with the national parks in the West.

In the summer of 1922 Harry W. Child, who was the owner of all the stock of both the Yellowstone Hotel and the Yellowstone Park Transportation Company, complained that he was losing money. Well, everybody knew that he was making a lot of money. He wanted to have the second part of his franchise fee remitted. By that time I had opened my own office as a certified public accountant in San Francisco. Mather and Albright asked me if I would be willing to go to Yellowstone and see what the situation really was. So I was appointed for ninety actual working days as a special field accountant for the National Park Service.

I went up to Yellowstone and went to Helena where the company had its head office. They had a huge big directors' table just stacked high with bank statements, vouchers, and things like that. I said, "What are these for?" "Well," they said, "don't you want to audit these?" I said, "I am not interested in whether you keep your bank accounts correctly. What I want to see is the minutes of your board of directors, your stock certificate records, and your general journal." "Oh, well, you can't have those. Those are private."

"Well," I replied, "your contract says here that the secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative shall have access to all corporate records. Am I his authorized representative?" "Well, you have to admit you are." "And aren't these corporate records?" "Well, we would have to consult our attorney about that." Well, [laughter] they came back; he told them that I would have to see them.

So I spent three days there and got the answer right then and there. Instead of losing money

on his investment, he had made over twenty percent during the last few years. Then they had accounts receivable of about six hundred thousand dollars on the books. I said, "Don't you ever collect your accounts?" "Oh, well, those are not customers' accounts." "Of course," I replied, "I know what they are. They are money that Harry Child has taken out of the business. They are dividends." "Oh, no, no, no," they said.

Well, the Internal Revenue Service got after them, and they were treated as dividends. Child went to the secretary of the Interior trying to get me removed, but Albright and Mather said that that would be a terrible thing to do. So I was reappointed and did the Yosemite and Glacier Park Company and a couple others after that.

Ray Lage: Well, I would say you were an invaluable asset to the government.

Farquhar: Well, I think that I did a rather good job as a matter of fact. [Laughter.] I earned my salary anyway.

Park Service Director, Newton Drury

Ann Lage: Could you tell us about Newton Drury, director of the National Park Service for several years?

Farquhar: Yes. Newton Drury was a graduate of the University of California and secretary to President Benjamin Ide Wheeler there. He was a publicity man; that was his principle vocation. I don't know where the initial beginning of his career in conservation came. It came through the redwoods. When they formed the Save-the-Redwoods League, he did a lot of publicity for that.

His brother, Aubrey, was a partner in the business. You should interview Newton Drury and

get the whole story from him. Just how it developed, I don't recall. Newton was in the same class as Horace Albright at Berkeley. Everybody knew him, respected his work, and gradually he got more and more contact with the National Park Service.

Finally, when Cammerer, who followed Albright, left, Newton Drury was appointed director of the National Park Service in Washington, and did some very fine work there until finally he had to resign and come back to San Francisco after his brother died to take care of things here. He became head of the state park system in California for several years. Then he left that to come back to the Save-the-Redwoods League as director.

Ray Lage: Were there any issues upon which the Sierra Club and the National Park Service had some substantial disagreement?

Farquhar: Not that I recall. No, the Sierra Club was always so close to people like Mather and Albright and Drury that we worked together very well.

Tioga Road

Ray Lage: Was the Tioga Road issue one in which there was some disagreement?

Farquhar: Not that I recall. The Tioga Road, of course, was built years before the Sierra Club was around. It was built in connection with the silver mines there. It fell into disuse after the national park was established and was barely passable in 1911, which was the first year that I was on a Sierra Club outing. We had an outing up in the Tuolumne Meadows. Colby arranged to clear the old Tioga Road enough so they could get trucks in there.

Mr. Mather came in about that time and took

a look at it. He found out who the owners of the Tioga Road were. The mining companies were extinct. And he acquired the ownership of the Tioga Road and donated it to the government, and then it was approved as part of the park. In that trip in the Sierra in 1919, I came over in Mr. Mather's car; it was one of the first trips over the new road.

Private Lands in National Parks

Ray Lage: In the national parks there have been numerous private interests. Are there now?

Farquhar: Well, before the parks were established there was some private patented land acquired. In Yosemite, for instance, there was the Soda Springs area that had been acquired as a patent. I think it was in 1915 that the Sierra Club, under Colby, began to acquire the ownership of that through a group of people in the Sierra Club, and finally turn it over to the Sierra Club. It is still owned by the Sierra Club, but in cooperation with the Park Service.

Then there was attractive land near Tenaya Lake which was privately owned. I think that has been acquired. In Kings Canyon, of course, there was some private ownership before it became a park. Jesse Agnew and a friend of his, named Zumwalt, owned one of the key meadows there. Jesse Agnew gave it to the Park Service after the park was established there. He also owned Horse Corral Meadow, which is now in the park. And there were private holdings in Glacier National Park. One of the great problems in the Grand Canyon was a man named Cameron, who had a mining patent right on the Bright Angel Trail. There was a lot of controversy over that. But it was eventually acquired.

Ray Lage: He was that fellow who charged fees for anyone who wanted to use the trail, wasn't he? He had

quite a thing going for himself for a bit.

Farquhar: Yes. I went down there with Mr. Mather and the superintendent of the Grand Canyon National Monument and looked over the prior holdings there. I took some pictures that were later used in the report in Congress when they established the national park there.

I tied my mule to a tree there and ran down to the river, about fifteen hundred feet, and took a swim and came back figuring I could ride my mule comfortably up to the rim [laughter]. I rode about a mile and came across two women sitting alongside the trail with their shoes off. They had come down the trail and their feet were all sore. One of them was still able to walk; the other could not walk. So I gave them my mule, and I walked out [laughter].

On another occasion I went down another trail to the river, and as I got half way down I had a little lunch. I went off the trail a bit to a level place, with my back up against a big rock and ate my lunch. All of a sudden a huge eagle flew right in front of my face. I couldn't back away, and I looked again, and it was a hummingbird [laughter].

Secretary of the Interior, John Barton Payne

Ann Lage: You have seen many changes in the national administrations in Washington. Can you mention any secretaries of Interior who stand out as particular friends of the wilderness?

Farquhar: Well, John Barton Payne was secretary of the Interior for a short time. I went to the Conference on State Parks at Gettysburg, I think it was in 1924 --maybe it was 1921. I was on the Resolutions Committee, and we were then trying to make a resolution

quite a thing going for himself for a bit.

Farquhar: Yes. I went down there with Mr. Mather and the superintendent of the Grand Canyon National Monument and looked over the prior holdings there. I took some pictures that were later used in the report in Congress when they established the national park there.

I tied my mule to a tree there and ran down to the river, about fifteen hundred feet, and took a swim and came back figuring I could ride my mule comfortably up to the rim [laughter]. I rode about a mile and came across two women sitting alongside the trail with their shoes off. They had come down the trail and their feet were all sore. One of them was still able to walk; the other could not walk. So I gave them my mule, and I walked out [laughter].

On another occasion I went down another trail to the river, and as I got half way down I had a little lunch. I went off the trail a bit to a level place, with my back up against a big rock and ate my lunch. All of a sudden a huge eagle flew right in front of my face. I couldn't back away, and I looked again, and it was a hummingbird [laughter].

Secretary of the Interior, John Barton Payne

Ann Lage: You have seen many changes in the national administrations in Washington. Can you mention any secretaries of Interior who stand out as particular friends of the wilderness?

Farquhar: Well, John Barton Payne was secretary of the Interior for a short time. I went to the Conference on State Parks at Gettysburg, I think it was in 1924 --maybe it was 1921. I was on the Resolutions Committee, and we were then trying to make a resolution

to protest sheep grazing in the Sierra Nevada. I read the resolution. Payne was cooperating in the whole thing, and he said, "That is a good resolution, but why don't you put some teeth in it?" [laughter] So we rewrote the resolution. He was a very fine man. He was president of the American Red Cross and a man of very great ability and integrity, one of the finest secretaries of the Interior we ever had.

Harold Ickes and FDR

Farquhar: Then, of course, we had Secretary Ickes, who was a wild man. He had his own way of doing things.

Ann Lage: Can you elaborate on why he was a wild man?

Farquhar: [Laughter] I have to go back and think about that. He turned out to be a little better than he originally looked. He backed up Mr. Albright in the long run.

Ann Lage: Was he friendly to park development?

Farquhar: Well, he became so, but he wasn't at first.

Ray Lage: Would you say that the New Deal had a greater or lesser effect on conservation than previous administrations?

Farquhar: If I can think back as to who was in at that time. Franklin Roosevelt was elected in 1932 and took office in 1933 and was in for twelve years. He didn't show any marked appreciation of the parks or conservation, but he was not hostile to it.

Warren G. Harding

Farquhar: Harding became President in 1921. He came out West and went to Yellowstone. Horace Albright took care of him in Yellowstone. Albright's team was programmed so close that he wore him out there. Then Harding went to Alaska. He came back and was due in Yosemite. We had a big arrangement in Yosemite for Harding. I was up there at the time with the Yosemite park people arranging the transportation and everything. I helped assign people to cars so we could all go up to Glacier Point. Howard Hayes, who was the concessionaire at Sequoia National Park, was there. We were working down in the hotel in Merced, making all these arrangements.

Howard went out for a while, and he came back and took all these cards that we had so laboriously worked out and threw them all over the floor. I said, "What is the idea?" He said, "The President has taken ill; he is going to San Francisco and not coming here." [Laughter.] So Harding went to San Francisco and went to bed. I was there with Mr. Mather and Secretary Wilbur. Then the word came out that Harding was improving and everything was okay. The newspapermen were released and could go on their way, and Mr. Mather and I took the Overland Limited East.

At Truckee we got the word that Harding was dead. So we went on to Washington. It was the first of August. My, it was hot, a perfectly terrible day. The President's funeral train came in, rode up Pennsylvania Avenue, and people wilted and fell in faints all along the line. A perfectly terrible day. But Coolidge took over and straightened things out. He was a very canny man and helped things very much.

Ann Lage: Did he have an interest in the parks?

Farquhar: Well, not personally, but he was helpful and saw things in a big way.

Ann Lage: How about Hoover, was his administration a

a friendly one?

Herbert Hoover

Farquhar: Yes, his was friendly. Hoover took office in March, 1929. I was in Washington at that time. I had just had printed a rather rare picture of the Big Tree in Palo Alto, after which Palo Alto was named. The picture was made in 1872, I think, from an old drawing. I went up to see Secretary Wilbur and gave him a copy of it, and he was very pleased. I said, "Do you think the President would like one of these?" He replied, "He certainly would." I said, "Would you give him this?" He said, "You go over and give it to him yourself."

So I went over to the White House. I had met Mr. Hoover before, and he knew my name. I went in and had a very nice chat with him. Here I was one of the first people to go in there to give him something instead of to ask for something [laughter]. We had a very pleasant chat. Suddenly the telephone rang and he said, "You will have to excuse me, I have a visitor."

So I went out, and as I walked through the corridor, a great tall man in a frocked coat carrying a silk hat was striding in--William Randolph Hearst, just having been thrown out of France by the People's Government of Paris for some remarks that he had made over there. And he had come in to tell the President what to do about it [laughter].

I was at a dinner in San Francisco a couple years later, and Mr. Hoover was there. I said, "I often wondered, Mr. Hoover, what went on during that conversation." He said, "Mr. Hearst did all the talking." [laughter] Mr. Hoover was a very difficult man to get acquainted with, but he meant well, and once the ice was broken he was a very easy man to get along with.

Congressman Martin Madden

Ann Lage: Would you be able to say whether the Democratic or the Republican parties had been more sympathetic to Sierra Club goals over the years?

Farquhar: Well, I don't think it was a party matter. I don't think that there were any of the major conservation-park decisions that were drawn on party lines. There were good Republicans and good Democrats involved. I don't even remember what party they were in. For instance, Martin Madden was chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. I think he was a Republican, but I can't remember distinctly. It would not have made any difference.

A group from the Senate and the House took a trip through the Panama Canal and came up into Los Angeles and left the ship there. I got Mr. Mather's car and his driver, and I went down there to Los Angeles and met the party. I took Mr. Madden, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, on a trip to Harry Chandler's ranch in the Tehachapi, and then on up to the Sequoia National Park. There were three congressmen in that party--Barbour of Fresno, and Madden of Chicago, and Louis C. Cramton from Michigan. I had Mr. Mather's Packard and driver, and we took the congressmen around.

Then we had a meeting in Visalia after we had come down from the Giant Forest. We had dinner there, and I established a world's record--four congressmen made after-dinner speeches for a total of twenty-five minutes [laughter]. Mrs. Madden was ill, and they wanted to get her up to the hotel as quickly as possible. So they agreed among themselves that I would umpire the thing and that if I raised my finger like that, they would stop within thirty seconds [laughter]. So we kept it down to about twenty-five minutes, and everything was accomplished.

Ann Lage: When did this trip occur?

Farquhar: I think it was about 1923.

Ann Lage: And that was to gain support for the Sequoia enlargement?

Farquhar: Yes. And then Madden went up to Yosemite, and Mrs. Madden was still quite ill. We came down ahead of time to San Francisco to the Palace Hotel. I was there with the congressman for almost twenty-four hours, keeping him away from the reporters. He was there, but his name was not out. He was not supposed to be there until the next day. I took him out to the Presidio and various things around San Francisco. The next day the Chamber of Commerce and the reporters took him over the city. Meanwhile, he had gotten all the information he wanted. He wasn't able to be hoodwinked by them. They wanted appropriations, of course.

Ray Lage: Mr. Farquhar, once again you have been delighting us with your reminiscenses. I think perhaps we will end this morning, unless you feel there is something that comes to mind that you want to touch on before we do.

Farquhar: I think I have dealt with all the relevant things at present. I may think of something else later on.

HISTORY OF SIERRA CLUB LEADERSHIP

William Colby

Ann Lage: We thought we would begin this session, Mr. Farquhar, by your giving us some of your recollections of club leadership over the years.

Francis Farquhar: Well, when I joined the Sierra Club in 1911, I was very fortunate in that most of the early leaders in the Sierra Club were still alive and active. Of course, towering above them all was Will Colby, who succeeded Joe LeConte as president and was a devotee of John Muir. In fact, I once met John Muir in Colby's office in the Mills Building. That was in 1912, but I only had the opportunity to talk for a few minutes, and I don't have anything to contribute in the way of John Muir.

But Colby was an outstanding man. He was a great lawyer, specializing in the law of mines. In fact, he lectured on mining while at the University of California Law School. His wife also had a law degree, and when Colby couldn't come to his class, she would substitute for him. It was quite a remarkable coincidence. That was Rachel Vrooman Colby, for whom Rae Lake in the Sierra is named. That was her common name--Rae.

I met Colby through Mrs. Colby's sister, Beatrice Vrooman, whom I had met in San Francisco, and I phoned her one time and said that I had been told that she was related to one of the leaders of the Sierra Club. She said, "Certainly, Will Colby, my brother-in-law. Come over Wednesday night for dinner and meet Mr. and Mrs. Colby." So that was when I met Will Colby, and it was about the first week in May of 1911. I had already heard about the Sierra Club outings through some friends, particularly Jim Whitney, and one or two others who had been on Sierra Club trips.

I told Colby I had heard about it and that I would like to know a little bit more about these outings. He handed me a little circular about them,

and I saw to my dismay that applications must be in before the first of May. I said, "I guess I'm too late for this year." He said, "If you really want to go, I think it could be arranged." I put in my application then and there and it was accepted. Colby then invited me to accompany him on a little family outing on the summit of Mt. Diablo the following weekend. There I became acquainted with other members of the Sierra Club, so that when we started for Yosemite at the end of June, I was really enthusiastic about the club.

Colby was the leader of the party then, as he was for a number of years thereafter. He was a remarkable man in every way, not only intellectually, but physically. He was a tremendously powerful man with great endurance. He led those outings and made them much more than just a physical exercise. He conducted the campfires in the evenings, introducing the guests and members of the party, and we had all manner of interesting talks at those campfires. Colby would then describe the following day's journey and say how many miles it was to the next camp. That's when we became aware of Colby miles.

A Colby mile is considerably longer than the miles expressed on the maps, but we all got there, except on one occasion and that was in a later trip. I don't remember which one it was. It might have been in 1920 in the Middle Fork of Kings River. The party got broken up into two or three sections, and two of them got lost and didn't come in until after dinner, but Colby, himself, never got lost. He always found his way directly to the camp. Colby always introduced a talk on John Muir during our campfires. He had know John Muir from the early days of the club, from the very founding of the club, and had many anecdotes to tell. He never lost that enthusiasm about John Muir, and communicated it to many of the rest of us.

Colby finally began to find substitutes for his leadership of the outings, and there were two or three others that came along. Bert Allen and another Allen, I've forgotten his name now, helped him. Then there was Clair Tappaan of Los Angeles,

who was dean of the law school at the University of Southern California. He was a great big man, really a tremendous man, but also a very strong man. He had been center on the Cornell football team in his youth, and that gave him a stamina that was almost unequaled in the club. Tappaan became an able assistant to Colby, both in the organization of the trips and conducting them around the campfires. He had many humorous stories to tell, and we all adored both him and Colby.

There were other leaders on those outings. I think I have already said something about Walter Huber, who had been an engineer with the Forest Service, and was a civil engineer, later president of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He succeeded some of the others whom I'll mention, as president of the Sierra Club. He was an authority on the water resources of the Sierra. In fact, representing the Forest Service, he had assisted in drawing up the permits for the use of water in the Sierra. He knew every stream and waterfall in the High Sierra.

William F. Badè

Farquhar: Another early leader whom I got to know very intimately was William F. Badè. Badè was a professor at the School of Religion in Berkeley and was, in fact, a clergyman, but devoted his time to education. Badè was the editor of the Sierra Club Bulletin for many years and helped establish the high quality of that publication. He was also the biographer of John Muir and edited the two volume Life and Letters of John Muir, which is one of the basic books on that subject.

Ann Lage: Was he a club officer as well?

Farquhar: Badè became president of the Sierra Club shortly after Colby. Another early president of the club was Duncan McDuffie, who was a real estate

enterprise leader in the Bay Area. He was the designer of St. Francis Wood in San Francisco, and other very fine real estate developments in the area. Duncan McDuffie was a little over six feet in height, and his wife was also very tall. They made a handsome couple. They lived here in Berkeley.

Joseph N. LeConte

Ann Lage: Did you know Joseph N. LeConte?

Farquhar: Joseph N. LeConte I knew very well. After John Muir died, J.N. LeConte became president of the Sierra Club and served several years until Colby took over. Joe LeConte was a graduate of the University of California, and then went to Cornell University for an engineering degree. He later returned to Berkeley and taught engineering at the university. He was a little man in every way physically, and when he stood up beside Colby or Tappaan, that was emphasized, but he was no small man in his abilities.

He had learned to camp in the Sierra and climb its mountains while he was still in college, and through his engineering interests, he began mapping the Sierra. He produced the first maps of the High Sierra to be published. They were blueprints issued by the Sierra Club, and they became the base for many other amateur maps until the U.S. Geological Survey took over. They were a great help to the Geological Survey in making their more minute version of the maps.

J.N. LeConte was the son of Joseph LeConte, who had come to the University of California in the 1870s from Georgia, I believe, and who was one of the founders of the university. He climbed many mountains and made the first ascent of several of the big ones like the North Palisade.

One of his closest friends was James S. Hutchinson, also a University of California man. Jim Hutchinson came along with J.N. LeConte and helped him with his photographic outfit, carrying his camera and tripod very often, and going to the top of the highest peaks. Hutchinson was also on the first ascent of North Palisade in 1903.

The third man in that party was James K. Moffitt, of the firm of Blake, Moffitt & Towne, the paper people, afterwards president of the Crocker First National Bank. I used to enjoy bringing guests of mine from the East into the Crocker Bank and introducing them to J.K. Moffitt, the man who made the first ascent of some of the best peaks in the Sierra. He didn't look as if he was that active, but he was.

I had an amusing time with J.K. Moffitt one time. He asked me to make out the tax return for his father's estate. When I brought in the return, I brought back the book in which he had kept the accounts, which was a three-ring binder with loose leaf. It was all falling to pieces so when I brought it back with his tax return, I threw it into the waste basket. He reached after it, and I said, "No you don't. You're through with that." He said, "I want it. It's an old friend of mine." And I said, "You can't have it."

There was a girl stenographer sitting at the desk. She had been taking dictation, and she thought I'd go up through the skylight. Nobody ever talked to J.K. Moffitt like that. But what she didn't know was that the preceding summer I had camped with J.K. and Joe LeConte at LeConte's camp in Porcupine Flats in Yosemite National Park, and I had eaten his flapjacks and slept right beside him, so I could take liberties with him without going through the skylight. Moffitt was interested in the Sierra Club, but not an active leader. Let's see, who else.

Robert Price

Ann Lage: Robert Price was an early leader.

Farquhar: Oh yes, Bob Price was an attorney in Reno, Nevada, and he had had a very interesting career. He had been to Alaska in the days of the Klondike and became very active in the Sierra Club later and became its president. In fact, in those early days we used to alternate the presidency between northern and southern California. Bob Price substituted for the south on one occasion, between two northern presidents.

Ann Lage: He was one of the founding members, wasn't he?

Farquhar: Yes, he was a charter member. In 1912 on the Sierra Club outing, Colby and Price invited me to go along with them on a climb of the then unclimbed Milestone Mountain. We got well up on the side of it, and Colby thought he could see a perfectly good route going up from ledge to ledge. As a matter of fact, Colby was a good mountaineer in the strength of his abilities, but not in a choice of routes. He got us up on one of these ledges, and I, being the smallest member of the party, got up ahead of them and had my hands around a big rock when the rock cracked just above my chest, and I felt that it was coming off.

I yelled at Colby to get out from under, but Colby thought he could save me from falling and stayed there until Price saw what the situation was and talked Colby out of it. Price got Colby to one side, and I let go of the rock, and it landed right where Colby had been. We would both have been killed if it had gone prematurely. The three of us finally found an easier route and got up on top. I prize very highly the recollection of that climb, the early first ascent of the Sierra, with Colby and Bob Price.

Edward and Marian Randall Parsons

Ray Lage: There have been several Parsons associated with the club.

Farquhar: Oh yes. Early in the history of the outings, around 1910 I guess, Edward Parsons came down from Portland, Oregon, where he had been active with the Mazamas, and became one of Colby's principal assistants on the outings. Into the northern mountains, Mount Hood and Mount Rainier, they [the Mazamas] used to take large groups of people up on the snow fields and glaciers. Parsons introduced that method in the Sierra on Mount Lyell, for instance. This also introduced a lot of very bad practices because it subjected many people to dangers that should not have been. But Parsons was an enthusiast and helped a great deal in the activities of the club in those years. He was a director of the club, but not a president.

Ray Lage: Then there was a Marian Randall Parsons.

Farquhar: Yes. Marian Randall went on Sierra Club trips and Parsons was along. Eventually they became engaged and got married. Mrs. Parsons, Marian Randall Parsons, was a very great help in the social life of the Sierra Club in those days. She lived in Berkeley and used to invite people over to her home for dinner and for exhibitions of pictures. I went to her home a number of times.

Ann Lage: She became a director, too.

Farquhar: Yes. She became a director of the Sierra Club after Parson's death.

Ray Lage: And I guess she served on the editorial board of the _Bulletin_, too.

Farquhar: She served on the editorial board under Bade.

David Starr Jordan

Ann Lage: Did you know David Starr Jordan?

Farquhar: I had a very interesting visit with David Starr Jordan one time. It was on the Lark going to Los Angeles. Jordan got on at Palo Alto and occupied the same section with me. I had a very pleasant talk with him. I said, "I have often wanted to find out more about a man who used to be a professor at Stanford, Bolton Coit Brown."

Jordan replied, "Oh yes, Brown, Brown. He was professor of drawing, a very fine professor of drawing. But he didn't have any discretion. Mrs. Stanford used to come around and visit the classes in those days. One day she came over to my office very much annoyed because she had dropped into Bolton Coit Brown's classroom, his class in life drawing. And Brown had brought down a young lady from San Francisco, a very well developed young lady, and she didn't have any clothes on [laughter]. And Mrs. Stanford came marching over and said, 'Mr. Brown must go'." Jordan said, "I hated to lose him because he was really a great artist, but I did have to let him go. He went to New York and became well established there." Brown contributed a number of articles to the Sierra Club Bulletin in the early nineties, with drawings of the peaks that he made on the spot.

Ann Lage: Was Jordan active in the club?

Farquhar: Jordan was quite active on the board of directors in the very first few years of the club. Long before I was married, I brought my mother to the first annual Sierra Club dinner--it must have been 1920 or 1921--and she was seated at the head table right beside Dr. Jordan. I was a little way off. I saw them laughing to each other. I later asked what it was all about. She said, "Well, Dr. Jordan picked up a fork to eat his fish and a waiter came along and took the fork away from him and substituted another one and said, 'This is the fork for the fish.' And Dr. Jordan said, 'He

doesn't know that I am considered the greatest authority on fish in this part of the world'." [Laughter.]

Francis Tappaan

Ray Lage: Mr. Farquhar, you have mentioned Judge Clair Tappaan. Who was Francis Tappaan?

Farquhar: His son. He used to go on the outings. He was on the University of Southern California football team, an All-American end. Although he was on the board of directors once, he never really devoted himself to the Sierra Club as his father had done, but he always showed an interest in it.

Ernest and Glen Dawson

Ann Lage: Ernest and Glen Dawson.* Is that another father and son team?

Farquhar: Yes. Ernest Dawson came on the Sierra Club trips at an early time like I did. I remember him particularly about 1920. He was an active leader of side trips for mountains and crossing passes and was very popular with everybody on the outings. He was not a very big man, but he was adequate to cover the ground. He had a bookstore in Los Angeles, an antiquarian bookstore, which was famous. His sons, Glen and Muir, and his daughter, June, who married George Shoehat, were active in the bookshop.

---

*Interview with Glen Dawson conducted by Richard Searle, Sierra Club History Committee, September 23, 1972.

They were very widely known in the book field.

Ann Lage: Did they do any publishing?

Farquhar: Yes, later on. Not Ernest Dawson, but Glen and Muir published little books from time to time. I have most of them downstairs.

Ann Lage: Phil Bernays was from southern California, too.

Farquhar: Yes. He was another southern Californian who became a member of the board of directors and afterwards president of the club. He had an art store in Los Angeles. Actually, it was right next to Dawson's bookshop. So it was very easy, after leaving Dawson's bookshop, to go over and see Phil Bernays and his pictures.

Ann Lage: Was he active as a leader of the club?

Farquhar: In a sense, yes. He never was a mountain climber. But he was a wise director and president and was very well liked by the southern California people particularly.

Ann Lage: Did these men in general seem to have more interest in mountaineering or were they interested more in conservation?

Farquhar: In those days the word conservation was scarcely known. But the actual work of conservation was a principal theme of the club. The club was active in founding Yosemite National Park, as well as Sequoia National Park, and then all the national parks generally. But it did not stand out as the principal object of the club at that time.

Mountaineering was developed largely through the outings. One year before I joined the club, I think it was 1905, the club made an outing on Mount Rainier, and about fifty or more members of the club climbed the summit of Mount Rainier. Interestingly enough, though, among them was a young man, Stephen Mather, who climbed to the summit of Mount Rainier. Steve Mather was afterwards director of the National Park Service and a very famous man in mountaineering circles.

Joel and Alex Hildebrand

Ann Lage: I notice here another father and son team, Joel and Alex Hildebrand.*

Farquhar: Joel Hildebrand, professor of chemistry and head of the chemistry department at Berkeley, was particularly interested in skiing and did a great deal to develop skiing in the Sierra, with his sons, too. He was originally an easterner, but settled out here and was very active in winter sports. At one time I had talked with him over at the Faculty Club and persuaded him to join the Sierra Club, which he did and very soon became its president. His son, Alex Hildebrand, later became president. His other son, Milton, never participated much in the Sierra Club. He is a professor at the University of California, Davis. Louise Hildebrand, his daughter, went on outings, in fact, went through the Tuolumne Canyon with Marge and me in 1934.

Harold Crowe

Ann Lage: You mentioned Harold Crowe.**

Farquhar: Among those from southern California who became active in the club was Dr. Harold Crowe, a doctor of medicine. He went on many Sierra Club outings, and at the campfires he was always entertaining. Among other things that I remember, he would say, "I don't think Margie would like this."

---

*Interview with Joel Hildebrand conducted by Ann and Ray Lage, Sierra Club History Committee, April 29 and May 13, 1973.

**Interview with Harold Crowe conducted by Richard Searle, Sierra Club History Committee, February 17, 1973.

And he brought in a lot of things about Margie, who was an entirely fictitious character, a creation of his imagination. But she served to enlighten a lot of things; anything that needed a lot of explaining, he would say, "Margie will tell you all about it." [Laughter.] He is still interested in the club, although not an officer. He became president one year.

Lewis and Nathan Clark

Farquhar: Let's see, have I left out anybody? Oh, yes, the Clark brothers. Lewis and Nathan Clark, who were active in the Sierra Club outings for years. They both became president. Nathan lived in southern California, and Lewis here in the Bay Area.

Ann Lage: Isn't Lewis Clark still active?

Farquhar: Yes. He has been on the board of directors for many years.

Ann Lage: I think maybe we have left out Bestor Robinson.*

Bestor Robinson

Farquhar: Bestor Robinson was not so much active in the Sierra Club outings. But he was active in the Sierra. He was a big powerful man, a lawyer here

---

*Interview with Bestor Robinson conducted by Susan R. Schrepfer, Sierra Club History Committee, March 8, 1972.

in Oakland. He ultimately was elected to the board of directors and became president. He married Florence Breed. They were both very active in the club and still are.

Ann Lage: I think we have covered the people that we had in mind.

Farquhar: Yes. Well, of course, there were a great many others who took an active part in the club from time to time, such as Dick Leonard. But those were the outstanding leaders throughout the period that I have knowledge of.

EDITORSHIP OF SIERRA CLUB BULLETIN

Typography and Format

Ann Lage: Perhaps we could turn now to one of your main contributions to the Sierra Club, the editorship of the Sierra Club Bulletin.

Francis Farquhar: Well, I had always been interested in editing. In college I was three years on the Harvard Crimson, and I learned there the importance of spelling people's names correctly. It is no fun to see your name misspelled in the paper the next morning. So I was accurate in those things.

Quite early in my career with the Sierra Club, Badè invited me to join the staff of the Bulletin. After he retired from the full editorship, Jim Hutchinson took it over for a year and then Nelson Hackett.* I was doing a lot of work, and Nelson was quite active then as trust officer of the Bank of California, so I more and more took over the work of the Bulletin.

I was interested not only in the contents, but in the physical makeup of the Bulletin. From the very beginning, the Sierra Club Bulletin was distinguished for its typographical excellence. It started out with C.A. Murdock, who was really one of the founders of Good Printing in San Francisco. For many years Murdock did the printing. Then when he retired, an Englishman named Blair bought out Murdock. For a year it was the Blair-Murdock Company.

That is just about when I came in. I was not very well satisfied with the way it was going, and I was a very close friend of Henry Taylor who, with his brother, Edward Taylor, were Taylor and Taylor Printers. They were really disciples of Murdock, and it was natural to go to them. For

---

*Interview with C. Nelson Hackett conducted by Mrs. Warren Harding, Sierra Club History Committee, March 8 and 13, 1972.

the rest of my editorship on the Bulletin, the printing was done by Taylor and Taylor in their shop on Mission Street. The Taylors were very meticulous about good printing, and the Bulletin for many years was an outstanding example of good printing, perhaps the best in mountaineering circles.

Ann Lage: And in other circles, I would say.

Farquhar: Yes, it was famous. I think the first number when I was in full charge was in 1926. I had been interested in typography because of my early association with printing, and my younger brother, Sam, who founded the University [of California] Press later on, interested me in the fine art of typography. So I paid particular attention to that. I have forgotten just how I was asked to take over. I had worked with Badè for several years, and Nelson Hackett decided not to continue.

Ray Lage: Did you revise the format of the Bulletin?

Farquhar: No, I kept it up very close to the Murdock style. In fact, I was very much disappointed at the end of my career when that format was abandoned, but perhaps it was necessary because of the large increase in the membership of the club. When Dave Brower took it over, he more or less abandoned that format.

Subject Matter

Ann Lage: Could you say what purpose the Bulletin served for the club during your editorship? Was it seen as a means of education or what?

Farquhar: Well, we always had an article on the preceding summer's outing, which was very popular with the members of the club, most of whom had been on

the outings, not necessarily that one, but it was a familiar subject. Then I tried to bring in articles of general interest to the members of the club.

I was able to get some very good contributions by prominent people. For instance, Willis L. Jepson, the great botanist from the University of California, wrote several articles. I got Stuart Edward White to write an article one time. Tracy Storer wrote an article on the grizzly bear. I tried to cover a wide variety of interests. Francois Matthes, the great geologist, contributed a number of articles.

Althought not written specially for the Bulletin, we printed David Starr Jordan's "Ascent on the Matterhorn," which he had made in his early youth and was published in a little volume called Science Sketches. When I went to get a copy of Science Sketches at the Stanford Library, the librarian brought me a copy, but it did not have "The Matterhorn" in it. I looked it up, and I found that there were two editions. "The Matterhorn" was in the first edition and had been left out of the second edition. I inquired for the first edition. The librarian looked it up and found that they used to have it, but they had sold it because they had thought it was a duplicate. I thought that was [laughter] not very complimentary to the librarianship of Stanford. They have had good librarians since.

Ann Lage: One of the distinctive features of the Bulletin, it seems, was the focus on the history of the Sierra.

Farquhar: Yes. I published a number of articles on the history, some of which I wrote myself. One of the great features of the Bulletin was its illustrations. We were fortunate in having great photographers in the club. The first was J.N. LeConte. Some of his photographs of the high mountains have never been surpassed. He was followed by Walter Huber, who was a fine photographer of the high mountain country. After that, in the later years, were Ansel Adams and Cedric Wright. So all together the photographs were excellent and were very well reproduced. The engravers took a very close personal interest in getting it done

right. I know that sometimes we tried several times to get a plate that was satisfactory. We always were striving for the very best in reproduction.

I also was active in getting biographies of people connected with the Sierra, like national park superintendents. We had Colonel Harry C. Benson, a superintendent in the early days, and Colonel Nathaniel Fish McClure, and later on, Walter Fry of Sequoia National Park, and Gabriel Souvelewski of Yosemite. Of course, later on there was Stephen Mather, who died in 1928. Altogether the volumes of the Sierra Club Bulletin, for some twenty or twenty-five years, are an immense compendium of factual information about the Sierra as well as good literary choices.

Other Mountaineering Journals

Ray Lage: Were there other mountaineering journals that were being published at the time?

Farquhar: Not many. Well, the Mountaineers of Seattle had a magazine called the Mountaineer, which had many interesting things in it but was not noted for its typography. The same way with the Mazama of Portland, which was perhaps a little better in typography and makeup. Appalachia in the East was also a very fine publication that was equal to the Sierra Club Bulletin in many ways. The American Alpine Journal came along in about 1901, and that had very fine articles on mountains in the Arctic.

Ann Lage: You were editor of that, were you not?

Farquhar: I was later on for three or four years in the 1950s. Of course, the great mountaineering journal of all time was the Alpine Journal, published in London. But I don't think that it ever came up to

the Sierra Club Bulletin in its physical appearance.

Ann Lage: Did the other journals have as wide a range of articles as the Bulletin?

Farquhar: No, I think not. Appalachia had quite wide interests, but Mountaineer and Mazama were pretty much local.

Ray Lage: Certainly it has been said that your wide acquaintance and ability to contract with very notable people for the Bulletin has figured in its popularity and quality.

Stuart Edward White

Farquhar: I think it did. I was very fortunate in knowing a lot of very fine people, like Stuart Edward White, whom I knew very well. Stuart White once called me--I knew him through the Bohemian Club largely--one day and wanted to know if I would be in my office the next morning. I said, "Well, I'll come down to see you, Stuart." He said, "This is my business. I will come up and see you." So I took the opportunity of bringing half a dozen volumes of his writings over to get his autograph in them. He was writing an article that was fiction but brought in a lot of western exploration, and he wanted to check it with me. I was able to confirm some of his statements.

Ann Lage: What role did your Editorial Committee have in helping to select articles and such?

Farquhar: Well, when I asked them for their help, they were ready to do so. But during my editorship, they left it pretty much up to me.

Ann Lage: It sounds like quite a time consuming task.

Farquhar: It was, it was. There is no doubt about it. But my friend Franklin Murphy, in giving my degree, said I shamelessly led a double life, as an accountant and in literary work, but at least somebody thought I was a good accountant. I had a pretty good practice, and I was eight years on the state board.

CHANGES IN SIERRA CLUB SINCE 1950

Chapter Expansion

Ann Lage: It seems, Mr. Farquhar, that the club has changed a great deal since the 1950s.

Francis Farquhar: Oh, it's changed entirely. The changes began when they organized chapters outside of California. The club was originally the Sierra Club of California. We had the Southern California Chapter and the San Francisco Bay Chapter. Then, some of our active members moved to Seattle, and they wanted to have a chapter up there. I was not in favor of it. I thought that the Mountaineers could get along very well up there, and they didn't need a chapter of the Sierra Club, but I was overruled on that.

From there on, they had the Atlantic Chapter, then the Great Lakes Chapter, and so on. Now, of course, it's gone way beyond anything that we had ever thought of in the 1920s. Personally, I am not happy about it. I think that the Sierra Club would have been better if we had just concentrated on California and let other people expand their own chapters and own organizations, like the Wilderness Society, elsewhere, but that is a thing of the past now. We have grown up to the one hundred thousand mark, which changes the character of the club entirely, and ninety percent of the club don't know anything about each other. At one time back in the 1920s and 1930s, we all knew each other very well, but that's a matter of a difference of opinion, and I don't want to dwell on it any more.

Among other things, it [the club's growth] made it impossible to keep up with the early format of the _Bulletin_. Dave Brower and others took it over, and they began to expand the bi-monthly, which had been just a little news sheet with a lot of color plates in it, and pretty soon the old bound volumes of the _Bulletin_ began to disappear. Do you want me to talk about Brower a little bit?

David R. Brower

Ray Lage: Tell us something, if you will, about your early association with Brower. He was assistant editor under you, wasn't he?

Farquhar: Yes, I was very fond of Dave and still am. He was a fine man in the mountains, and he wrote some articles while I was still editor. I was very glad to have him on the board and more and more depended on him for assistance. So when I left, I recommended that he take my place. He is a very competent and extremely able man and has a great vision of preserving the scenic beauties of this country and has been a leader in conservation and has done a lot of good, but he also got a little out of hand as far as the Sierra Club was concerned.

I was on the Publications Committee later on, and he used to bring things before us, asking for authority to go ahead with them. I remember on one occasion he produced an outline of a book that he wanted to publish in his Exhibit Format Series, and we felt that it was not appropriate and didn't approve it. "But," he said, "I've already spent $10,000 on it." Well, he was like that. He went ahead and spent thousands of dollars without any authority whatsoever. He opened a New York office without any authority whatsoever, and then he opened a London office and spent a lot of money. He practically bankrupted the club. And that turned me against him as far as any activities in the club were concerned.

He was executive director and did a lot of very good work. There was no doubt about his ability and enthusiasm and his vision, but he couldn't submit to authority and when you are spending thousands of dollars, you've got to have some authority to do it. He went ahead anyhow.

Ann Lage: Do you have any opinion on what Brower's motivation was?

Farquhar: Oh, it was the highest kind. I never thought

of Dave working for his own interests. He was always public spirited and has done a lot of good. I don't want to underrate him, but I just can't support a man who would spend thousands of dollars of the club's money without any authority. We used to have what was called a permanent fund; when we had bequests or any large sums of money, we put it into what we called the permanent fund. It was supposed to be permanent, but he depleted that on his books, and in another year or two, it would have bankrupted the club.

Ann Lage: Was the Publications Committee set up to be the final authority in choosing books?

Farquhar: Yes. Publications had to be submitted to the Publications Committee for authority to go ahead. One of the most outstanding examples was the Galapagos Island books. Dave went ahead and did a lot of work without getting authority. I felt, and others did, that he was more or less intruding into the field of the University of California on that, but he went ahead anyhow and had the plates made and committed himself to it. It was a great book, there is no doubt about that, but it was far too costly for the Sierra Club to produce.

Ann Lage: Were you on the Publications Committee at the time the charges were brought against Brower?

Farquhar: Yes. That is just what I've been talking about, but personally, I am very fond of Dave, and we are still good friends.

Loss of Tax Deductible Status

Ray Lage: How did the Internal Revenue's decision of 1966 come about?

Farquhar: Well, Dave was working to prevent the building

of dams in the Grand Canyon. Without any authority from the club, he took a full page ad in the New York Times, I think it was, trying to prevent the bill passing in Congress. The Internal Revenue got hold of that, and, of course, there was no answer to it. They were right.

Contributions to the club were exempt, were deductible, up to that time. But when the Internal Revenue got hold of these ads--there was one in the Washington Post as well as the New York Times--they said that that was influencing legislation. The law provides that contributions to public organizations are deductible unless the organization is engaged in legislative activities. The law is very precise on that point. There is no question in my mind but that the Internal Revenue Service was right in denying these contributions deductibility. But that deed was done before anybody on the board knew about it.

Ray Lage: He went ahead without permission from the board?

Farquhar: Yes.

Ann Lage: Was there a definite line of authority where he should have approved all of these ads before?

Farquhar: Oh surely, you don't go ahead and spend $10,000 on a project like that without any authority whatsoever, and moreover it was influencing legislation and depriving the club of its deductibility.

Ray Lage: Some of Brower's supporters have said that, while he overextended his authority, this was offset by the publicity and the growth of membership which is brought to the club. Do you think there is some validity in that?

Farquhar: Well, there is no doubt that it assisted in the growth of the club, which I think was one of the adverse factors. I'm sorry to see it. I thought the club was large enough without that. Size is not necessarily good.

Ann Lage: It's also been said, I think, that much of the opposition to Brower was really a reaction against these changes that he had brought about. Do you think that is the case?

Farquhar: What changes?

Ann Lage: The changes in the growth of the club and the expansion of its goals.

Farquhar: Oh yes, that would be my opinion.

Ann Lage: Do you think that created some of the opposition to Brower or did the opposition center on his financial irresponsibility?

Farquhar: I think it was all of it together. He was the paid director of the club. As such, he did a lot of good work, but he did a lot of things without any authority and developed policies within the club without consultation. You can't run an organization that way.

Ann Lage: Was there disagreement also on his manner of campaigning?

Farquhar: Oh, I don't think so.

Ann Lage: Someone said he wasn't willing to compromise perhaps as much as the former club leaders had.

Farquhar: Oh, I can't think of any instances of that. I think the other things were sufficient. He went ahead without authority, and changed the whole purpose and size and objects of the club without consultation, and was leading it into bankruptcy. I have been active in a lot of organizations, and I don't know of any other that ever permitted anyone to run away with things like that. I counted up once that I have been on the board of directors or trustees of nineteen organizations and president of six of them, so I have had some experience in organizations.

Ann Lage: Does it seem, now that Brower is no longer executive director, that the board of directors has more control?

Farquhar: Yes, I think they do. It is much improved.

The John Muir Award for Conservation

Ray Lage: Mr. Farquhar, as we are sitting here in your spacious living room, on the wall there is a beautiful black and white photograph by Ansel Adams of the east side of the Sierra Nevada.

Farquhar: The Mt. Whitney region from Lone Pine. This was given to me in connection with the John Muir Award.

Ann Lage: What did the John Muir Award recognize?

Farquhar: The John Muir Award for Conservation. It is given at one of the annual meetings of the club.

Ann Lage: And you received that in 1965?

Farquhar: Yes.

Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters

Ray Lage: I also have before me, Mr. Farquhar, what you mentioned a bit ago this morning, the presentation to you from the Regents of the University of California. They awarded you the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. May I read from this a little bit?

Farquhar: Yes indeed.

Ray Lage: Thank you.

Francis Peloubet Farquhar, born and educated in New England, he has shamelessly led a double life since coming to California. On the one hand he is a highly successful certified public accountant; on the other, he has won fame as a writer, historian and conservationist, through such books as Place Names of the High Sierra, published in 1926; Mt. Olympus; Yosemite and the Big Trees in the High Sierra; Books of the Colorado River and the Grand Canyon; Drake in California, A Review of the Evidence; and his definitive History of the Sierra Nevada, published in 1965. More than an armchair adventurer, he has climbed Mt. Olympus in Greece, as well as many peaks of his beloved High Sierra and has traveled several times around the world. For his valuable contributions to the art of illuminating Western history, and for his vigorous efforts to preserve California's natural heritage, we confer upon him an honorary membership in the University of California.

It must have given you quite a feeling.

Farquhar: It was quite a thrill. It originated in a way in the Bohemian Grove in the camp to which I belonged, Silverados Squatters. Franklin D. Murphy, who was then chancellor of the University of California at Los Angeles, was a member of the camp. He read the manuscript of my History of the Sierra Nevada, a number of chapters of it, and gave me some suggestions. He was familiar with the work, and some of the other things that I had done, and it was largely through him that that degree was voted by the regents.

Future of Sierra Club and Conservation

Ann Lage: To sum up our series, would you like to comment on what you see as the future of the Sierra Club or the future of conservation?

Farquhar: Well, I think the club is having a great effect on conservation, which has become a popular subject nowadays and is doing a lot of good work. With the large number of active people in the club, it should continue to have profound effect throughout the country. But the old Sierra Club, with which I started, is gone; that is a thing of the past. While I don't want to express any opinion on whether one phase is better than another--they are both good--it is the old club that stimulated me to so many things that I am missing now. But there is a new phase that is engaging the attention of a lot of very fine people, and I heartily approve of that.

There is one other subject I haven't mentioned in connection with the club. In the summer of 1931 there was a red-haired girl who joined one of my parties, climbing Seven Gables, I believe it was. Thereafter we became very well acquainted, and in 1934 on a Sierra Club outing we were together a great deal. In fact, we went through the Muir Gorge of the Tuolumne Canyon together. The following December we were married.

Family Ties to the Sierra Club

Ann Lage: So you have received many benefits from the club [laughter].

Farquhar: Yes, that was one of the great ones. She

has also been very active in the club. She was on the board of directors for a year or two. She has had a lot of influence in the club and still does.

My children, as they arrived, became life members of the Sierra Club the day they were born. I remember when my first child, Peter, was born out at Children's Hospital in San Francisco. When it came time for me to leave, I went down to the Mills Building and called on Colby and enrolled Peter as a life member right then and there [laughter]. He has justified that. He is now a member of the American Alpine Club; he has climbed in Nepal, where he was in the Peace Corps for two years. He is teaching at Cabrillo Junior College in Aptos. Altogether, he is a real Sierra Club member.

My daughter, Suzanne, went on a number of Sierra Club trips and then a few years ago went with the Iowa Mountaineers on a trip in East Africa and climbed Mount Kilamanjaro. She has the family altitude record--19,000 feet. She was married last summer to a very fine man, James Ellmore. They live in Aptos.

My youngest boy, Roger, got his master's degree from Stanford, in geophysics, and is about to try for another master's degree in mathematics, which is his real love. He has been in the Sierra and is interested in the mountains but has not participated as much as the others.

Ray Lage: Well, Mr. Farquhar, we cannot begin to thank you for this opportunity to record your reminiscenses and recollections about the Sierra Club for posterity. I think your eloquent contributions speak for themselves. On behalf of the club and ourselves, we thank you.

Farquhar: I am very happy to do what I can.

INDEX

Adams, Ansel, 67, 76

Agnew, Jesse, 45

Albright, Horace, 24, 29, 37, 40, 42-3, 44, 48

Allen, Bert, 53

Alpine Journal, 68

American Alpine Club, 79

American Alpine Journal, 68

American Civic Association, 28

Appalachia, 68-9

Appalachian Mountain Club, 16, 28

Badè, William F., 54-5, 58, 65, 66

Balkan War, 9, 11

Bancroft Whitney Company, 1

Barbour, Harry, 26, 50

Barbour bill, 26-9

Benson, Harry C., 68

Bernays, Phil, 61

Big Trees, 5, 6-7, 23, 49

Blair-Murdock Company, 65

Bohemian Club, 69, 77

Bohn, Dave, 20

Books of the Colorado River and the Grand Canyon, 77

Boston Transcript, 24, 28

Breed, Florence, 64

Brower, David R., 66, 71-5

Brown, Bolton Coit, 59

Buffalo Society of Natural History, 28

Butler, Vincent, 21

California, 3, 12, 32, 38, 39, 44, 71, 77

California State Parks Commission, 32-3, 44

Cammerer, Arno, 43

Camp Fire Club of America, 24

Canada, 16, 17

Chamberlain, Allen, 24

Chandler, Harry, 25, 27, 38, 50

Child, Harry W., 42-3

Clark, Lewis, 63

Clark, Nathan, 63

climbing, see Farquhar, Francis; mountaineering; names of individual peaks; Sierra Club, Outings

Clyde, Norman, 20, 21

Colby, Rachel Vrooman, 52, 79

Colby, William, 1, 13, 14, 18, 21, 32, 34, 44, 45, 52-5, 57

conservation, 3, 13, 23-34, 36-51, 61, 76

see also national parks; national forests; Save-the-Redwoods League; Sierra Club

Coolidge, Calvin, 48

Cornell University, 54, 55

Cramton, Louis C., 50

Crocker First National Bank, 55

Crowe, Harold, 62

Dawson, Ernest, 34, 60-1

Dawson, Glen, 17, 19, 60-1

Diablo, Mount, 1, 53

Drake in California, A Review of the Evidence, 77

Drury, Aubrey, 31, 43

Drury, Newton, 31, 43-4

Echo Park, 18

Eichorn, Jules, 19, 21

Elliot, Tom, 5, 6, 7

Ellmore, James, 17, 79

Elston, John Arthur, 40-1

Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of, 34

Fall, Albert, 38-9

Farquhar, Francis P.

education & boyhood, 1, 3
joins Sierra Club, 2-3, 52-3
European travels, 5, 7-12
mountaineering, 1-3, 5, 7-9, 12, 16, 20, 28, 39, 56, 57, 78-9
Hetch Hetchy, 15
U.S. Navy, 24, 40
with Park Service, 24, 39-43
accountancy, 41-3, 56, 70, 77
conservationist, 26-34, 37-41, 44-7, 50-1, 61, 76
editor, 65-72, 77
changes in Sierra Club, 23, 71-8
author, 77
family, 17-9, 66, 78-9
honors, 76-7

Farquhar, Marjory Bridge, 17, 19, 78

Farquhar, Peter, 17, 18, 79

Farquhar, Roger, 18, 79

Farquhar, Samuel Thaxter, 66

Farquhar, Suzanne, 17, 79

Federal Power Commission, U.S., 30

Forest Service, U.S., 23, 26, 27, 33, 34, 36-7, 54

Fry, Walter, 68

Galapagos Islands, 73

Geogical Survey, U.S., 55

Giant Forest, 6, 23, 50

see also Big Trees

Glacier National Park, 45

Glacier Park Company, 43

Good Printing, 65

Grand Canyon National Monument, 45-6

grazing, 25, 37, 47

Greece, 5, 7-9, 77

Greeley, William, 29, 37

Hackett, C. Nelson, 5, 65, 66

Hall, Ansel, 18, 19

Hamlin, Chauncey, 28

Harding, Warren G., 38, 48

Harriman, Averell, 24

Harvard *Crimson*, 65

Harvard University, 1, 5

Harwood, Aurelia, 35

Haskell, Mary, 6, 7

Hayes, Howard, 48

Hearst, William Randolph, 49

Hetch Hetchy Valley, 3, 12, 15

High Trips, *see* Sierra Club Outings

Higher Cathedral Spire, 17

Hildebrand, Alex, 62

Hildebrand, Joel, 32, 34, 62

History of the Sierra Nevada, 77

Hoover, Herbert, 48-50

Huber, Walter, 14, 18, 34, 54, 67

Hume Lumber Company, 25

Hutchinson, Jim, 65

Ickes, Harold, 47

Interior, U.S. Department of, 38-40, 43, 46

Internal Revenue Service, U.S., 43, 73-4

Iowa Mountaineers, 79

Jepson, Willis L., 67

John Muir Award for Conservation, 76

John Muir Trail, 16, 21-2, 25

Jordan, David Starr, 59-60, 67

Kern River & basin, 5, 26-7, 39

Kilamanjaro, Mount, 79

King, Clarence, 5-6

Kings River, Middle Fork, 53

Kings River, South Fork, 27, 30

Kings River Canyon, 6, 23, 25-8, 31-2, 45

Kings River National Park, 27-8

Lane, Franklin K., 40

LeConte, Joseph, 55

LeConte, Joseph N., 14, 52, 55, 56, 67

Leonard, Richard, iv, 64

Life and Letters of John Muir, 54

Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light, 27, 30

<u>Los Angeles Times</u>, 25, 27, 38

lumber industry, 36

Lyell, Mount, 2, 5, 12

Lyman, Jack, 1

Madden, Martin, 50-1

mapping, topographic, 55

Mather, Stephen, 16, 24, 27, 31, 37-45, 48, 50, 61, 68

Matthes, Francois, 67

<u>Mazama</u>, 68-9

Mazama Club, 58

McClure, Nathaniel Fish, 68

McDuffie, Duncan, 14, 32, 34, 54-5

McFarland, J. Horace, 28

Middle Palisade, 18-9

Milestone Mountain, 57

Mineral King, 29-30

mining, 36-7, 44, 52

Moffitt, James K., 56

<u>Mount Olympus</u>, 77

<u>Mountaineer</u>, 68-9

mountaineering,

early rope use, 16-9

in Canada, 16-7

in Europe, 7-12

skiing, 62

<u>see also</u> Sierra Club, Outings; Farquhar, Francis, mountaineering

<u>Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada</u>, 5

Mountaineers, 71

Muir, John, 4, 13, 21, 52, 53, 55, 60-1

Muir Gorge, 12, 78

Murdock, C.A., 33, 65

Murphy, Franklin, 70, 77

National Conference On State Parks, 46-7

national forests, 23

National Park Service, U.S., 16, 18, 23, 24, 37-45, 61

national parks, 19, 23-5, 27, 29, 40, 44-6, 61, 68

National Parks Association, 26

New Hampshire, 3, 36

New Mexico, 39

<u>New York Sun</u>, 39

<u>New York Times</u>, 74

North Palisade, 18-9, 20, 55, 56

Olmsted, Frederick Law, 32

Olympus, Mount, 5, 7-9, 77

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 38

Parnassus, Mount, 5, 7

Parsons, Edward, 58

Parsons, Marian Randall, 58

Payne, John Barton, 46-7

Phoutrides, Aristides, 5, 7-10

Pinchot, Gifford, 36

Place Names of the High Sierra, 77

Price, Robert, 35, 57

Rainier, Mount, 17, 41, 61

Reddington, Paul, 29

redwoods, 31, 43

Rennie, James, 2-3, 12

Robinson, Bestor, 19, 63-4

Roosevelt, Franklin D., 47

Roosevelt, Kermit, 24

Roosevelt, Ted, 24

Roosevelt, Theodore, 25

Roosevelt Sequoia National Park, 26-7

rope technique in climbing, 16-9

Rowell, Chester R., 25

San Francisco Chronicle, 25

Save-the-Redwoods League, 31, 43-4

Saylor, Henry, 24

Science Sketches, 67

Sequoia National Park, 18, 23-5, 48, 61, 50-1, 68

Sequoia sempervirens, 31, 43

Sequoiadendron gigantea, *see* Big Trees

Shasta, Mount, 17

Show, Stewart, 23, 29

Sierra Club,

- changes in, 23, 71-8
- chapters, 71
- character of membership, 4-5, 12, 15
- conservation efforts, 3, 13, 23, 26-34, 37-8, 41, 44, 50-1, 61, 76
- History Committee, vi, 5, 17, 60, 62, 63, 65
- leaders, 52-64
- Outings, 1-3, 5, 6, 11-4, 16-7, 20-2, 39, 41, 44, 56, 57, 60-3, 78-9
- skiing, 62
- Soda Springs, 45
- southern California, 57, 60-3, 71
- tax status, 73-7

Sierra Club Bulletin, 21, 25, 33, 39, 54, 58, 59, 65-70, 71, 72

Sierra Nevada, 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 27-9, 47, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 67, 68, 77

skiing, 62

Smith, Addison, 26, 33

Smith, Borax, 39

Soda Springs, 45

Southern California Edison, 26, 30

Souvelewski, Gabriel, 68

Stanford University, 14, 59, 67

Starr, Pete, 20-1, 34

Starr, Walter, 20, 32

Storer, Tracy, 67

Tapaan, Clair, 14, 34, 53-4, 55, 60

Tappaan, Francis, 60

Taylor and Taylor, 33, 65-6

Tenaya Lake, 45

Thompson, William Boise, 25

Thorkilsen Mather Company, 39

Tioga Road, 17, 25, 44-5

Tower Peak, 12-3

Tuolumne Meadows, 2, 12, 16, 21, 25, 44

Tuolumne River Canyon, 12, 62, 78

Turkey, 7, 9, 10

Tyndall, Mount, 5

Underhill, Robert, 16

Unicorn Peak, 2, 16-7

United States Army Corps of Engineers, 34

United States Congress, 26, 27, 29, 34, 46, 50, 74

United States Department of the Interior, 38-40, 43, 46

United States Federal Power Commission, 30

United States Forest Service, 23, 26, 27, 33, 34, 36-7, 54

United States Geological Survey, 55

United States Internal Revenue Service, 43, 73-4

United States National Park Service, 16, 18, 23, 24, 37-45, 61

University of California, 14, 20, 39, 43, 52, 55, 56, 62, 66, 67, 73, 76-7

University of Southern California, 54, 60

Vrooman, Beatrice, 1, 52

Washington, Mount, 28

Washington Post, 74

Wheeler, Benjamin Ide, 43

White, Stewart Edward, 36, 67, 69

Whitney, J.D., 1

Whitney, Jim, 1

Whitney, Mount, 5, 19, 22, 26, 76

Wilbur, Ray Lyman, 48, 49

Wilderness Society, 71

World War I, 11, 37, 40

Wright, Cedric, 67

Yard, Robert Sterling, 26

Yellowstone National Park, 33, 41-3

<u>Yosemite and the Big Trees in the High Sierra</u>, 77

Yosemite National Park, 2-4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 45, 48, 51, 56, 61, 68

Young, Governor C.C., 32

Joel Hildebrand

SIERRA CLUB LEADER AND SKI MOUNTAINEER

An Interview Conducted by
Ann and Ray Lage

Sierra Club
History Committee
San Francisco, California

1974

Sierra Club

San Francisco, California

Copyright c 1974 by Sierra Club

All rights reserved

PREFACE

Doctor Joel Henry Hildebrand was already at the height of a brilliant career when he was elected to the board of directors of the Sierra Club. Dean of the College of Chemistry at the University of California, Berkeley, he had been awarded three doctorates and nearly a dozen other high honors in chemistry.

He was an instant success in the Sierra Club. Elected to the board in 1935, he became vice-president a year later and president after only two years. Such quick recognition of ability was not equalled until thirty-two years later in the election of Phil Berry as president after only one year on the board.

Joel served ten years on the Sierra Club board vigorously supporting the revival of skiing in California. This served perfectly as a winter form of the club's original purposes "to explore, enjoy, and render accessible the mountain regions of the pacific coast." Joel was so expert in this field that, at age 55, he served as the manager of the 1936 United States Olympic Ski Team. Joel continued skiing into his eighties, expertly demonstrating that his healthful, enjoyable outdoor sport is not for the young alone. At ninety-two his vigorous intellectual and mountain life has provided him with a keen mind and rich memory to enjoy life with Emily, his delightful wife of sixty-five years together.

Richard M. Leonard
May 4, 1974

INTRODUCTION

Professor Joel Hildebrand's active Sierra Club career spans over thirty years. He and his family joined the club in the early 1930s, and he resigned as honorary vice-president in 1965, after an effort to curtail the activities of the club's executive director.

Professor Hildebrand was club president from 1937 to 1940, during the successful campaign for Kings Canyon National Park. He helped the National Park Service draft the bill creating the park, insuring the Sierra Club's insistence on a wilderness park would be written into law.

In 1938 he initiated the club's burro trips, a radical departure from the existing club outing program. These burro trips were the original model for most club outings today. Professor Hildebrand contributed to the club as a leader of ski mountaineering, who did much to advance the sport in California by improving ski techniques, devising ski tests, and stimulating competition.

At ninety-one, Professor Hildebrand has the vigor and confidence of an active man half his age. Although officially retired from the University of California, he continues his productive research in chemistry at the university six hours a day, as well as taking sole responsibility for the care of his spacious garden.

This interview was made on April 29, 1973, and May 13, 1973, in the Hildebrand home in Kensington, California.

Ann and Ray Lage
Sierra Club History Committee
April, 1974

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION iv

EARLY EXPERIENCES WITH MOUNTAINEERING AND THE SIERRA CLUB 1

Wilderness Trips East and West 2
Initiating Club Burro Trips 3
Sierra Club Outings in the 1930s 5

SKI MOUNTAINEERING 8

Early Involvement 8
Ski Instruction in Europe 9
Developing Ski Technique and Tests 11
The 1936 Winter Olympics 13

SIERRA CLUB LEADERS AND ALLIES IN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 16

The High Caliber of Club Leaders 16
Relationship with Harold Ickes 17

THE SIERRA CLUB'S APPROACH TO CONSERVATION IN THE 1930s 22

Formation of Kings Canyon National Park 22
Assessment of the Forest Service 25

CHANGES IN THE SIERRA CLUB AFTER WORLD WAR II 27

A New Concept of the Board of Directors 27
Conflict within the Club 29
From Cooperation to Confrontation 30

INDEX 35

EARLY EXPERIENCES WITH MOUNTAINEERING AND THE SIERRA CLUB

Wilderness Trips East and West

Ann Lage: Shall we begin today, Mr. Hildebrand, by your telling us some of your early experiences with mountaineering?

Joel Hildebrand: Yes, I was born in Camden, New Jersey, in 1881. I attended the University of Pennsylvania as an undergraduate and also got my Ph.D. in chemistry there. I went abroad for a year, and then served as an instructor there for six years. In the meantime, I had gone up to New England for summer vacations; I hiked in the Adirondacks and in the Green Mountains. There was a colony of relatives on Lake Champlain. My uncle had a sailboat which I sailed.

During two summers I was a counselor in a summer camp for boys on Casco Bay near Portland. They had a seven ton fishing sloop and a local fisherman to sail it, but they found I could sail it, so I was master of the sloop the rest of the summer. You see, I was introduced early to the outdoor life. I took two canoe trips down the Connecticut River and two down the Delaware River. The second was with my young bride. It was our honeymoon. I took her the following summer into Algonquin National Park in Canada for a canoe trip.

Ann Lage: Was this all new to her, or had she come from an outdoor family?

Hildebrand: No, she was a very citified girl. Her mother could not understand--it was all friendly enough--why she would want to sleep on the ground, not comb her hair so much, have dirty fingernails, and so on. But she proved to be an excellent camper, and so we continued out-of-door treks as we came West. As a substitute for a canoe we turned to burros. Our first burro trip occurred when our daughter was four and a half and our eldest son was not quite three. We bought burros through a friend in Sonora, and we traveled from Sonora to Yosemite over the old Big Oak Flat Road. It was then a dirt road with not much travel. We went up over El Capitan and down the Yosemite Falls Trail.

Ann Lage: Were you traveling by burro all the way from Sonora?

Hildebrand: Yes, three burros with kayaks on each side, a child on two. The third burro carried two kayaks, the tent, and bedding.

Ann Lage: Do you recall how long that trip took?

Hildebrand: It took perhaps six days. We repeated the experience the following summer starting from Bass Lake. My children were all brought up to be outdoorsmen and eventually became expert in mountaineering and camping. Each learned to throw a diamond hitch on a burro and became an excellent camp cook. This eventuated in the book, Camp Catering.

Camp Catering began with a request by the editor of the Sierra Club Bulletin to write up the grub list I had worked up for our pack trips. It was expressed in fractions of a pound per man-day in each of the categories--proteins, starches, fats, and oils, sugar, fruits, etc. After it was published, certain persons came and asked me, "What do you do with this?" My daughter, Louise (now Mrs. Fred Klein) a born cook, said, "Perhaps I had better write the cookbook to go with the list." So Camp Catering was born, with jolly illustrations by Milton. It is the only literary treatise on cooking since Charles Lamb wrote on roast pig [laughter.]

We have had lots of fun, you see. The children learned that in order to enjoy life you must put up with the inconveniences. If you want to catch trout, you must put up perhaps with mosquitos. If you want to have comforts in camp, you must carry them with you on your back during the day, etc. You take pride in meeting emergencies and overcoming difficulties.

I wrote this philosophy into the introductory chapter of Going Light with Backpack or Burro. Son Milton and I wrote together the chapter on trail travel. He wrote the chapter on burro management, a psychological threatise on the burro, and also one on burro packing. Son Alex wrote on food, drawn from his experience with the family. Louise wrote on women and children's problems. So we've had a good deal of influence. I early came to the conclusion that you do more for people by introducing them to the joys of the wilderness and their attendant moral lessons than you do by trying to convert them to your particular religion.

Ray Lage: Were those early burro trips your first introduction into the Sierra Nevada?

Hildebrand: Yes, it was about the third summer after we came to California, in 1913. Son Alex was born the following October, and before he was three years old we took our first trip.

Ray Lage: Were you a member of the Sierra Club then?

Hildebrand: Not at that time. We did not join the Sierra Club for some years; we felt self-sufficient. As the children grew older, we would add their friends' to the party. I have gone across the Sierra like Father Abraham, followed by a long train of retainers and Hannibals. So we have introduced a number of people to the mountains. A number of years later I thought it would be a good thing for the children to have the experience of the Sierra Club and the wider acquaintance. I also became aware of the services of the club to conservation, and I became a member.

Initiating Club Burro Trips

Ann Lage: I understand that when you were president of the club you initiated the burro trips.

Hildebrand: Yes, you see the ordinary Sierra Club trip was a large party, with animals packers and commissary supplied. But I believed that people ought to be equipped to go beyond that. It was all very well to go alone when you are young, but after getting married and the babies come along, people are likely to drop hiking and never take it up again. If they learned how to handle burros, they can learn how to go on their own, taking it easy but having the joys of camping and the pleasures of family life in that way.

Son Milton was nineteen when he led the first party of twenty, with a dozen burros, two people handling a burro. Their average age was much greater than his, but he was the boss all right because he knew his job and is also very skillful in dealing with people. An amusing incident occurred--one of the young women on the trip, an employee of the university library, turned up after her trip with a diamond ring. People asked her where she got that. "Oh," she said, "I went on Milton Hildebrand's burro trip and learned to throw the one-man diamond hitch!"

I never became a rock climber because with young children along you do not want to go off and climb mountains. I have been over most of the passes in the Sierra and taken pictures of the mountains, but I am not a rock climber. In one of our early trips with the Sierra Club, the children wanted to learn rock climbing. Mrs. Hildebrand and I discussed whether or not we ought to allow them to take up such a dangerous sport. But I do not think one should prohibit an activity because you do not understand it, so I took some practice instructions, roped down a fifty foot vertical cliff, and we decided to let the children do it. The result is that they are very skillful mountaineers.

Son Roger, now a professor of physics at the University of Chicago, was attending a scientific conference in Italy. He and another physicist climbed the Matterhorn without a guide. We scolded him for doing that. They had a guidebook in German. He did it successfully, although the other fellow, who was a good mountaineer, did not have the stamina of my son. My son had to practically bring him down the mountain.

Ann Lage: Weren't the burro trips the first departure from the large outing format and the first one where people participated?

Hildebrand: Yes.

Ann Lage: So that was quite a new departure.

Hildebrand: Oh, yes. It introduced families to outings and made them independent, you see. It was much cheaper to go on that sort of a trip than to have to pay packers and cooks.

Ann Lage: And it also seems sort of the father of all the typical outings today.

Hildebrand: Yes, I'll claim the credit for that [laughter.]

Sierra Club Outings in the 1930s

Ann Lage: You went on a lot of summer outings with the club?

Hildebrand: I did not go on very many. While I was on the board of directors and president of the club, I went on a number, but I do not suppose I have been on more than six or eight.

Ann Lage: Were these mainly during the 1930s?

Hildebrand: Yes.

Ann Lage: Would you recall any particular anecdotes or experiences that would give us the flavor of some of these outings?

Hildebrand: Let me think.

Ray Lage: While you are thinking, you had related to us on a previous visit with you about the grandfather's swimming race.

Hildebrand: Oh, yes. On one of these trips we were camped on Bench Lake in sight of Split Mountain, which is one of the 14,000 foot peaks that we climbed from that camp. They liked it so well that they decided to stay there three days. The committee in charge, responsible for the happiness of the people, thought up various kinds of things to do, and one was a water carnival. It included various kinds of swimming, with various ages of people and mattress paddling and so on.

I suggested that we have a grandfather's swimming race. They thought it was a fine idea, so it was scheduled. But before the race, I went out and swam on the course. Several of the other grandfathers saw me, and when the race was called none of them appeared against me. I got the prize without getting out of breath laughter. At thirty, you see, I could not have done that, so my recipe for success is to find something that you can do better than anyone else in your age class and win the prize that way laughter.

Ann Lage: Was there much emphasis on the teaching of conservation by way of the outings?

Hildebrand: Oh, yes. Every evening there would be a fireside talk and music. Somebody would have a guitar along and there would be singing. The directors

or officers present would talk about Sierra Club policies, work, and problems. The trip would furnish object lessons for us, so it was an educational experience for the members.

Ann Lage: Did you find that many members joined mainly for recreation and later were involved in conservation?

Hildebrand: Yes, of course. There were many young people who thought this would be a fine thing; that was one of the objectives, to catch people's attention to the mountains and to have them enjoy the mountains, and to enjoy them skillfully, in a non-destructive way. So the Sierra Club fulfilled its objectives. In fact, the trips were undertaken originally by Will Colby and others to acquaint people with the mountains and show them that there is something to conserve, and to love and enjoy.

There were many people who joined without participating, older people, although there were certain people pretty well along in years who were tough enough to stand it. There was a delightful lady of seventy, I remember, who was on one of the trips, and she would saunter along the trails quite comfortably. She did not climb any nearby mountains, but she was a lovely person. She once told us in Berkeley that she had called up a friend and asked her if who would not like to go for a walk. The friend said, "What do you want to walk for; haven't you got an automobile?" [Laughter.]

Ann Lage: Now these outings that you recall took place during the 1930s. I wonder if the depression had any effect on the outings?

Hildebrand: Oh, probably, but it was one of the cheapest vacations that one could get, and many, such as schoolteachers, did not lose their jobs. The cost of packers and cooks and management was far less than the cost of going to a summer resort. We used to figure in our own family trips that we could feed each other on much less than a dollar a day. We paid, I think, seven dollars a day for the burros. If you go out for ten days that is not much.

Ann Lage: Were most of the people on the outings employed?

Hildebrand: Yes. There was a great variety of people. It was a sort of melting pot. There were many teachers. There would be a certain number of men of affairs, and lawyers. There were plumbers and

seamstresses. You discover that a man may have what is considered a lowly job and yet be capable of responding to the beauty of the mountains. So it was a mixing process; friendships were formed, and couples were formed. The "one-man diamond hitch" was not the only instance!

Ray Lage: I guess you have read recently that the Sierra Club Foundation has decided to turn over the campground at Tuolumne Meadows to the Park Service.

Hildebrand: That is, I think, the right thing to do. We owned the key spot in Zumwalt Meadows in the southern Sierra in Kings Canyon. We held on to that until we were sure it would not be gobbled up and become the site of another Ahwahnee Hotel. We gave Zumwalt Meadows to the Park Service with the understanding that it would be administered according to our principles. I think it is very logical to do the same thing with Parson's Lodge.

SKI MOUNTAINEERING

Early Involvement

Ann Lage: You took quite an interest in ski mountaineering. Can you tell us how you got involved in that?

Joel Hildebrand: There was a group of men in Berkeley--about half of them were faculty members --who used to meet Sunday mornings to take walks together. I did not walk with them because I had my family, but I knew them all very well. They decided one winter to go up into the mountains for snowshoeing. At that time there was a hotel at Cisco on the railroad, about fifteen miles west of Donner Summit. It was the site used by the Auburn Ski Club for building a jump. I skied there and set slalom courses there later on. Well, we ended up there and had a good time. The next winter we went to Hobart Mills, where there was a hotel for lumbermen--that was east of the Sierra and north of Truckee. It was not cold enough there; it was slushy and rainy. So we held a meeting and decided to build our own lodge up at Donner Summit.

In the summers of 1925 and 1926, this group formed the Sierra Ski Club, and we built what is now the Hutchinson Lodge. Lincoln Hutchinson had been a member of the faculty at the University of California and was an economist. He had had a good deal of experience. He had been a financial adviser to the young Czechoslovak government, and he had been a United States consular representative in South America. He and his brother, Jim, took the responsibility of getting the project launched, so we built this very fine lodge. It was designed by Walter Ratcliff, an architect, recently deceased.

We had a lot of fun. We would go up to this lodge between Christmas and New Years. Some of the members would walk around on snowshoes; others would try to go on skis. Well, it was just what I wanted, because I loved the mountains in the summer and to be able to go up in winter was also fun. You could not buy decent skis then. Spiro's in San Francisco sold skis, but they were likely

to be jumping skis. But I read books, and I worked at it and gained some little skill.

Ski Instruction in Europe

Hildebrand: I went abroad with the family in 1930. I took sabbatical leave from the university. We put the three boys in a school on the Zugerberg in Switzerland, at about 3,000 feet altitude, where there was snow all winter long.

Louise and Mrs. Hildebrand and I lived in Munich. The boys came at Christmas time to join us at Sankt Anton in Tyrol, the site of the most famous ski school in the world at that time, directed by Hannes Schneider, the great god of skiing. We took the course under him, and we got a thorough grounding in good ski techniques. Well, Mrs. Hildebrand did a little, but not very much.

Louise was eighteen and the boys were sixteen, twelve, and eight. Eight year old Roger took to it so well that at the end of the winter, when they held the races for the canton of Zug in Switzerland, Roger beat all the Swiss boys in the downhill race, and Milton, twelve, was number two in his race. The Hildebrands got quite a wallop out of that. We came back with a pretty good grounding in the skiing of the day.

Ann Lage: I take it skiing was not a very well known sport out here.

Hildebrand: I have written a history of skiing in California for the British Ski Annual. It does have a very interesting early history. There were Scandanavians in the lumber camps and the gold camps in the mountains. And there was a "snowshoe club," as they called it, in Portola.

There was a very famous character, "Snowshoe Thompson." He carried the mail across the Sierra in winter for several years. He made himself some skis from memory; he was only about ten years old when he came to this country from Norway. They were very heavy, weighing about twenty-five pounds each. He would carry eighty pounds of mail on his back.

He went over what is now the Calaveras Route to Genoa, south of Carson City. It took him three days to go east and two days to come back, because he had the long, gentler downhill western slope. If he was caught in a blizzard, he danced on a rock all night to keep from freezing, or he would set a dead tree on fire, or there were one or two cabins he could sleep in. It was a pretty rugged life.

There was sport skiing in these lumber camps. They had downhill races in which they would get up speeds of sixty miles an hour. They had long skis and steered themselves with on pole. They would set out a course of about 2,000 feet downhill and race on it late in the afternoon when it would freeze and be fast again. They invented "dope"--mixtures of beeswax, shellac, tar, etc.--and painted their skis with it. Snowshow Thompson did not know about dope. One of his partisans issued a challenge to the Portola boys. He was going to show them how to ski, but he was ignominiously defeated because he did not have dope. The newspaper account of this was in Bret Harte language, very delightful.

My children and I took pleasure in passing out to friends some of the technique that we had acquired during our winter in Europe, on the ski slopes of Bavaria, Switzerland, and the Tirol. I found eager disciples among members of the Sierra Club.

We chartered a bus to take us to Soda Springs where the women slept in cabins and the men on the floor of the abandoned railroad station. We had a grand time. On the way home I said, "The Sierra Club has several mountain lodges for use in summer; I propose that we get it to sponsor the building of a ski lodge." We there and then formed a committee.

Several of the directors of the Sierra Club were members of our Sierra Ski Club, so the old Sierra Ski Club helped the birth of the Clair Tapaan Lodge, as we called it, and the latter gave birth to a grandchild, the Associated Students Lodge, which son Milton and others helped to build.

Developing Ski Technique and Tests

Ann Lage: When you came back from Europe, then, did you sort of take the role of teacher?

Hildebrand: Yes, I have coached scores of beginning skiers. I am a born teacher. I just love to explain things to people and even show them how to do it. I and my children all became ski teachers. The following winter I set the first slalom course ever set in the Sierra. Roger, then nine years old, came in fifth in the men's race, which I set at Cisco. Then the Yosemite Winter Club was formed, and in their first meet I set the slalom and each of our four children took home a medal.

In 1936 I managed the American Olympic Ski Team. I took Milton with me to help me manage the team. He could speak German; most of the members could not. He and I took lessons. I had to pick the team; I was not really a coach, but I was the one who made the final selection as to who should operate. Milton and I had a private lesson on an off-day from Anton Seelos, world champion slalom runner. After we returned home, one of our friends said, "Well, I hope you do not go to Europe too often and come back and try to revolutionize our skiing."

Ann Lage: Were techniques very different in Europe than they were here?

Hildebrand: Oh,yes. In this Sankt Anton School, it differed greatly from the then-style in California. The people who organized the Auburn Ski Club were interested in jumping, Norwegian style, and cross-country running, but they did not know anything about slalom. I devised ski tests suitable for our purposes, based upon the British ski tests. These had a good deal of influence in developing competent skiers among club members. We had first, second, third, and fourth class pins.

Ann Lage: You added the fourth class, I understand.

Hildebrand: Yes, that was to encourage people to learn enough about going across country to be able to go along on easy trips. The third class skier had to be a fairly competent cross-country skier; he had to pass tests on different ski maneuvers. The second class skier was a person who could do a down mountain run in pretty good time. I think we reserved first class for just a few outstanding people, virtually an honorary membership.

Ann Lage: And you also coached the University of California ski team?

Hildebrand: Yes, after we came back from Europe, intercollegiate skiing arose. There were very good skiers from the University of Nevada. Stanford had a few, and there were several from junior colleges. So I coached the University of California team.

My sons were members of the team and eventually each one became captain. We had very successful teams. Milton was the star performer. When Alex skied there was only a cross-country race and a downhill slalom race. The first meet organized by the Winter Club at Yosemite was a cross-country race on the floor of Yosemite Valley. They brought up several supposed experts from the south to show these college boys how to race. Alex beat all these southern experts by ten minutes and the best college skier by fifty minutes!

One of the great things about ski racing is that everyone goofs now and then and puts himself out with an absurd fall, so that you do not take yourself too seriously. I have seen a California boy congratulate a Nevada boy for a particularly good run; it was not the dog-eat-dog kind of competition that often attends other sports. Skiing girls came along as a sort of ladies auxiliary to help the boys and cheer them on, a good substitute for a fraternity or a sorority.

Ann Lage: Does Cal still have a ski club and team?

Hildebrand: Yes, I do not know just how active it is now. I was an honorary member of it for some years, but I have not kept up.

The 1936 Winter Olympics

Ann Lage: You mentioned you were manager of the 1936 American Winter Olympics Ski team. Could you tell us something about your experiences with that?

Hildebrand: My experience in Germany and Austria in 1930 and 1931 had familiarized me somewhat with the conditions of skiing in Europe, and my winter activities of the Sierra Club, combined with the fact that I could speak German--I spent a post-doctoral year in Germany, as I think I told you, in 1906 and 1907--led the American Olympic Committee to invite me to be the manager of the team. I asked President Sproul if he would let me take a leave for that purpose; he did not object.

I took my son Milton along, who was then a sophomore. I thought it would be an interesting thing for him and he would be a great help to me. He could speak German. The Norwegians could not speak German and only one American could; Dick Durrance had spent a good deal of time in Europe. He was a student at Dartmouth and a very fine skier, the star of our team.

I had three groups. One, the jumpers, all Scandanavians, most of them born abroad; two, cross-country runners, Scandanavians and Americas; and three, downhill and slalom racers. About half my team was from Dartmouth, where skiing had been developed under a very good coach, Otto Schniebs. He was quite a character. He is quoted as saying, "Skiing is not a schport, it is a vay of life." [Laughter.]

Our best jumper was Roy Mikkelson of the Auburn Ski Club. Durrance was the best downhill racer. He came in, I think, fifth or sixth in the downhill race, and he placed pretty well in the slalom race. In the jumping we were about halfway down the list.

Ann Lage: You had not expected to win?

Hildebrand: No, not against the European skiers who lived close to snow and ski daily all winter. German skiers under the Nazi regime were taken care of by the government as if they were soldiers in the army. The same was true in Italy and Japan. The skiers of all those totalitarian countries wore crash helmets, and the idea was to ski all out and take every risk, in order to win for El Duce.

Scientists in the Fascist Countries

Hildebrand: I was interested in going to Germany in 1936 partly because I had spent the year 1930 to 1931 in Germany and also my year there in 1906 to 1907. I had known many of the German scientists who had either left Germany or had been dismissed from their positions. After I returned from the games I talked to many audiences about what had happened to scientists that I knew as a result of the Hitler regime.

Ann Lage: Did you have a chance to talk to these scientists in Germany?

Hildebrand: While in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, I went up nearby Munich to visit the wife of one of them who was a Pole, and doubly distasteful to the Hitler regime on that account. She told me how her husband had consulted the rector of the university about resigning and leaving.

The rector tried to assure him that the troubles would blow over, but, of course, it did not. He was then in the United States. I received a cablegram from the University of Michigan asking what I would think of calling him to the University of Michigan. I replied that he was a very fine person, a distinquished scientist, could speak English, and I thought he would adapt himself very well to American ways. The result was that he became professor at the University of Michigan.

After the Olympic games were over, Milton and I went to Vienna. There was a professor I had met earlier, director of the division of physical chemistry. That was just before the Anschluss; it was not much later that the Nazis invaded and took over Austria.

This man, who has since come to America, came home one day and found that the police had spent several hours in his apartment. He had been a friend of Dolfuss, the displaced premier who had resisted the Nazi takeover. The police had been searching his apartment for incriminating evidence. His wife was there all the time.

When they left, he immediately took his wife and children and some clothes hangers that were made of platinum, and they drove over the Alps into Italy over a mountain road. Later on they came to Canada, and he became a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a professor at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute.

Another professor who had entertained us in Vienna escaped in a packing case in a freight car. I think his daughter was already outside of Austria. His wife was eventually allowed to leave. He spent the later years in England.

The ruthlessness of the Hitler regime was illustrated again by the fact that a German professor who had developed the method of fixing atmospheric nitrogen, without which the Germans would have had to surrender much earlier because they were not able to get saltpeter from Chile--they did not have command of the seas--was half Jew and so he was a persona non grata. He went to Switzerland.

A brillant young scientist, whom I had met in Berlin in 1930, got to England where he was helped to a position in Oxford University by Lord Charwell. He became eventually Sir Francis Simon. Germany did a great harm to itself by driving out some of its best scientific brains.

Ann Lage: You say you spoke a lot when you returned about the conditions. How were your speeches received?

Hildebrand: I addressed the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco, the best public forum in the United States, on "London at War."

SIERRA CLUB LEADERS AND ALLIES IN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The High Caliber of Club Leaders

Ann Lage: Let's return to the Sierra Club for a minute. Perhaps you could tell us something about some of your companions that you met through the Sierra Club.

Joel Hildebrand: Of course, in those days the Sierra Club was a smaller organization composed of men who organized to do a job. They included such men as William E. Colby, a man who received an honorary degree from the University of California. There was Duncan McDuffie of Berkeley, of the Mason-McDuffie Company, who had been chairman of the conservation commission of the state, an extraordinarily fine person. I was his sponsor when the university gave him an L.L.D. degree.

There is Ansel Adams, whom I sponsored when the university made him a doctor of fine arts. There is Francis Farquhar,who for years was editor of the <u>Sierra Club Bulletin</u> and a member of the board of directors. Walter Huber was a hydraulic engineer. Harold Bradley, who is still living, was a professor of physiology at the University of Wisconsin. Lewis Clark, of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, was a very good skier and companion on many ski tours.

There was Bestor Robinson, a noted attorney in Oakland, a skilled rock climber and mountaineer and a fairly good skier. I improved his skiing, but he was not a born skier. There was Einar Nilsson, another engineer. I formed a pleasant friendship with Colonel White, superintendent of Sequoia National Park. I have in my garden a husky, young <u>Sequoia gigantea</u>, property he gave to me when it was about eighteen inches tall.

Ann Lage: Was he in the Sierra Club or did you meet him through your activities?

Hildebrand: He was a member. Many of the Forest Service and National Park Service people took out memberships. Some were honorary members. But we had constant contact with these men. Later on when I get to talk about the Sierra Club policies, I will mention the difference between the present situation in which an attitude of confrontation has largely replaced the friendly collaboration that we had with officers of the National Park

Service and the Forest Service. We were often consulted by the chiefs and superintendents, and we treated each other as gentlemen.

Relationship with Harold Ickes

Hildebrand: I got well acquainted with Harold Ickes, the secretary of the Interior. He was a very colorful person. He had been a Bull Mooser but was appointed as secretary of the Interior by President Hoover. He was an almost vicious campaigner. He had a biting sarcasm and a wit that is not usually employed in campaigns. Politics is deadly serious business, you see, and if you crack a joke you are considered as being light-headed and not responsible. But he could excoriate his political opponents very effectively because they did not know how to answer him.

He had heard that the Sierra Club had opposed an earlier attempt to create a national park in the Kings Canyon region, and he said he wanted to meet with the directors of the Sierra Club. I was president at the time, and we entertained him at the Bohemian Club in San Francisco. We gave him a very nice dinner.

He was in an expansive mood, talked freely. He told us about his troubles with Henry Wallace. I do not know if you remember Henry Wallace, but they were two men at the opposite poles of character and common sense. Henry Wallace, you know, became a candidate for the presidency, and did not know that he had almost been taken over by the leftists in the country. His great achievement was hybrid corn.

We told Ickes our objections to the earlier bill. We wanted a national park made that would not be another Yosemite with an Ahwanee Hotel. We wanted a wilderness park. The secretary was impressed and gave orders to the California superintendent that the next time a bill was introduced we should have an opportunity to comment upon it.

The following winter, while I was in Providence, Rhode Island, at a scientific symposium, I received a telegram from Ickes asking me to come to Washington. I went to Washington and saw Ickes. He turned me over to his deputy for this sort of thing, a man of great

experience in conservation and the Park Service, and I spent the day helping to write the bill, not the actual wording,but the provisions that the bill should contain guaranteeing that it would be a wilderness park.

I was invited the following summer to go on a trip organized by the California superintendent of parks with a party to scout out the region. Ickes sent out this specialist. I knew more about the region than the national park superintendent did because men in that position spend much of their time in offices. I had roamed all over the Kings Canyon area, so I told them what look-outs to climb and where the boundaries should be.

I have brought to read to you what my son, Roger, who was then about twelve years old, said many years later about that trip. He introduced me in 1953 at the time when I received a Gibbs Medal in Chicago. It takes two people to introduce a Gibbs Medalist, one to tell about his scientific work and the other to give the lowdown on his character. They selected Roger, then an assistant professor at Chicago, now a full professor, to do the latter.

He nearly stole the show. He said:

> Nothing inspires such faith as a teacher who never asks that you accept a truth on faith. Here was a savant who welcomed being put to test. Nearly every evening after dinner he would read to us some poem or play or novel. He taught us to recognize the paintings of the great masters. He taught us to know all the trees in the Sierra forest, the flowers and rocks in the field, the constellations in the sky. He taught us how to swim and dive and how to sail a boat. He taught us much about getting along with people by telling us of the problems which confronted him and how he proposed to solve them.
>
> He said, "Never despair for lack of brains. You probably aren't using the ones you have at maximum efficiency. Judgment and perseverance go a long way in making up for lack of genius. Look at me," he said, "I'm not brilliant, yet I have managed to do a number of things in my life." He had indeed done a number of things but I was not sure whether he was otherwise qualified as an example.

> We were encouraged and instructed in any worthwhile pursuit. The most competent blockhead could hardly have withstood the assault of intellectual enthusiasm which we enjoyed. Any flare for science, athletics, music, arts, or crafts was noticed and the spark was fanned by a powerful hand. As a result, enough bonfires lit the sky to reduce any mother but mine to cinders.

He told about the grandfathers' swimming race and then about that trip to Kings Canyon:

> Another time he took me with him into the magnificent region which is now Kings Canyon National Park. My father was then president of the Sierra Club, which was fighting hard to create the park, in order to save the region from the ravishes of the road and dam enthusiasts.
>
> One of the men on the trip was the personal representative of secretary of the Interior Ickes and another was the regional director of the National Park Service. What impressed me at the time was not so much that these men had invited Dad to show them their own park district, but that Dad baked better biscuits than the cook, and he showed the packer how to throw a one-man diamond hitch. [Laughter.]

After we got that bill passed to create the park, I was attending a meeting of the National Academy, and I had a little time before the plane started West, so I said to myself, Wouldn't it be rather nice to go and shake hands with Secretary Ickes and congradulate each other on our victory?

So I went around to the Department of the Interior and sent in my name. I was kept waiting only a short time, and as I went in the secretary greeted me in a friendly manner. I said I did not want to sit down and take his time, I just wanted to compare our satisfaction over this victory.

"Oh," he said, "Sit down, I want to talk with you. I need a new director of the National Park Service. I want a western man. I don't know whom to get." I said, "You ought to try and get Newton B.Drury. You offered it to him seven years ago, and he did not take it then, but he might be persuaded to now."

I told him about Drury, who had been secretary to the Save-the-Redwoods League for many years. He was a good public speaker, and he had been secretary to the

president of the University of California in the early years of Benjamin Ide Wheeler. "Well," he said, "I would like to see him." I said, "All right, I'll see what I can do."

The next day I arrived in Berkeley and saw Newton and told him what I had done. "Well," he said, "I do not think I want that job, but I'm going East tomorrow." I said, "You must promise me to go and see the secretary." He did. He said, "Now, you know, Mr. Ickes, I am a Republican." Ickes said, "That doesn't make any difference in the National Park Service." And it ended up by his being appointed.

I had a conversation with Newton Drury lately, and I sent him a copy of my autobiography. I got a letter from him on April 18, and I thought you might be interested in this paragraph:

> I have not forgotten that the apex of my career--ten and one-half years in Washington, D.C.--was due to my meeting you on Shattuck Avenue and your telling me that Secretary Ickes wanted to see me. There were some trying episodes, but in most ways I am grateful to you for that.

Ann Lage: He does qualify it a bit.

Hildebrand: Oh, yes. Well, being director of the National Park Service under a curmudgeon like Ickes might be a bit trying at times.

Ann Lage: Ickes sounds like quite a strong personality. Was he capable, did you think?

Hildebrand: Oh, yes, very capable. The previous director was a civil service man who had come up through the ranks and did not have any standing. He nearly had nervous prostration every time he went into the presence of Ickes.

Ann Lage: Was this Cammerer?

Hildebrand: Yes. Drury replaced him. There was a Professor Andrew C. Lawson at the University of California, a famous geologist who snapped at people in a manner similar to Ickes. I was appointed, when I was a young assistant professor, to the executive committee of the Engineering Council.

I said to myself at first when I saw how Lawson behaved that I would have to be circumspect or I would get into unpleasantness. I soon decided that the only people he respected were those who were knights on

horseback, not foot soldiers. If you had a good argument, Lawson would listen and heed it, but if he could scare you, he paid you no attention. Lawson and Ickes were alike.

I regard the appointment of Drury as director of the National Park Service as one of my services to my country.

Ann Lage: Were there other interesting persons among your acquaintance?

Hildebrand: Those are the ones that chiefly come to mind. But you asked about my skiing activities where I ran into a number of people that I became friendly with. There was Hannes Schneider, the great god of skiing. There was Charlie Proctor, manager of the Winter Club of Yosemite, and Luggi Foegger, the head coach at Yosemite.

There was also Arnold Lunn, later Sir Arnold Lunn, editor of the British Ski Annual and the father of the slalom. He lived in Switzerland in the winter and became the great god of British skiing. When I was in London in the American Embassy during the Second World War, he took me with him to the meetings of the Alpine Club.

Once when he was in this country, Lunn was invited to set a slalom for a race at Yosemite, and he invited me to set one of the parts of it. I set a special invention of my own. I have his books on mountaineering and skiing. He is a very delightful author.

I mentioned Einar Nilsson who was an engineer and a frequent companion on ski touring. I was very happy to be sponsor for Duncan McDuffie and Ansel Adams when they got their degrees from the University of California. Colby also got a degree. I will refer to that when I come to discuss Sierra Club policies because the directorship was made up of men of this caliber who brought prestige to the club instead of seeking to gain it by becoming director.

THE SIERRA CLUB'S APPROACH TO CONSERVATION IN THE 1930S

Formation of Kings Canyon National Park

Ann Lage: In our last interview, Professor Hildebrand, you talked somewhat about your role in Kings Canyon National Park, and I wondered if maybe we could go into more detail today. You mentioned that the Sierra Club had pushed the idea of a wilderness park. Could you tell us more exactly what you meant by this?

Joel Hildebrand: Yes, a wilderness park would be a complete contrast to Yosemite. It is a park where people travel on trails, not in automobiles or campers, where there is no Ahwanee Hotel. There were people who sought to turn Kings Canyon into another Yosemite.

The Forest Service had tried to impress the club with its ability to manage the park in accordance with our principles. Twice I was with a party that they had invited to scout the area. On the third time, when we were contemplating the bill for a national park, I was invited to join a party organized to show the area to Bob Marshall, who had been appointed by Ickes as a special consultant.

Marshall had spent many years in the Forest Service and Park Service. He wrote a book called Arctic Village. He had lived in Alaska for a considerable period. One of the things he told us during the trip was about the attitude of whites toward Eskimos. He gave his own intelligence tests to whites who lived in the north, and he found that the most intelligent whites there thought that the Eskimo were fully equal to the whites in intelligence. The least intelligent whites felt themselves to be superior to the Eskimos [laughter.]

Ann Lage: I guess Bob Marshall was interested in maintaining wilderness parks, also. Why was it that the Sierra Club felt that the Park Service could do a better job with Kings Canyon?

Hildebrand: Well, the Forest Service is charged with taking care of the forests but allowing use--controlled cutting, hunting, building of roads that could serve to fight fires, and other things of that sort. We had a very good Forest Service at the time, but Forest Service policies could be changed by order of the secretary of Agriculture, whereas the National Park Service's policies were established by Congress.

Ann Lage: Was the Sierra Club the main proponent of making Kings Canyon a wilderness park or were there other groups as well?

Hildebrand: Interest in it was widespread. There was opposition in the Fresno area from groups who wanted to have the park developed so as to bring tourists through Fresno. There were lumbering and mining interests that wanted to be able to exploit natural resources. So we had very powerful opposition.

The Sierra Club issued effective brochures, copiously illustrated. After the bill was introduced, directors who were experienced speakers addressed many audiences. I addressed the state Senate and Assembly. We got the Commonwealth Club interested. We won a great deal of public backing. Ickes himself was a powerful proponent.

Ann Lage: Well, I understand that even the Forest Service came around to that viewpoint and supported the bill.

Hildebrand: I think so.

Ann Lage: Now you mentioned that you had gone to Washington and helped prepare the Gearhart Bill.

Hildebrand: Yes, I told you about the dinner that the Sierra Club had at the Bohemian Club, where Ickes gave orders that the Sierra Club should have the opportunity of commenting on the provisions of the bill when it was finally prepared to be introduced.

I was in Providence, Rhode Island, attending a chemical meeting at Brown University when I got a telegram from Ickes asking if I would come to Washington. I went there and conferred with him, and then he turned me over to Marshall and his assistants who were writing up the bill. We were very much interested in having the boundaries put in the right place and having provisions specified which would maintain a wilderness character. So I had ample opportunity to express the Sierra Club's position and my own on that subject.

Ann Lage: I understand that there was a compromise involved in the bill that left out Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley.

Hildebrand: I don't remember the details of that. Well, it was this. Cedar Grove Meadows was owned by the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club finally donated this to the Park Service, but we did not want to do it before there would be a thorough commitment that it would not be used for a hotel or anything of that sort. We were allowed to own it as we owned Parsons Lodge in Yosemite,

Tuolumne Meadows. [Error: The Sierra Club owned Zumwalt Meadows, not Cedar Grove.]

Ray Lage: You mentioned the lumber and water interests as being very much opposed to this. Was the light and power block in opposition, also?

Hildebrand: There were people who wanted to build a dam and do what they had done to Hetch Hetchy. Fortunately, it was one of the government bureaus, maybe the Corps of Engineers, who discovered that it wasn't a good foundation for a dam and that helped to weaken that demand.

You see, there had once been a lake there, and the place where the dam would be was a glacial moraine that could slide like cobblestones can slide over each other. That may have helped it. Then the interest shifted to getting water from northern California to support the excess population of southern California.

Ray Lage: Do you have some recollection of the date, approximately, when you feted Ickes at the Bohemian Club?

Hildebrand: Well, it would be about the end of my second year as president of the Sierra Club or the beginning of the third.

Ann Lage: About 1938 then.

Hildebrand: Yes, it was probably just about the end of the second year.

Ann Lage: The club had a pretty extensive public campaign, then. You mentioned that they printed up brochures.

Hildebrand: Yes, we did our best. We spent a lot of money in printing and traveling.

Ann Lage: Was that a more extensive effort than they had had in the past?

Hildebrand: I think so, yes. This was the biggest issue in which we had a big stake, and we were better developed than had been the case earlier, a larger membership and so forth.

Ann Lage: Do you remember if you had a lobbyist in Washington to talk to congressmen?

Hildebrand: We did not have any paid lobbyist. We had members of the board of directors who were men of

influence, and they would alert all their friends in the East to apply pressure.

Ann Lage: It seems that the Kings Canyon campaign showed a great deal of cooperation between the Park Service and the Sierra Club. They appeared to look to you for guidance?

Hildebrand: Oh yes, I went on trips with Forest Service parties as the representative of the club. The attitude of Ickes toward the Sierra Club is shown by the fact that he asked me whom he could get for the director of the National Park Service. What more could you want? I cannot imagine anything like that happening today.

Ann Lage: Were there any instances of conflict in goals between the Sierra Club and the National Park Service during your years?

Hildebrand: Oh, no. We were on excellent terms. They regarded us as allies. I was on a first name basis with park directors White and Kittredge. The Sierra Club was regarded as the civilian mainstay in maintaining the quality that these very superior officials felt.

Ann Lage: So the Park Service's goals were themselves quite high--nothing that the Sierra Club would disagree with?

Hildebrand: Very high, indeed.

Assessment of the Forest Service

Ann Lage: How about the Forest Service during your years as club officer? What would your assessment of it be?

Hildebrand: Well, the leaders were men who had to do their best to fulfill the purposes of the Forest Service. They had a multiple purpose, you see, to provide a continuous supply of timber for the country; to fight fires; and to manage recreational hunting and fishing. Their responsibility was towards both the public and the business interests of the public, whereas the Park Service had a more limited and stronger ideal. They did not have to divide their efforts between different interests.

Ann Lage: Were there charges in those years that the Forest Service cooperated too fully with these business interests, as they are accused of now sometimes?

Hildebrand: I don't think so. There were differences of opinion, inevitably, as to what permission should be given for lumbering and so forth, and different officers would have different policies, but there were no scandals that I know of.

Ann Lage: I guess Robert Marshall was quite a proponent of wilderness areas while he was with the Forest Service, before he transferred into the Park Service.

Hildebrand: Oh, yes, very much. He was a very fine idealist, but also a man with a sense of humor along with it. Many reformers, you know, have no sense of humor. The essence of a sense of humor is not to enable one to be funny but it is to see paradox, to be able to see both sides of a question.

Ann Lage: Did you know the regional forester? Was that Stuart Show?

Hildebrand: Yes. But the man that I got to know best was the director of the Kings Canyon region--I forget his name just now--but he was a very agreeable friend.

Ann Lage: I noticed in the 1938 Bulletin there was a copy of quite an extensive report that you and a committee had presented to the Forest Service, giving them suggestions for the use of the Sierra.

Hildebrand: Yes. When we were invited to go on these two trips, we had to tell them what we found and what our ideas were. They wanted our ideas. If the area was going to remain Forest Service land, we wanted to continue advisory functions. So we prepared the way for either continguency. We were on good terms with both. The antagonism between the Forest Service and the Park Service was largely on the part of a few leaders of the Forest Service who wanted to retain as much of their empire as possible. They did not want us to oppose them, and if they were going to continue to manage the country, we wanted to be called upon to advise them.

Ann Lage: You gave quite an extensive report on maintaining trails and preventing overuse.

Hildebrand: We told them a great deal about individual trails, some of which were in very bad shape, and these men did not know them as well as I and one or two others, such as Walter Starr, did. That was a welcome opportunity for us.

CHANGES IN THE SIERRA CLUB AFTER WORLD WAR II

A New Concept of the Board of Directors

Ann Lage: I was quite impressed, in looking over those materials, at the respect shown to the Sierra Club. Do you feel there have been changes,along those lines, in the Sierra Club's approach to conservation campaigns?

Joel Hildebrand: The whole attitude is different. I can come to that when we talk about the changes in the nature of the Sierra Club.

Ann Lage: Maybe we should get into that now, unless you have some further details about Kings Canyon.

Hildebrand: All right. The changes in the Sierra Club were to some extent inevitable. There was established the Los Angeles Chapter, and that became, to a considerable extent, a social club. They held dances; they had a retreat that had been donated to them where they would have weekend parties rather than go off on hiking trips. When they passed upon new applicants for membership they considered their acceptability as members of a social club.

It was not very long before they wanted an opportunity to elect their own representatives to the board of directors of the club. We always had chosen representatives from the south, men like Clair Tappaan and his son, and Phil Bernays, who fitted in very well. But those were not persons who busied themselves with dances and parties, and we had complaints that the men who served the chapter well ought to be "rewarded" by election to the board of directors. That was an entirely new concept of the function of the board. We did not think of it as a reward to us for faithful service to the social activities of a chapter. As more chapters were established, the tendency was to shift to a board made up of regional representatives.

Now the Sierra Club had not been created to be a social club. There was no reason, for instance, why Will Colby, Bestor Robinson, Joe LeConte, or Duncan McDuffie should ever vacate their directorship to make room for some whippersnapper who coveted the distinction

of being a director of the Sierra Club. I was never a candidate; I had been invited to become director of the Sierra Club.

Ann Lage: Did the nominating committee only nominate the number of directors there were spaces for? They did not give you a choice?

Hildebrand: No. I don't remember how often a director had to be renominated, but he held office almost in perpetuo.

When it became possible for chapters to initiate nominations to contest the nominations by the central nominating committee, you can see that the club became an ordinary political organization.

Ann Lage: When would you say these changes were taking place?

Hildebrand: They took place gradually after the war. It was not long before a man would get himself elected by petition, and whole character of the directorship changed. My son Alex refused to be renominated as president partly because the directors' meetings became unmannerly. One of these new directors would accuse other directors of being stupid or not holding the high ideals that he held.

Ann Lage: Did this have anything to do with the social interest you mentioned earlier, or did that just bring a different type of person to the board?

Hildebrand: It brought a different kind of person.

Ann Lage: It sounds as if the spirit of camaraderie of the board is gone.

Hildebrand: It changed all together. Persons who are "coercive, self-righteous busybodies," as Peter Viereck called them, do not work together or with the national officials with whom we used to be able to deal freely.

Ann Lage: Would you care to mention any names of the self-righteous busybodies?

Hildebrand: No, I don't want to name individuals. You can get them from my letters, of you like. Fanatics believe that the end justifies the means and that you should accomplish your means by confrontation rather than persuasion. That hardens your opponent. You never convert anybody by name-calling.

Conflict within the Club

Hildebrand: Some of these people on the board of directors and some others who were weak-kneed allowed Dave Brower to acquire power the way Nixon has acquired power with much the same psychological process. Then Brower is so high-minded that he knew better than anybody else what should be done. He put a full page ad in the New York Times without authorization. He frequently spent money, and then he would go to the Sierra Club to have its approval after he had spent it. Well, that outrages a person who is used to accountability.

My son Alex, who is an engineer and had to manage large engineering enterprises where accountability is a first consideration, refused re-election as president of a club that winked at the spending of club funds without authorization.

Brower also made a ridiculous statement in the Sierra Club Bulletin about fertilizers; he said that they are mining the world's fertility by the use of phosphate fertilizers. Well, he does not know anything about fertilizers or chemistry, and I sent to the editor of the Bulletin a factual refutation of this, but the editor would not publish it.

Ann Lage: He was a Brower man?

Hildebrand: Yes, he was a Brower man.

Ann Lage: Now, Brower's article was in the December, 1964, Bulletin.

Hildebrand: Perhaps, very likely, yes. I tried several times. A group of presidents, for example, made a representation concerning the policies--they were past presidents--but it was not published. Well, this so disgusted me that I resigned as an honorary vice-president, just as Ansel Adams did recently.

Ann Lage: You resigned back in 1965, before the Brower thing was really brought to a head in the public eye.

Hildebrand: Yes.

Ann Lage: You had quite a bit of early association with Dave Brower, before he became executive director.

Hildebrand: Oh yes, before he got carried away by his own importance, I skied with him. He edited Going

Light with Backpack or Burro and told in the introduction how the thing was born in my garden. He had suggested that the Sierra Club should take over and publish Camp Catering.

He did very well in his arguments over building one of the dams, so he became a sort of fair-haired boy or knight in shining armor and got carried away with his own self-importance, just as Nixon has been carried away by his big landslide to feel that he knows better and does not need to ask anyone for advice.

Ann Lage: But Brower did seem to come out of the sort of traditional aspect of the club, rather than a newcomer as you have mentioned some of these others were.

Hildebrand: Yes, but you see he clearly declared that he thought the Sierra Club should not be run by its directors, and that the board of directors and everybody else should approve what he wanted to do, that he knew enough that he did not need any advice.

From Cooperation to Confrontation

Ann Lage: You mentioned that he engaged in a lot of personal attacks on individuals. Can you recall the nature of any of these?

Hildebrand: Well, the individuals were not always named, but he did make snide remarks about people who did not agree with him. I will give you an example of his attitude of arrogance. When he wrote a letter to Governor Brown, he addressed him as "Dear Pat."

Now, if that had been a personal letter and he wanted to do that, that was his privilege. But it was a letter as representative of the Sierra Club. The Sierra Club in my day did not address him as "Pat," even though privately we might have done so, but in public and official considerations he was Governor Brown. Brower also addressed Udall as "Dear Stu."

Now you have the Sierra Club endorsing a union in a strike. That alienates the officials of the business, of Shell Oil Company, with whom the Sierra Club ought to remain in respectful communication, not

close the door they might want to open later on. Well, that is enough, I think, on what is happening to the Sierra Club.

Ann Lage: I have one other question to get your opinion on. Do you feel it was this kind of personal attack and the club's new way of handling their conservation that alienated them from the Park Service, or have there also been changes in the Park Service and the Forest Service and the national Administrations that have caused the alienation?

Hildebrand: I do not know enough about it to assess responsibility. I know that the attitude of the directors and officials of the Sierra Club was such as would inevitably alienate, or close, the free, friendly communication, the opportunity for expressing advice in such a way that it would likely be considered.

The only value that the Sierra Club has now is that its membership is so large that it represents voters, voting strength, and no official who wants to be re-elected, of course, wants to alienate a good many thousands of voters if he does not have to. Our strength earlier was moral strength rather than numbers, but when you do not have a majority you had better try to achieve what you want to do through moral strength and cogent argument rather than threats and confrontation.

Ray Lage: Professor Hildebrand, would I be incorrect in assuming that while there were things that were going on with Brower in terms of his responsibility with the Sierra Club that you were not pleased about, the major break between you and Brower seemed to center on the article which he wrote in the December, 1964, Bulletin?

Hildebrand: Well, that was the occasion rather than the cause, because it was a clear instance that enabled me to express as powerfully as I could criticism of what was merely one instance of his arrogance.

Ray Lage: Yes. He did not seek your consultation then, with respect to writing this article?

Hildebrand: Oh my, no.

Ray Lage: Do you think he sought any scientific consultation in that regard?

Hildebrand: He was not thinking of me when he wrote this because he would not know that fertilizer was a matter of chemistry [laughter.]

Ray Lage: That reminds me of something else as well; there seems to be a thread that goes throughout this. You know, at this time Rachael Carson's Silent Spring had been published, just a few years before that.

Hildebrand: Yes, he extolled that book as a great contribution to conservation, although it was not a scientific book.

Ray Lage: Did it have merit?

Hildebrand: I never read the book. I recently put a short piece into Science. Adelle Davis, whom you have doubtless heard of, has a best selling book on nutrition. She is not a scientist, but she is an evangelist, and she has made a hell of a lot of money over this. I heard her over television one night in which she warned people against chemical fertilizers.

Well, in my little piece that I sent to Science, I said that I had heard the author of a best selling book on nutrition warning her listeners against chemical fertilizers. It reminded me of the freshman in college who was asked early in the term whether air was a chemical compound or a mixture of gases. He wrote that air cannot be a chemical compound because chemistry was not invented for thousands of years after the creation [laughter.] I said that that was the boy who, as he went along, learned enough chemistry to realize that ammonia from steer manure is the same stuff as ammonia from a synthetic plant.

But there are people who are like those that have been mentioned by Santyana, who said that there is nothing that gives such an idea of the infinite as human credulity. Here is a woman who deals with the complex chemistry of nutrition and does not realize that all of the things that a plant takes up are chemicals.

Now to warn against pesticides is one thing. But to warn against chemical fertilizers is another. Everything the plant can absorb is a chemical, and it does not absorb anything esoteric from the ground, from decaying substances. They are broken down into ammonia and carbon dioxide, and the plant rearranges them. It is not like an animal. When you eat turkey, you can taste the things that a turkey ate. I once ate some trout that came from a private pond where they had been fed breadcrumbs. Well, they tasted of breadcrumbs! What else have we?

Ann Lage: Do you have a general assessment to make of Brower, his motivations, or do you think we have covered this enough?

Hildebrand: Oh, no, my complaint is not against Brower, it is against the club that would not hold him in check. He was an employee of the club, and he had no business spending money that was not approved by the club. Instead of that, he published these books without proper authorization, and the club is still in debt for huge stocks of these terribly expensive books.

Ann Lage: Why do you feel that the president and the directors at that time were so reluctant to put the brakes on him?

Hildebrand: He was their champion, you see, who was fighting the very nefarious interests of business and government, confronting them, waving his flags, and calling them names. Why shouldn't they give him rein to do what he wanted to do? The majority of the people who had gotten into the directorship were not persons who had had any particular experience with human affairs.

Ann Lage: Well, there were some, for instance, I think Will Siri was president for part of the time.

Hildebrand: Yes, well Will Siri knew it was wrong. There is some of my correspondence with him, and I liked him personally, but he did not have enough guts to hold Brower in check.

Ann Lage: So you feel it could have been resolved simply by a stronger directorship?

Hildebrand: It was the directors, yes. It was the change in the quality of the directorship, whereby men could become candidates. You see, the Sierra Club membership had very little opportunity to learn the truth about these candidates.

Somebody whom you have never heard of is nominated by the Atlantic Chapter. Is he a person of affairs? No, he has been a member of the local chapter committee for this or that. He is not the kind of man who would ever get an honorary degree, as members of the old board of directors did.

Will Colby had an L.L.D. degree from the University of California. Ansel Adams had a Doctor of Fine Arts. I was his sponsor. I was also sponsor for Duncan McDuffie, a man who had been a very fine

influence in conservation in the state and a long-time member of the board of directors.

Well, that sort of person does not get on the board of directors. There is no way in which he gets on the board now. Anybody of the old caliber would refuse to run, just as my son, who after being president of the club, would not allow himself to become a candidate later on.

Ann Lage: This is Alex?

Hildebrand: Yes.

INDEX

Adams, Ansel, 16, 21, 29, 33

Adirondack Mountains, 1

Agriculture, U.S., Department of, 22

Alaska, 22

Algonquin National Park, 1

Alpine Club, 21

Atlantic Chapter, 33

American Olympic Ski Team, iii, 11

Arctic Village, 22

Associated Students Lodge, 10

Austria, 14-5

Auburn Ski Club, 8, 11, 13

Bavaria, 10

Bernays, Phil, 27

Bohemian Club, 17, 23, 24

Bradley, Harold, 16

British Ski Annual, 9, 21

British skiing, 9, 11, 21

Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, 14

Brower, David R., 29-34

Brown, Pat, 30

Brown University, 23

burro trips, 1-3

California, 3, 9, 17-8, 24

skiing, 8-12

California state legislature, 23

Cammerer, Arno, 20

Camp Catering, 2, 30

Canada, 1, 14

Carson, Rachael, 32

Cedar Grove, 23-4

Charwell, Lord, 15

chemistry, 1, 29, 31-2

Clair Tappaan Lodge, 10

Clark, Lewis, 16

Colby, William, 6, 16, 21, 27, 33

Commonwealth Club of California, 15, 23

conservation, 3, 6

Dartmouth College, 13

Davis, Adelle, 32

Department. *For all governmental departments, see under state or nation: e.g. United States Department of Agriculture*

dope, 10

Drury, Newton B., 19-21

Durrance, Dick, 13

England, 15

see also British skiing

Eskimo, 22

European skiing, 9, 11, 13, 21

Farquhar, Francis, 16

fertilizers, 29, 31, 32

Foegger, Luggi, 21

Forest Service, U.S., 16-7, 22, 25-6, 31

Gearhart Bill, 23

Germany, 10, 13, 14

Great Depression, 6

Green Mountains, 1

Going Light with Backpack or Burro, 2, 29-30

Hetch Hetchy Valley, 24

Hildebrand, Emily, iii, 1, 4, 9

Hildebrand, Joel

- early life, 1
- mountaineer, 1-5
- in Europe, 1, 9, 11, 13-4, 21
- family, 1-4, 11, 13, 18-9
- joins Sierra Club, iii, 3, 5
- initiates burro trips, iii, iv, 3
- ski mountaineer, 8-9, 11-2, 21
- European ski instruction, 9, 11
- coach, Olympic ski team, 11, 13
- coach, UC ski team, 12
- on World War II, 13-5, 21, 27-8
- on changes in Sierra Club, 16, 21, 27-34
- on federal land agencies, 16-21, 22-6
- and Kings Canyon, 17-9, 22-6
- Gibbs Medalist, 18-9
- on David Brower, 29-34
- on fertilizers and pesticides, 29-32

Hildebrand, Milton, 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13-4

Hildebrand, Roger, 4, 9, 11, 18-9

Hitler, 14-5

Huber, Walter, 16

Hutchinson, Lincoln, 8

Hutchinson Lodge, 8

Ickes, Harold, 17, 19-21, 22, 24-5

Interior, U.S. Department of, 17, 19

Italy, 4, 13, 14

Japanese skiing, 13

Kings Canyon, 7, 17-9, 22-5, 26

Kittredge, Frank, 25

Klein, Louis Hildebrand, 2, 9

labor union strikes, 30

Lawson, Andrew C., 20-1

LeConte, Joe, 27

Los Angeles Chapter, 27

lumber industry, 23

Lunn, Arthur, 21

Marshall, Robert, 22, 23, 26

McDuffie, Duncan, 16, 21, 27, 33

Mikkelson, Roy, 13

mining interests, 23

mountaineering, 1-4

see also ski mountaineering

National Academy of Sciences, 14, 19

National Park Service, 7, 16-21, 22-5, 26

Nazi regime, 13-5

New Jersey, 1

New York Times, 29

Nilsson, Einar, 16, 21

Nixon, Richard, 29, 30

Norway, 9

Oxford University, 15

Pacific Gas and Electric, Company, 16

Parson's Lodge, 7, 23

pesticides, 32

Proctor, Charlie, 21

Ratcliff, Walter, 8

recreation, outdoor, 6, 25
see also ski mountaineering

Robinson, Bestor, 16, 27

rock climbing, 4

Sankt Anton, 9, 11

Save-the-Redwoods League, 19

Scandanavian skiers, 13

Schneider, Hannes, 9, 21

Schniebs, Otto, 13

Science, 32

scientists flee Nazis, 13-5

Sequoia National Park, 16

Shell Oil Company, 30

Show, Stuart, 26

Sierra Club, 1, 3

and labor strikes, 30
burro trips, 3
changes in, 21, 27-34
David Brower, 29-34
Kings Canyon, 17-9, 22-6
objectives, 6
Outings, 5-6
relations with federal bureaus, 16-21, 22-6
rock climbing, 4
ski mountaineering, 10

Sierra Club Bulletin, 2, 16, 26, 29, 31

Sierra Club Foundation, 7

Sierra Nevada, 2-4, 7, 8, 9, 11

Sierra Ski Club, 8, 10

Silent Spring, 32

Simon, Sir Francis, 15

Siri, Will, 33

ski mountaineering,

British, 11, 21
California history of, 8-12
European, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21
Japanese, 13
slalom, 8, 11, 12, 13, 21
Sierra Club, 10
tests and racing, 8, 9, 11-3, 21

slalom, 8, 11, 12, 13, 21

Sproul, Robert, 13

Stanford University, 12

Starr, Walter, 26

Switzerland, 9, 21

Tappaan, Clair, 27

Tehipite Valley, 23

Thompson, Snowshoe, 9-10

Tuolumne Meadows, 7, 24

Udall, Stuart, 30

United States Army Corps of Engineers, 24

United States Congress, 22

United States Department of Agriculture, 22

United States Department of the Interior, 17, 19

United States Forest Service, 16-7, 22, 25-6, 31

United States National Park Service, 7, 16-21, 22-6

University of California, iii, iv, 8, 9, 12, 16, 20, 21, 33

University of Chicago, 4

University of Michigan, 14

University of Nevada, 12

University of Pennsylvania, 1

University of Wisconsin, 16

Viereck, Peter, 28

Wallace, Henry, 17

White, Colonel John, 16, 25

Wheeler, Benjamin Ide, 20

Winter Olympics, 13

World War II, 13-5, 21, 27-8

Yosemite Valley, 1, 12, 17, 21, 22, 23

Yosemite Winter Club, 11, 12, 21

Zumwald Meadow, 7, 24

Bestor Robinson

THOUGHTS ON CONSERVATION AND THE SIERRA CLUB

An Interview Conducted by
Susan R. Schrepfer

Sierra Club
History Committee
San Francisco, California

1974

Sierra Club

San Francisco, California

Copyright © 1974 by Sierra Club

All rights reserved

PREFACE

Bestor Robinson brought a great deal of strength, vigor, and unwavering perserverance into all the activities in which he was engaged. This was notably illustrated in his law practice, his Sierra Club leadership, and in his skiing and mountaineering. His assistance was constantly sought as advisor and organizer of winter sports and conservation committees. He was also a leader and contributor to such East Bay activities as the Botanical and Zoological Society. In addition to all these pursuits, he has had a happy family life with wife Florence Breed Robinson and their three sons and daughters.

Francis P. Farquhar
Sierra Club
April, 1974

INTRODUCTION

Bestor Robinson was interviewed in his home in the Oakland hills. It is a substantial house, bordering a small bushy canyon. A heavy-duty, recreational vehicle stands in front of the house. Now retired from his law firm of Breed, Robinson, and Stewart, he is the outdoor man in demeanor and appearance. His opinions are forcefully given and frank. The interview was impromptu, the manuscript uncensored.

In the complex world of environmental battle lines, Bestor Robinson trod his own path. During the 1940s and 1950s he served as a member of the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Committee on Conservation and the California Region's Forest Service Advisory Committee. He regarded independence as prerequisite to this service.

It is perhaps in his involvement with the issue of Mineral King in the Sierra Nevada that his independence is most visible. During the late 1960s many winter ski enthusiasts found that wilderness-lovers, especially the Sierra Club, opposed the Disney Corporation's development of Mineral King as a ski resort. Bestor Robinson is a wilderness preservationist by avocation. He served as president of the Sierra Club during the late 1940s and as director from 1935 into the 1960s. He has been an outstanding mountaineer with first ascents to his credit. He served as director of the American Mount Everest Expedition. Yet he is also a skier of note--recipient of the First Class Ski Badge of the Far West Ski Association and a leader of the National Ski Association.

He weighed the assets of Mineral King and the land-use needs of Californians. He decided that, in his mind, a ski facility was the highest possible use for Mineral King. He accepted membership on the Disney conservation advisory council. His object was to insure the least possible scenic damage and the maximum possible recreational use, including summer knapsacking, should development be realized.

Bestor Robinson favors the realistic approach to scenic preservation. He is not a purist. Wage the all-out battle for wilderness, but always know when to compromise. Never let your love of nature overshadow your concern for human needs. The mountains are to be used. "I want," he said, "wilderness to contribute to the American way of life."

Susan R. Schrepfer
Sierra Club History Committee
April, 1974

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION iv

THE FEDERAL LANDS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATING AGENCIES . 1

The United States Forest Service 1
Kings Canyon National Park 3
The Irascible Harold Ickes 6
Departmental Reorganization Proposals 7
Olympic National Park Threatened 8
Advisory Committee to the Department of the Interior 10
Park Service Director, Newton B. Drury 13
Park Service Director, Horace Albright 14
Controlling Park Wildlife 16

FIVE GREAT CONSERVATION ISSUES OF THE 1950s AND 1960s 19

Dinosaur National Monument 19
The Grand Canyon of the Colorado 23
The Art of the Possible: Cascades National Park 28
Redwood National Park 31
Land-Use Planning: Mineral King 41

CHANGES IN THE SIERRA CLUB IN THE 1950s AND 1960s . . 50

Grass-Roots Opinion? 50
Club Leader, Richard Leonard 50
Ecology is a Science! 52
David R. Brower 53
Club's Loss of Tax Status 56

INDEX 60

THE FEDERAL LANDS AND THEIR ADMINISTRATING AGENCIES

The United States Forest Service

Susan Schrepfer: We might begin, Mr. Robinson, with your views concerning the United States Forest Service.

Bestor Robinson: Well, as far as I am concerned the U.S. Forest Service is one of the finest if not the finest of the bureaus in the federal government. It has two things that made it so. The first is that it is a professional organization. It was originally rather narrow--how do you raise timber and how do you cut it--but it broadened out very significantly in the last two decades.

The other thing about it is they have delegated the decision-making process more and more down to the lower levels, so the grass-roots part of the decision making is very definitely there to a greater extent than is true of many of the other bureaus. For instance, in the National Park Service any important decision has to be made in Washington. The kinds of decisions that in the Forest Service would be made at the regional office are made within the Park Service at the Washington level. They haven't learned yet how to decentralize. This country is not just a country; it is an empire, with all the diversity of problems that comes to an empire.

Schrepfer: Grant McConnell at Santa Cruz wrote an article on the Forest Service in which he claimed that the service's discretionary powers were too broad and that they were allowed to make important land-use decisions with absolutely no legislative or popular control.

Robinson: Well, now, let's see what we are talking about. There are many people, including Grant, who would love to have rigid legislative lines laid down provided they agreed with his ideas and would be violently opposed to them if they didn't.

When you get into a situation, such as the Forest Service is in with its multiple-use doctrines, its

obligation to the future as well as the present, you need a professional system. The objectives, of course, need to be laid down by the legislation. But in any professional operation, whether it's medicine or law or forestry, the best decisions are made by the professional, provided the objectives are laid out for them by law. The methods, the details, are decisions for the professional.

Schrepfer: Do you think the Forest Service has been too timber-oriented?

Robinson: Oh, very definitely it was timber-oriented! But, since I first went on the advisory committee in 1948, I have watched a gradual movement away from overwhelming interest in timber production and away from the importance of the financial returns to the government from that timber. I have seen the development gradually move away from that, until the new policy that just came out from Washington a few months ago. Once implemented--which requires actual re-education of a great many foresters--it will work out a sound balance.

You see, the actual objective of the foresters in the early days was, How can we maximize our timber yield and, also, maximize the monetary returns to the federal government? Now, the maximizing of the timber yield in the proper areas, that is the silvicultural areas, was perfectly sound. But when they got to the question of, How you maximize the return to the government? they have to eliminate a lot of desirable things, such as patch-cutting instead of clear-cutting huge areas because it cost more for roads.

They had to open up the harvesting of timber on steep slopes and other types of slopes where erosion control was more important than the value of the standing timber. They were always worrying about how much additional cost was imposed upon the purchaser of logs, because additional costs imposed on the logger meant a lower bid on the timber. So that was the pattern that they were following.

Breaking this pattern required pressure, both within the organization, and from Congress. And, of course, there was grass-roots pressure for the control of erosion, the maximizing of wildlife, and scenic preservation. These factors are working in, not at

the rate I would have hoped for, but one that I have to agree is realistic. You just don't turn over attitudes in an organization overnight; it takes time.

Schrepfer: The Forest Service appears to be on the defensive.

Robinson: Being on the defensive is a part of this shift in policy away from an overemphasis on timber production toward a total pattern of compatible use. It's merely a part of the history of any governmental system that they are on the defensive, then yield, then further on the defensive, then yield, and then gradually the entire policy gets in order.

I don't quarrel with them being on the defensive, because some things they have defended they have been right in, as against some crazy cockeyed ideas. Other things they have had to yield and that process is sound. It is a headache for everybody involved, but the process is sound.

Schrepfer: How much of this defensiveness has been due to conflicts with the Park Service and fear of the various government reorganization proposals that have been advanced?

Robinson: It has been noisy at times, but I don't think it had any harmful effect. In fact, the existence of the Park Service as a separate organization, up to the present time anyway, has been desirable because the Forest Service has always recognized that the pressure can get to a point where a large piece of forest is turned over to the park. So they have to do a better job in terms of recreation and scenic preservation, or otherwise they are going to lose more and more to the Park Service. Your Kings Canyon situation was exactly that. That is what the battle was about.

Kings Canyon National Park

Schrepfer: Were you involved in the Kings Canyon controversy?

Robinson: Yes. I was on the board of directors of the Sierra Club at the time and was quite actively involved.

Schrepfer: I understand that, in order to get local support for the Park Service, Harold Ickes made a deal with local interests.

Robinson: Well, let me put it this way; my involvement in it was to analyze the pros and cons. Then there was a meeting of the California legislature sitting as a committee-of-the-whole, I think it was the Assembly, and I testified there. At that time the Forest Service had far better public relations through contacts with the local groups, and they got a resolution through opposing the transfer.

Now, in the populated area surrounding Fresno the public opinion picture was relatively simple. There is an overwhelming determination that sufficient reservoir sites should be preserved so as to fully utilize the water of the Kings for irrigation. At the same time they thought it was desirable to have a national park, provided there was that compromise that insured that there would be no interference with any actual needs for reservoir purposes to support irrigation. That was the general public opinion down in the Fresno area.

The difficulty was that the Park Service originally wanted to include the reservoir sites--the principle one on the South Fork of the Kings River and Simpson Meadow and the Tehipite Valley on the Middle Fork. This had to be compromised out. And Ickes did compromise it out. On the basis of that compromise, the question came back to the Sierra Club board of directors, Would we endorse that proposal that had been worked out? And we decided at that time to favor the idea of creating the national park then, without the necessary reservoir sites, postponing the question of the inclusion of the sites for final solution sometime in the future. That was the final settlement Ickes made on that battle.

There was another battle, too. I was one of those who battled against the boundary lines submitted to us on the basis that they followed section lines and not natural boundaries. The board of directors had a dinner with Secretary Ickes. We were firm on the proposition that section lines may sound useful to some

people drawing boundaries back in Washington but that they didn't make any sense on the ground, and he agreed with us. He went back and told them to revamp the boundary line. We suggested where we thought the boundary lines should be. He had the boundary lines redrawn, and then we, the Sierra Club, endorsed the proposal.

Schrepfer: Not all of the preservationist groups supported the bill?

Robinson: That is correct. As I recall, the National Parks Association did not. In all these matters you come up with the conflict between the purist and those who simply say, if we can't get all the loaf, let's take three-quarters of it. And I'm of the second type. Rather than nothing, I'd rather take three-quarters of the loaf and postpone for the future whether we get the other quarter.

We have gotten the other quarter, of course, in Kings Canyon. It has worked out fine. But the purists were opposed to it because the lines weren't drawn correctly.

They felt that a decision could be rammed down the throats of those who believed that irrigation was indispensable for the economy of the Fresno area. It just couldn't be rammed down their throats. Nobody making speeches back in Washington and saying I am the president of the National Parks Association could possibly get the votes in Congress!

Schrepfer: So you think that if you had not compromised the park would not have been created.

Robinson: Absolutely. Without the compromise it would not have gone through Congress. Remember the compromise received the support of the local congressmen, which meant a bigger block of votes than any other support could possibly mean in Congress.

The Irascible Harold Ickes

Schrepfer: What was your opinion of Harold Ickes?

Robinson: I thought that he was a very capable fellow. He was an irascible individual when he wanted to be, and he was very pleasant other times. Now around the dinner table when we were discussing the boundaries, there was no attempt to ram anything down our throats. It was an open discussion. We tried to keenly analyze the difficulties that might arise on somewhat vague boundaries; when you follow along the top of a ridge, at least for fifty feet the boundaries are bound to be somewhat vague. The whole thing was very friendly, and he said, "Okay fellows, you're right." At the same time if he wanted to make a talk about the forty families or something like that, he, with his legal training, knew that you came out with overemphasis to try and tear the opposition apart.

As far as organization is concerned, I think that he was one of the few secretaries of the Interior who maintained control on policy matters over the various bureaus. There is a great tendency in our government for bureaus to follow the quip that secretaries come and secretaries go, but bureaus go on forever. The bureaus insist frequently on their right to do as they please, irrespective of what the secretary, who is their boss, decides is the proper policy. Ickes made it perfectly clear that any bureau chief who didn't follow his explicit orders on matters of policy was fired. But in carrying out the orders, he did not try to interfere with the details. I felt that he was a good manager, a good executive.

Schrepfer: Did he use very strong language when you heard him speak?

Robinson: I'd put it this way; he used strong language when he felt strong language was appropriate. And he would use very mild, thoughtful language if he felt that was appropriate.

Departmental Reorganization Proposals

Schrepfer: What was your opinion, at the time, of his organization proposal and the idea of moving the Forest Service into the Department of the Interior?

Robinson: As a part of a total reorganization, I've always believed in having a few super-departments, instead of our break up. The first one that I was quite interested in, having served in two wars, was a consolidation of the Army and Navy and Air Force into the Department of the Defense. There's what I would call a logical super-organization or super-cabinet setup. We need another one. The exact boundaries of it I don't know. Certainly the Nixon proposal, which is not a new proposal, for a department of natural resources is perfectly logical.

Schrepfer: Don't you think it will destroy the Forest Service's esprit de corps?

Robinson: I don't think that it will do anything of the kind. The Forest Service was once in the Department of the Interior, but because of the battles between Ballinger and Pinchot, it got transferred to Agriculture. Both men were considered valuable by the President, and he wanted to keep them both. I think that the Forest Service, as a well-organized bureau, would function just about the same as it does now even if placed within a department of natural resources.

I do not think that they would even have to lose their work with private forestry, because their professional competence in raising trees is more important than the theoretical viewpoint that Agriculture should take care of all crops. There is a big difference between a hundred-year tree crop and a crop of corn. I would think that professional competence would indicate that that phase of assistance to our production of timber is basically different in terms of the professional competence required than the work of the Department of Agriculture in connection with crops and so forth. But if they are all put together, as it is now indicated by putting Butz in as the super cabinet-man, why, then there is no real conflict.

Schrepfer: The reorganization proposals of the 1930s would have moved the Forest Service into Interior as

an existing organization.

Robinson: I think that it was inadequate. I felt that it was a good step, but just moving one bureau into another department did not accomplish the main purpose. We need a department of natural resources that decides what is the best use of our land resources for all their multiple purposes.

I think the Nixon proposal is sound. Now, of course, there will be any number of questions as to exact jurisdiction. But those can always be worked out. The basic principle that we need to look at our total land resources as a single overall problem, no matter how many bureaus are involved, I think is sound. We needed to look, not at the Navy and the Army as different organizations, but rather at our total national security problem. Similarly, we need something in terms of looking at the cities as a whole, not as a whole bunch of different organizations each trying to run its own program.

Olympic National Park Threatened

Schrepfer: Let's go on to the Olympic National Park controversy. The issue was the removal of some of the rain forest in order that it could be logged by local companies?

Robinson: My major participation in that was to testify before a committee hearing of the House of Representative on the Olympic National Park. So I went up with my wife, and I hiked over a good deal of the park. Along the Bogachiel River there was an interesting contrast between the areas that had been logged--they were outside the national park--that looked like the wrath of God had been directed to them and the areas that had not been.

I'm talking particularly about the bottom land, because the huge Sitka spruce, up to eight feet in diameter, gave somewhat the same effect as our redwoods and sequoias. This spruce needed to be preserved, but it was what the lumber industry was after. They wanted

a modification of the boundaries.

So I looked it over. The rain forest, with the moss hanging from the trees and the other things that were characteristic of a temperate-climate rain forest, was spectacular. It is probably the finest temperate-climate rain forest in the world. I felt that it should be preserved. I also felt that ultimately there should be a continuation, at least in strips, down to the coast, so that coastal dunes and some of the backwaters behind the dunes would all likewise be preserved; and I looked that area over.

From the standpoint of a lawyer looking at tactics, I was somewhat appalled when I had a good long talk with my friend Newton Drury. I had known Newton since he was an instructor in public speaking and I was a student at the University of California, so there was no formality in our discussion. He told me--and I don't think that it represented his own opinion--that they were working toward a compromise. I thought it over.

I came to the simple conclusion that I would take the full offensive for preserving the boundaries. If a compromise became necessary then, it could probably be made somewhat stiffer from the park's standpoint by somebody taking the offensive rather violently against the lumber companies. I had gathered statistics as to the way that they were cutting and getting out and not doing replanting. This was before the replanting law went into effect in the state of Washington. So I used all those statistics that I had gathered.

You might say I took the Harold Ickes viewpoint--lambaste them just as hard as you can and give them hell, which I did. I was rather surprised at the very courteous treatment that I got from the congressional committee. So that was my part in it.

Schrepfer: So you objected to the compromise bills?

Robinson: I objected to any compromise whatsoever. I took the viewpoint that the proper policy was to extend the park with narrow strips along the rivers down to the seashore and acquire the seashore. I believed that instead of backing up on the size of the park, there should be an expansion program and that the lumber interest had no right at all to demand more lumber until they took care of their own cut-over lands.

Schrepfer: This was your personal opinion as well as that of the club?

Robinson: Yes. I represented the club. The club had not gone into it in detail and pretty much left it up to me.

Schrepfer: Were you involved with this before they selected you to plead their case?

Robinson: Well, I was on the board of directors of the Sierra Club and was involved for the purpose of expanding the park system and not yielding, unless we couldn't do anything else. I wasn't given any detailed instructions from the board of directors, except to go up and represent the viewpoint of the club, which I knew.

Advisory Committee to the Department of the Interior

Schrepfer: At that time you were on the advisory committee to the Department of the Interior?

Robinson: It was about that time, because I came back from World War II in 1946, and very shortly after that the advisory committee was established. I'm just not sure whether it came up before the advisory committee or didn't.

Schrepfer: You don't have any recollection of being in a compromised position by representing the Sierra Club when the Department of the Interior had taken a different position?

Robinson: I never thought so, because I have always taken the position that an advisory committee should think independently. It is up to the responsible officer to take the advice or refuse it, but we should never pull punches.

I put one limitation on that. If I was on an advisory committee, and I have been on a number, I would never go out publicly and denounce the official to

whom we gave our advice. I would resign first if I felt that necessary, and I have never felt that was necessary. But in the committee operation, I have always felt that everybody should speak up, and whether the responsible agent agreed or disagreed was up to him. We were giving him advice as independent thinkers.

Schrepfer: How was it that you were selected to serve on this advisory committee?

Robinson: I think at that time I was president of the Sierra Club, because I became president for my usual two-year hitch shortly after returning from the war. I'm pretty sure that was the reason I was selected.

Schrepfer: Have other presidents served in such a capacity?

Robinson: No, I continued to represent, not the Sierra Club--I never felt I represented the Sierra Club, I was an independent agent on the advisory committee--but more or less to represent that type of thinking. So I remained on as a member during the Democratic administration. When Eisenhower came in, I was made chairman because I was a Republican, I think for no other reason.

Then after a while I realized that the advisory committee was ceasing to function properly. It was no longer fully independent. More and more when vacancies occurred, the new appointments were made from executive secretaries of national organizations. Whether you call them managers or executive secretaries, from the nature of their job they could not be independent. They had to merely speak for the organization. This group of the executive secretaries of national conservation and wildlife organizations actually began developing a separate channel with the secretary--holding special conferences with him.

We always sent in our resignations when a new secretary was appointed, a pro forma resignation, and I was asked what should be done about the committee. I recommended that it be abolished. You shouldn't have two advisory committees--one which was representing independent judgement and the other which, even though informal, was representing the collective and specific viewpoints of the conservation organizations speaking through their executive secretaries. There

was no need of two of them. And so it was abolished.

Schrepfer: Who else was on the advisory committee, as a general rule?

Robinson: It started with the majority being independent. In other words, they were not executive secretaries of national conservation organizations. By the time that I recommended the abolition, the membership was primarily executive secretaries of national conservation organizations.

Schrepfer: Didn't they have any advisory members from industry?

Robinson: No. This was a conservation advisory group. They had other groups from industry.

Schrepfer: So in some sense you represented advisory pressure groups?

Robinson: Exactly. I would say the advisory committee represented the broad field of conservation thinking. But insofar as the majority in the original committee was concerned, they were under no obligation to follow any instructions from the board of directors of any organization. They were free to think and act and to look at the facts and see what the proper answer would be.

Schrepfer: Do you recall approximately when the committee was abolished?

Robinson: It was during the Eisenhower administration because it had shifted from Truman to Eisenhower, from Democratic to Republican. Although Interior was a nonpartisan committee, they saw to it that the chairman under the Democratic administration was a Democrat and the chairman under the Republican administration was a Republican. Otherwise there was no attempt for political appoints.

Park Service Director, Newton B. Drury

Schrepfer: During the Olympic crisis, Newton Drury must have been under some type of pressure.

Robinson: I think he was.

Schrepfer: And it must have been from the secretary of the Interior.

Robinson: Well let's put it this way; I came to the simple conclusion talking with Newton that he was under orders he didn't admit, and I didn't try to pressure him on it.

Schrepfer: From the Forest Service I've heard that the secretaries of the Interior have, by and large, been political appointment as opposed to the secretaries of Agriculture who have been professional people. Is there any substance in that allegation?

Robinson: I don't think so. I think that always the appointment of all secretaries is essentially political. That does not mean that they are just plain politicians, because a President wants to bring some competence to any of those big departments. But I think they are always political in the broad sense, not in the narrow sense.

Schrepfer: Doesn't it happen fairly frequently that there is a conflict between the director of the Parks Service and the secretary of the Interior? Didn't this happen to Newton Drury with Dinosaur National Monument?

Robinson: I don't know whether or not it was true with the Dinosaur. Let me say this; I assume that sometimes the secretary of the Interior overrules any bureau head, whether he is of the National Park Service or any one of the other bureaus. If you are going to have organization, after the bureau chief has had a chance to make his presentation, he must either accept the conclusion of the secretary or resign.

Schrepfer: I understood that Drury had had this conflict with the secretary over Dinosaur.

Robinson: I don't know. I heard rumors. You hear so many rumors that I don't even pay any attention to them.

Schrepfer: I had it in my mind that it was the issue of Dinosaur that ended his term as Park Service director.

Robinson: Well, everybody likes to talk about the secretary, but the basic conflict was between the Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation. Both of them are in the Department of the Interior, and Reclamation wanted dams wherever there was a good dam site. They were engineers who loved to build them, and the Park Service had different ideas on certain areas. Then it was all a question of which viewpoint was supported by the secretary.

I know on other things Newton Drury disagreed with the secretary. One, he did not want to establish the Roosevelt home under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. He thought it was not appropriate as a national park or monument.

Newton's thinking has been of national parks of the wild type. I know he was not totally happy, when he was the head of the California State Parks Commission, with the establishment of the Hearst home as a state park.

Schrepfer: And the roadside rests.

Robinson: Oh, he fought the roadside rests. His thinking was for the preservation of typical natural areas, not wilderness necessarily, but natural area. He just didn't seem to have any interest in these other phases, which I would call the part of our history that ought to be preserved.

Park Service Director, Horace Albright

Schrepfer: He and Horace Albright did not always agree on such matters.

Robinson: Horace has been a friend of mine since way, way back, and we have revived the friendship in connection with meetings of the Disney Conservation Committee. Horace, you see, is not a purist.

Schrepfer: No.

Robinson: Horace very definitely wants to look at the whole pattern, including secondary effects, and decide what in the long run is the best use of the land. He is not committed to the philosophic principle that we have to let nature take its course and that nature has the best answers. He fits in with the Rene Dubos viewpoint that man is the custodian of all the land and the natural resources and that he should intelligently intervene but should weigh all the consequences and all the secondary effects. He does not follow blindly some philosophic doctrine, like Barry Commoner, that says nature knows best. My thinking is lined up with Dubos and Horace Albright and has been from the beginning.

Schrepfer: I remember an exchange over the bears in Yellowstone.

Robinson: Yes.

Schrepfer: Did you agree with Albright?

Robinson: I agreed with Albright.

Schrepfer: I gather some people are saying now that, if they hadn't fed the bears, the bears would not be coming down and attacking the people. On the other hand, some are saying that if they had continued to feed the bears, they would not be having so much trouble with them getting into the trash now.

Robinson: Well, now, let me put it personally. I was in Yellowstone one summer, and I went up in the evening, like everybody did at Yellowstone, to watch the bear-feeding program. The bears--black bears and grizzlies--were feeding on what was the garbage. That wasn't natural but it was darned interesting. The interaction between the grizzly and the black bear was fascinating. Whenever a grizzly went over to take over a square yard of garbage, all the black bears got out of the way. There was a pecking order there.

It was extremely interesting just to watch them and to see the animals, instead of being told that there was some grizzly way, way back and that some of the scientists, like the Craighead brothers, might be able to see them if they spent enough days in there.

Why, we saw grizzlies, we saw black bears. I knew it was artificial, but it didn't bother me because it was so interesting.

Controlling Park Wildlife

Schrepfer: Would there be a problem maintaining the natural balance there? Would the bears increase in population because of this?

Robinson: My answer is a simple one. You cannot maintain a national park without game cropping where it is necessary, and the idea that nature maintains a balance in our national parks without huge areas all around is simply false.

I was in the middle of that battle over the north herd of the Yellowstone elk. We had 14,000 elk, and a large number of surveys set 5,000 as the maximum. They were simply destroying their own range. And they were in for a population collapse from starvation. In fact, it had already started.

The question came before the secretary's advisory committee, and we discussed it. There was overwhelming agreement that the population had to be cut down to the 5,000. But there was some disagreement as to the extent to which they could trap and move them away. Although they tried that, the elk seemed to know how to come back.

I advocated the use of hunters, making them unpaid deputies so you have control. That was tried, but it turned out to be a failure. The hunters wouldn't cooperate. The reason was simple. What the Park Service wanted was to eliminate a large percentage of the does and to keep the bucks with the big rack of horns because they were valuable for photographic and appreciation purposes. The Park Service wanted a large number of big bucks and merely an adequate number of does with calf. When you get starvation conditions you get a high percentage of the does not having calves and very few having two. So this was

the objective. But the hunters wouldn't cooperate. They wanted to shoot the big rack of horns and hang it up in their den.

So the Park Service then went to the process of trapping, to the extent that there was demand from the fish and game organizations of the surrounding states, and shooting the rest of them if they could give away the meat to the prisons and hospitals in the surrounding area. I think that that policy was one they have to follow.

This is not something that is solely applicable to the elk. In Africa, I found that one of the worst problems was the elephant. Down in two different areas, one was Savo, the elephant had increased in population under protection, to the extent that all trees that they could push over had been pushed over and the bark of all the bigger trees had been removed for food.

The baobab tree stores water in the trunk. It is a semi-desert tree, and the trunks will be eight or ten feet in diameter and smaller. It is very soft wood, and the elephants could rip that apart and chew up the portions of the wood they wanted, particularly the branches and the bark, and they were eliminating one of the most scenic parts of the park--these strange looking trees. They had just wrecked portions of the park. In the Savo part they went into a population collapse where they lost roughly half of the elephants, as I understand, from starvation. In other areas they cropped them.

I talked first to one of the local rangers of the park where they had this problem. He said, "We shoot a few elephants to provide food for the lions and so forth." I then talked to the chief ranger and said, "What do you really do?" "Oh," he says, "We do leave a few carcasses around, but primarily we advise all the surrounding villages and tribes that, if there is no poaching from their area, they will get elephant meat; if there is poaching from their area, they won't." "On that basis," he said, "we cut down on the poaching more than fifty percent."

It was a very practical solution. The men of the village slaughter the elephants, but the Park Service provided the trucks to haul the meat into the village.

They had a big feed, and they saw to it that there was no poaching in the portion of the park boundaries that was near their village.

Schrepfer: It sounds very practical.

FIVE GREAT CONSERVATION ISSUES OF THE 1950s AND 1960s

Dinosaur National Monument

Susan Schrepfer: Let's see, now, let's get back to Dinosaur.

Bestor Robinson: My participation with the Dinosaur consisted of going down, by boat, the Yampa and the Green, through the Dinosaur area, and hiking very extensively over the entire Echo Dam. I camped there, and I hiked all over to see what it was like and also went up to the top of the ridge to look over at the dam site. I came to the conclusion it simply wasn't needed.

I went also over the reports of Reclamation and found that their talk about the Echo Dam site being Utah's last water hole was false, because they had shown that under their principal plan, the diversion of water for Utah was to come from the Flaming Gorge Dam site, and not from Echo at all. So I simply came to the conclusion that there was no need for a dam at that location.

I also concluded that any further storage that was required to meet commitments under the Colorado River Compact for the lower states did not require Echo. Under their own studies, the Glen Canyon Dam could be increased by some ten million acre feet if they needed it over and above what has been built now. In other words, there were several levels.

So I came to the conclusion that the proper way to handle it was to make no objection with regard to the Flaming Gorge and to make no objection with regard to Glen Canyon, which was indespensible for meeting commitments of the upper basin to the lower basin under the Colorado River Compact. That way we were in a good position to prevent the dams from going in at Dinosaur. An attempt to be a purist and say no dams at all anywhere on the river would just lose.

In fact, I have checked with some of my congressmen friends, and they told me frankly that we would have to work out something that would take care of the needs of the lower basin states so that there would

not be the votes in Congress. I also went over the dam site for Flaming Gorge and decided it was not wrecking any unusually scenic area. It was a logical place for it. It would, of course, have recreation values as well as water-storage values.

Schrepfer: It would be a storage dam?

Robinson: Well, it would be storage and recreation. Flaming Gorge had been built several years back. It is above Echo, on the Green River.

Schrepfer: There was a proposal for a lower dam, too.

Robinson: Yes, that was to be a diversion dam, but it didn't look like it had any particular value unless Echo was put in.

Schrepfer: And did you recommend against the lower one?

Robinson: I don't know that I even took a position on it because I knew doggone well there was no need for it. The lower dam was Split Mountain.

I thought that if Echo was filled and Flaming Gorge was in, there would not be any need for the other. If the need was demonstrated, I was not going to get too far out of line on it, but I didn't think they would ever have a demonstrated need.

I went back to Washington to testify before the secretary against the Dinosaur development. I had gotten secretly, but not illegally, a copy of the data that had been developed on evaporation by Reclamation service in Salt Lake City. I argued that if there was any additional storage needed, you don't put in Echo, you simply increase the size of the Glen Canyon Dam.

In testimony before the congressional committee, the assistant secretary, taking his figures from Reclamation, used old, false figures that had been completely disproved by the new report that the Reclamation service had, which had come out of Salt Lake City. I also got the data from a parallel study on evaporation that one of the universities was doing, and that data roughly confirmed the figures of the Salt Lake City study. Reclamation was arguing that there would be low evaporation up at Echo and very high evaporation down at the Glen Canyon if they made any increase.

I don't know whether they thought everybody else was dumb. But I simply worked it out. I took their own figures on area and found that the additional ten million acre field would result in a certain small additional evaporation that was far less than the evaporation from their Echo site under their own figures.

When I brought that to the attention of the secretary, the assistant secretary had to change his testimony before the congressional hearing of the committee. But at first he changed it only part way, and then they found that they would have to change it a second time.

Chapman was the secretary at that time, and he told me that, by God if it wasn't for some political difficulties, he would fire the chief of the Reclamation service and several assistants for presenting false data to the head office. He was very embarrassed by having to change their figures twice. Well, having changed their figures twice they were sunk. The congressional committee just simply had no use at all for the testimony of the Reclamation service. So we won the battle!

Schrepfer: I recall mention of a secret report in the Sierra Club Bulletin.

Robinson: It hadn't been released to the public. I had gotten it without a public release. I imagine that all the users of water that were interested in the issue, had it. Being a conservationist, I was probably on the list that shouldn't receive it; but I did.

Schrepfer: The engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation were deliberately misrepresenting the situation?

Robinson: Yes. I had a very good friend who was one of the assistants in the secretary's office who told me, "First of all, you are going to win. Secondly, the reason is that these fellows have falsified, and knowingly falsified, their reports." He was mad as the dickens.

Schrepfer: They were that desperate to get the dam?

Robinson: I don't understand it, because they were competent engineers. They knew better. I used their

own figures on areas and proved that they were wrong. You see, my first attack was using their own figures and their own figures on evaporation, which proved that they were false; and that was the first retraction of testimony that the assistant secretary made. The second one was after I got this data on evaporation, I proved that they had to change it again. [Pause.]

I can't understand that they had done this. My first attack was based on the figures that they themselves had, that they published. Then the second one was based on a study that they had had for several months and still thought that nobody else had seen. From the technical standpoint, I just thought that those fellows were dumb.

Schrepfer: So it was the secretary of the Interior, then, who you talked to.

Robinson: I talked to him just briefly afterwards, but my main entree into the ideas of the secretary came from one of his assistants.

Schrepfer: He took a more open-minded view?

Robinson: He was a very honest engineer. He was the head man on the testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation before the congressional committee. He was a capable and thoroughly honorable engineer. He didn't review all the figures; he just assumed that these figures that the Bureau of Reclamation had come up with were accurate. He was mad as the devil, at what had been done.

Schrepfer: Was the club able to make use of your findings in their campaign?

Robinson: Our public campaign was based primarily on the principle of keeping dams out of the national parks unless there is no other alternative in the national interest. A dam should not be built in the parks merely because it is a good dam site. In other words, our public campaign was not basically on the figures. I don't mean to say that the figures didn't come out, but the basic campaign was to preserve the national parks as a national heritage.

Schrepfer: As I understand it, this was Dave Brower's first real national campaign.

Robinson: Yes. Dave did an excellent job there. He never did agree with me with regard to Glen Canyon. In fact, we had a showdown over the telephone. He wanted to oppose Glen Canyon. We had a meeting--I'm not sure whether it was of the executive committee or the local members of the board--out at Dick Leonard's house, and we got him on the telephone. At that time he was just given preemptory orders not to oppose Glen Canyon. You see, he was the purist who thought that it was important to take a purist stand even though you went down to defeat. And we were hinging our whole case on, go ahead and use Glen Canyon.

I went through Glen Canyon by float, partly by kayak but based on the floats. I came to the conclusion that if you didn't have Grand Canyon, then Glen Canyon should be preserved. But when you had Grand Canyon, the thing to do was to preserve Grand Canyon and let Glen Canyon be a storage and recreation reservoir as long as the Rainbow Bridge was preserved adequately.

Schrepfer: I gather from talking to Richard Leonard that he felt that, while a dam in Glen Canyon might be objectionable in some ways, to fight it would have made it impossible to win on any score.

The Grand Canyon of the Colorado

Robinson: That is correct. You see, Glen Canyon figures, not only in Dinosaur, which I pretty much covered, but in Grand Canyon. Now I, of course, have hiked clear across the Grand Canyon, have chased around on the edges by hiking, and have also gone where there were roads. Then, I was with a group that put the first motor boat down through the whole Grand Canyon.

Schrepfer: A motor boat?

Robinson: It was the first motor boat through. We had a different idea as to how it could be done, which worked out fine.

So we were faced then with a Senate document in which Reclamation proposed a dam--I'm talking about

Grand Canyon--at Marble Canyon and a dam at Bridge Canyon. From Marble Canyon they wanted to tunnel right through to Tapeats Creek; that way they would get a power drop of about a thousand feet over and above the height of Marble Canyon.

My main objection--I thought it was absolutely terrible--was the diversion of water so that the stream going through the finest part of Grand Canyon would be a creek instead of a river. Instead of it being a canyon that displayed the river that created the canyon, why, they would have a creek running down through a gravel bed. So I tried to figure out how we could win.

I asked some of my congressman friends to size up the situation, and they told me that we could not stop the whole project. There was a provision in the Grand Canyon Act that permitted reclamation dams. So the proposal of the Reclamation service conformed to the act creating Grand Canyon National Park. I was very much disturbed by the situation. According to the reports I had, the votes were there to put in some system of dams, and that would be below the Glen Canyon dam. We weren't opposing that; we had finally gotten that straightened out.

I thought the worst thing of all was the tunnel which bypassed the water in the main parts of Grand Canyon. Then I found out that the Marble Canyon dam was not economically feasible without that tunnel.

Bridge Canyon was the next one. I went through Bridge Canyon and also looked at it from above. I came to the conclusion that Bridge Canyon was the minimum damage to Grand Canyon. It's a rather second-rate canyon as you get down where the reservoir was proposed in Bridge Canyon.

So I tried to figure out what I thought was the proper tactical approach--not the beautiful theoretical one--but the tactical one we could win on. I figured out roughly by formula that Bridge Canyon would fill up with silt in twenty-seven and a half years. That is unless there is a dam upstream--a requirement met by Glen Canyon--and also a dam on the River Colorado, which, although it contributes a rather small flow, contributed one-quarter of the silt into the Colorado River.

I don't recall the details of the resolution that I fathered. But I did father a resolution--of course, it did get amended in conversation--from the Sierra Club that promised no opposition to Bridge Canyon dam provided there was first built a dam on the main stream, which would be Glen Canyon, to hold the silt there, and another dam on the Little Colorado, to hold silt from the Little Colorado, so as to not fill up the Bridge Canyon dam in twenty-seven and a half years.

Now the tactics there involved meeting the tactics of the Reclamation service. What they had been doing was always scheduling the downstream dam first; build that and then one of the big arguments that they would have with contributions of non-reimbursable funds would be the protection of the lower dam against siltation.

What I wanted to do was to reverse the process and force them to put in the two silt-retaining dams upstream. Then it would be questionable as to whether the Bridge Canyon Dam would be economically feasible, because they couldn't get a good portion of their funds out of protecting the Bridge Canyon dam from siltation. If you just reversed the order in which you constructed the dams, it would be economically infeasible to construct Bridge Canyon. If they built Glen first, the dam on the Little Colorado River would have no reimbursement value at all; it would be out of pocket.

Schrepfer: What is reimbursement value?

Robinson: You get your reimbursement from two sources. One is the sale of water for irrigation and for cities, and the other is from power. Now the dam on the Little Colorado River was not scheduled for power at all. It added nothing to the total water supply for the irrigationists or the city. It would be put in solely for the purpose of controlling silt. There was some value, of course, for recreation and water-based wildlife, but no reimbursement money.

So it appeared to me that the thinking in the Reclamation service was that they would build Bridge Canyon first. Then they would claim that they had to build the dam on the Colorado River, with no reimbursement possibilities, to keep Bridge from filling up. Then they would also build Glen Canyon--which

had some reimbursement because there would be power there--charging part of that to protect the lower dam at Bridge Canyon from siltation.

I just wanted to reverse the order, so they couldn't do that. That was the whole theory behind the resolution that was adopted by the Sierra Club. Dave Brower never understood the tactics of it. Being a purist, he objected to it. And that was his privilege; I had no objection, but I got the votes.

Then came a mana from heaven, because there was the possibility of diversion either by tunnel or by lift over the hump from Bridge Canyon into the Verde River and therefore down to Arizona. At Diamond Creek there is a fairly low pass; in fact, there is an old road down to Diamond Creek from the main highway that is up above the river. There was one proposal to put a tunnel through and just feed the Verde River into Phoenix and that area--the Salt River Valley. One proposal was a long tunnel, and another proposal was to pump it over.

This got California highly alerted and mad that they might lose some of the water that was essential to the Los Angeles area for domestic supply and to the Coachella Valley and Imperial Valley for irrigation. So then the battle started with a lawsuit before the Supreme Court on the division of the water between California and Arizona. That went on for some years, with the ex-judge of the district court, I believe, acting as master for the Supreme Court. You see, when a state sues a state, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction, but it doesn't have time to take all the evidence.

The mana from heaven was that, by resolution, the congressional committee put the whole proposal for dams on Grand Canyon on the shelf until the matter of the division of water between California and Arizona had been decided by the Supreme Court.

Well, by the time that was decided, three things had happened. The first was a far stronger public appeal for the preservation of our great scenic resources, like Grand Canyon. The second was a great increase in the efficiency of oil-fired, electric generating plants. Then, of course, the cost of dams had gone up. So the economics became very, very

doubtful. In fact, the economics became so doubtful that there was an abandonment, I don't mean officially, of any further attempts by Reclamation, or at least by the Department of the Interior, to put dams in Grand Canyon.

I was tickled that the whole thing worked out. But I had not anticipated this mana from heaven, as I call it, of the congressional committee putting the thing on the shelf for five years. So there is a difference between what I call the tactical approach to these problems and the purist approach. In this case the tactical won out.

Schrepfer: It wasn't a difference in opinion on what you wanted but how you would get what you wanted.

Robinson: What I wanted to get was no dams, that was the ultimate. But if we had to have a dam, I wanted it at Bridge Canyon, so as to preserve the mainstream, and no dam at Marble Canyon, no diversion of the water through the national park and coming out at Tapeats Creek.

Schrepfer: Wouldn't Bridge Canyon bring damage downstream by changing the flow?

Robinson: The two primary purposes of Bridge Canyon were as a power project and for the diversion of water into the Salt River Valley of Arizona.

Schrepfer: Would it have changed the Colorado through the canyon?

Robinson: In the lower part of the canyon but the less scenic part of it. If you had to give up any part of the canyon, that would be the part to give up. And it actually had a great deal of recreational value, which you just can't dismiss because water recreation is valuable and the location of Bridge Canyon Dam was such that the water level of Lake Mead--when it was full--would be twenty feet deep at the foot of Bridge Canyon Dam. So that you actually use motor boats up to a point just below the Bridge Canyon Dam, then a truck road to the top of Bridge Canyon, and then go up the long Bridge Canyon Dam--all as a part of one recreational vacation. Now that alone would not justify, but it was a factor. And in trying to weigh these factors, I took that into consideration, making it the

least objectionable dam but not one that was desired in principle.

Schrepfer: What was the opinion of the rest of the club directors?

Robinson: Oh, I got a majority vote. I don't think it was unanimous. But it was a decisive majority. This was a question of tactical maneuvering as against the purist position. This division crops up time and time again.

Schrepfer: That it does.

The Art of the Possible: Cascades National Park

Schrepfer: Well, shall we go on to the Cascades? A basic question in the Cascades controversy is whether the Forest Service was actually more stubborn than necessary or the Park Service too demanding?

Robinson: Oh, I think these were just the two natural viewpoints. Before this something was tried that I certainly supported; consultants would go out and try to figure the wisest possible division of land between the Park Service and the Forest Service. The position of the Forest Service was that they wanted to give up nothing, if possible, and as little as possible if they had to give up something. The Park Service wanted the whole area to be a national park.

When the consultants' report came out and there was administrative support for the combination that they finally worked out, then I personally felt that, except for some adjustments in boundaries, this was a feasible way to preserve the area for the appropriate recreational use. If you blasted too hard against this compromise, you would end up with nothing.

Personally I would have preferred to see a much larger park, but there comes a time when you decide that you are going to go down to glorious defeat or you are going to get a workable system that isn't ideal.

So I supported the basic idea of division with changes of the boundaries.

Schrepfer: Did most of the other directors of the Sierra Club agree with your position?

Robinson: No. I think they wanted more park. This was a personal viewpoint. I don't know whether or not we had passed resolutions. I guess I was still on the board; if so I certainly would have voted for more park. But at the same time I recognized that, when the chips were down, you better just stop the opposition and let it go through.

Schrepfer: Do you remember giving any advice to the secretary of the Interior or testifying at all?

Robinson: I don't recall any advice to the secretary of the Interior, and I know that I did not testify.

Schrepfer: There were people who believed that if the Forest Service had proved more cooperative, the conservation groups, including the Sierra Club, would really have preferred to see the area as a wilderness area, rather than a park.

Robinson: Oh, that was a tangential viewpoint that was expressed. But, as far as I'm concerned, the basic conflict was, Who is going to run it? Was it going to be Forest Service property or Park Service property?

Schrepfer: Wasn't there some feeling that the Park Service sometimes overdeveloped and that a wilderness area might be preferable?

Robinson: Yes. But it was one of those tangential points. You've got a fundamental conflict. Every service is an empire builder, so the Park Service wants to get as much park land as it can, and the Forest Service wants it to get none, if possible. There is your basic conflict. Then you have all these tangential arguments: Who is going to do the best job? or, If somebody had done a better job in the past, why, there wouldn't be opposition. I think these are tangential; I don't think they are the ones that determine the action that is taken.

Schrepfer: Perhaps, however, the Forest Service would not have had to give up that land or the support of

some of the conservation groups.

Robinson: You can always get into speculation. I don't know whether it would have been possible at all. In fact, I doubt very much that there would not have been pressure for a national park, because the National Park Service was promoting it. Also, you have certain areas there that warranted national park classification. So the National Park Service's stimulation of a program to establish a Cascades National Park would have continued and would have gotten, not necessarily unanimous, but very strong support from conservation organizations because there is a natural alliance there.

Schrepfer: Do you recall anything about J. Herbert Stone's role in the question?

Robinson: Well, I know Herb Stone. He was a very capable administrator, but I have always felt that Herb Stone in trying to balance out the pros and cons, was very timber-oriented. That didn't mean a hundred and one percent, but timber counted with him far more than it did with the regional foresters under whom I worked here in California. I thought Stone's was an honest opinion. I disagreed with him.

Schrepfer: I suppose it was natural to be more timber-oriented up there than it was here in California where watershed and recreational problems are so much more significant than timber production.

Robinson: Well, in Region 5 we have tremendous recreational pressures on our national forests. That does not exist to the same extent up in Oregon and Washington. So it is only natural that you weigh more heavily the recreational uses in California.

Schrepfer: Did Stone's handling of the issue have any impact on his career?

Robinson: I don't think he had any real chance for advancement to chief of the Forest Service simply because there was no retirement coming up at that time, and that is about the only advance a regional forester can get. He usually retires as regional forester unless there is an opening for chief. If there is an opening for chief, he might be advanced if he is not too old.

For the last advancement to chief, they took John McQuire, who was the head of Research out here in Region 5 and who I knew very well. They brought him in as the assistant chief of the Forest Service. He turned out to be an expert administrator of the whole service--something he had proved in the smaller field of research administration--and he was moved up.

My recollection is that Stone retired, and then Charlie Connaughton went up there. I talked to Charlie Connaughton about it and he said, "They just put the pressure on me to go up there until I reached retirement age to see if I couldn't do something about stopping the vigorous criticism of the Forest Service in the Northwest." There was no question why he was assigned up there.

Redwood National Park

Schrepfer: Were you at all involved in the Redwood National Park controversy?

Robinson: I have been very much interested in redwoods. My folks had a summer home up in the redwoods since 1925. Then in 1940 I built a home there when my mother suggested that the four grandchildren were underfoot when my wife and I went off on a camping trip. I still have it. With my brother and sister, we put up the money for a grove for my parents when they passed away. So I was interested in the redwoods, and because of my contacts in the area through my summer home there I knew a great deal about the attitude of the lumbermen and the people up there that were not lumbermen--there was a split.

Newton Drury had the idea that the best national park was one that covered a complete watershed, so his advocacy was the Mill Creek watershed. It was a perfectly good national park. But the survey that was made for the National Park Service, with supplements, was the basis of the Sierra Club's idea of where the national park should be. I favored the Sierra Club's position rather than that of the Save-the-Redwoods

League.

Then the real question was, How much can you get by with? There was the money problem. There was also the problem of the extent of the opposition, not just of the local industry, but all their friends in the total lumber industry who would naturally support their viewpoint. There was also the problem of how much of the purchase unit belonging to the Forest Service would be included in the park.

I decided that some compromises had to come about or we were not going to get a redwood park. With the Forest Service Advisory Committee, I urged that the Forest Service determine the areas that were really desirable for a park and the areas that were necessary for their scientific studies on different methods of lumbering in the redwood areas--shelter wood, selective cutting, patch cutting--and that they should insist on the retention of those and there was nothing much they could do about the rest of it.

I had known Tommy Kuchel, senator then, from the time he was assemblyman. So Tommy Kuchel and I had some correspondence on the possible compromises, and he worked out the compromise on boundaries. They were really his ideas. I threw out some ideas at him, but basically he had to figure out what was the most you could get by with, and that was the Kuchel compromise.

Schrepfer: You mentioned that you had spent a lot of time in the redwood area. I gather there was a lot of public pressure to disapprove of the park.

Robinson: Oh, the overwhelming public opinion in Humboldt County, since the primary industry was timber, was against the park. There were some people who favored it up there, but they were a minority.

Schrepfer: I did some interviews up there at the time, and the people who favored the park felt a lot of pressure, from some of the unions and this type of thing.

Robinson: Oh, anybody who relied on public patronage had to be against it. Even one of my close friends and neighbor, a dentist in Fortuna, was against it. I sort of softened him in discussion over drinks. But he couldn't take a position in favor of the park. There would just have been a lot of his patients who

would find another dentist. Feeling was strong up there. Between what you call the Chamber of Commerce group and the labor group, there wasn't any effective organized support for the park. A lot of individuals, I think, felt that the park was a good idea just because they had that attitude, but they weren't going to stick their necks out.

Schrepfer: In reality, do you think the park hurt the local area that much? Even if more acreage had been put in, would it have hurt the local economy seriously?

Robinson: Yes, at least for a temporary period the park hurts the economy, because it withdraws the redwoods from economic utilization. In the long run I think it will be a benefit through the tourist industry. Before that becomes fully realized, however, we will have to have a four-lane freeway through the entire area, because they are reaching traffic jam situations on some of the two-way highways now.

Schrepfer: Do you think the lumber companies really lost out because of the park?

Robinson: I don't think so. I think the lumber companies got a fair price.

Schrepfer: More than fair?

Robinson: I think probably fair. It is one of those tough problems. I think that if they had been able to hold the redwoods, with this tremendous increase in the sales price of redwoods, they would probably have made more out of the redwoods than the sales price for the park. But as of the market at the time, I think they received a fair price.

Schrepfer: Actually, as I recall, only about five thousand acres of the park was unlogged. The vast majority had been cut once.

Robinson: Much of it was second growth. But in some of those areas that had virgin timber in the flats, there were big trees and an awful lot of board feet per acre.

Schrepfer: How would you evaluate the position of the various companies in the course of the crisis?

Robinson: I think all of them were opposed to the national

park.

Schrepfer: Arcata and Georgia-Pacific were the major companies involved.

Robinson: Arcata, as far as I am concerned, was doing a terrible job. Our Forest Service Advisory Committee was up there, looking over some of the areas that Arcata had denuded. Our forestry representative, who is the head of one of the big lumber companies in the Pacific, said that this was terrible. He couldn't understand how any company could do such a terrible job right alongside a highway.

Schrepfer: Were the lumber companies united in their opposition?

Robinson: Oh, I suppose, there was a lot of inside maneuvering as to who was going to lose the land and how they could shove the boundaries around. But the general pattern as far as congressional action was concerned was that the redwood lumber companies were opposed and they had the support of the lumber industry in the United States. It is that simple.

Schrepfer: With the power of the lumber interests in the United States, it is surprising that they lost.

Robinson: No, they lost because of the strong public opinion supporting the idea that the national park system should include the redwoods. Now, the public interest throughout the United States was not particularly interested in where the park should be--that would be up to the Park Service--but they wanted a national park. And the support that was given by national magazines, such as the National Geographic, was of tremendous importance.

Not on that matter, but on a similar matter--a reclamation matter--involving the parks, I was talking one time to a congressman from upper New York. He laughed and said, "Well, I'm against this particular reclamation matter." I said, "Why?" He said, "Well, usually if the western states want a reclamation project, I'll go along in the hopes that I will pick up some votes from the westerners on something I am interested in." "But," he says, "what do you do when the women who are the wives of my local supporters and the members of the local garden club and so forth come

in and say, 'John, you can't vote for that, that should be preserved.'?" He said, "I don't vote for it." [Laughter.] That is the kind of action that took place in other parts of the United States.

Schrepfer: Don't you think it would have been much better if the Sierra Club and the Save-the-Redwoods League had been able to get together, even if one of them had had to sacrifice their position?

Robinson: It would have speeded things up. But I don't think it would have substantially changed the program. You see, they both supported the final compromise bill that Senator Kuchel worked out. They talked about how they both wanted more here and there, but they both supported the bill. So as far as the congressmen were concerned, it was a national park proposal supported by the two leading conservation organizations of California and a senator from California working out the compromise. So as far as the rest of the votes were concerned, this was the national park.

Schrepfer: If they had agreed before the final compromise, would they have been in a stronger position in relation to the lumber companies and have gotten a larger park in the end?

Robinson: I doubt it. I think the compromise bill was worked out realistically by Kuchel, trying to evaluate the dollar cost, the opposition of the lumber interests, as against the national park idea and its supporters. That was the compromise he was making.

Schrepfer: The league's plan would not have been that much more expensive than the final park.

Robinson: You had to have a compromise. If you get a large industry, with tie-ins with the national chamber of commerce and that group, opposing something, then you have to bring it down into something within reasonable cost, in order to get the votes of congressmen and senators who are cost conscious. There is your big swing block of votes; it's the group that says, sure, we want a redwood national park, but can we afford to put in that many millions of dollars.

Schrepfer: What is your opinion of the national park as finally constituted?

Robinson: It is a good park. It will be better if they can add some additional areas, such as Dead Man Creek. These areas would make it better, but they are not indispensable to it being a good park.

Schrepfer: Doesn't it violate some watershed principles?

Robinson: Well, I don't see that there are any principles involved in this so-called watershed argument. This is Newton Drury. He argues that if you have the entire watershed you have greater control over the flow of streams and so forth. And I agree with him. But I don't think it is a principle. I think it is one of those instances when you have to weigh the pros and cons. You can have a perfectly good redwood park without having the total watershed.

Schrepfer: I guess Newton Drury got his fingers burned pretty badly with Bull Creek flooding.

Robinson: That was the denuding of the watershed. It was also very unfortunate that, with the denuding of the watershed, the best way to preserve the trees was to build a dam where it was recommended by some of the engineers, above the beautiful redwoods. You did not have to classify the area as a park but rather as a recreation area and you would have had a nice water recreation spot as well as taking the top off the flood.

But the park people did not like that idea. For some reason they had not gotten used to the idea that you can classify an artificial body of water as a recreation area, like they have up at Benbow right now. They are now accustomed to the idea. I don't know if the cost would have been prohibitive, but I went over the area with park people and others, at Bull Creek, and I could not see any objection to this cut-over, God-forsaken land being occupied by a reservoir. It was not redwood country. It was denuded.

Schrepfer: I had not heard much about this dam proposal.

Robinson: It was a definite reconnaissance study; it wasn't a detailed planning of the dam. But the building of the dam would have taken the top off of the flood. It was a rather interesting design because they were going to make the front of the dam irregular as though it were sort of a natural rock dike.

Schrepfer: This was after the 1955 flood, but before the 1964 flood?

Robinson: Yes.

Schrepfer: Did the league take a position on it or just the California park service?

Robinson: The park service rejected it so firmly that it never came to life again. That was the time Newton Drury was the head of the state park service. Newton is a very capable man. He is a purist, not to the extent of David Brower, but he also is a purist.

Schrepfer: It was a state proposal?

Robinson: It came from the state. Someone from the state was called in for flood control and came up with this answer.

Schrepfer: Now they are acquiring all the land in the watershed.

Robinson: And if they do not have a good flood before they can restock the watershed with timber, they will be in pretty good shape. But the net result has also been that they have all this cribbing in there, with wire and so forth, to prevent a further widening of the channel. It looks like the devil. They have probably dumped dirt on it by now.

You can see, I am just not a purist. It doesn't bother me at all to say that, if you want a dam above the beautiful redwoods, okay if you fix it up so it has good recreation value and fishing value and let it out in the wintertime so you can use it for flood control.

Schrepfer: How about the access for recreation? Over the ridges?

Robinson: It would be perfect, up the regular road that goes through the park. It is still a public road. Ultimately they will plan for locating it outside the flat. It goes right through the flat and goes up to a pass and drops down on the ocean side of the ridge. It is still used for lumber trucks. So there would have been no problem with the road. The ultimate plan would have been a park road gaining gradually

in altitude so they could bring their boats and such in.

Schrepfer: One of the things I hear repeatedly is a denunciation of The Last Redwoods. What was your feeling about the book?

Robinson: My only objection was the title, because I think you lose more than you gain by using a title that overstates rather than understates your position.

Schrepfer: What was your feeling about the Sierra Club's redwood campaign?

Robinson: Oh, I thought it was good. I thought it was overstated, but this doesn't bother me because you know that the lumber companies are going to overstate their position. So it doesn't bother me to overstate as long as you don't get into a spot where you can't defend your position without being foolish, and to say that these are the last redwoods just was not correct. You already had substantial areas in state parks, and the title indicates that you are not even going to have second growth, and we had plenty of that.

Schrepfer: Were there people in the club, particularly the directors and other leaders, who would have preferred to go along with the Save-the-Redwoods League, or was there ever any internal discussion?

Robinson: I don't think there was any great internal discussion except urgings to find some basis for getting together because the lay-out was pretty much left to Ed Wayburn, who was the man on it. The club was not going to scrap his position, except as the thing evolved so that the club and the league finally had to support the compromise bill. Anybody who knew legislative process, knew that somebody would work out a compromise bill, and that both had to support it. It was just obvious. I don't think anybody wanted to interfere with Wayburn; let him see how good a compromise he could work out.

Schrepfer: You think that Redwood Creek was definitely superior to the plan to round out the Mill Creek area.

Robinson: Yes.

Schrepfer: On what basis?

Robinson: Primarily because that stretch up Redwood Creek, including the Tall Trees, is simply a very outstanding stretch of stream. Though you have some outstanding stream in Mill Creek, you don't have anything the equivalent of that stretch of Redwood Creek.

Schrepfer: Would you say that the redwoods themselves were superior in Redwood Creek?

Robinson: I would say, yes. The creek itself is superior. It is bigger.

Schrepfer: Yes. I gathered that one of the feelings paramount in the minds of those of the club was the emphasis upon the size of the Redwood Creek area, making it a better potential wilderness area. But hadn't there been a significant amount of logging there?

Robinson: Oh yes, there had been logging up Redwood Creek. One thing about redwoods in that well-watered country, if you keep fire out, why, your stump sprouts make it green again in a few years.

Schrepfer: What about the Forest Service? Do you feel that they were successfully administering the Redwood Purchase Unit?

Robinson: I have no quarrel with their administration. What they are trying to do--and to me it is very important--is to find the best way to cut redwoods with a view to their regeneration as a continuing redwood product. I went all over that operation with our advisory council and, of course, the professional foresters, and I thought they were doing a very good job. This wasn't for scenery; it was for silviculture.

Schrepfer: I understand that they were using the same cutting cycle as the surrounding lumber companies were.

Robinson: The idea of the cutting cycle was flexible. You can make your best guess as to the cutting cycle in order to determine how much you are going to cut. Suppose you have a whole hundred thousand acres of forested territory and you say, well, this is a hundred-year cycle, then you use a thousand acres each year. But we must remember that the cutting cycle is subject to variation. They might, in other words, find it is a hundred and twenty years and start slowing down. Or they might find that with a little bit of fertilizing

or some other process they can reduce it to eighty years, and so they would increase the cut. So the cutting cycle is something that can be perfected with years of experience.

Schrepfer: Why then did they lose the purchase unit if they actually had a successful system developed?

Robinson: Because that was a compromise bill.

Schrepfer: But they must have been vulnerable at some point.

Robinson: It was not that they were vulnerable, it was simply a determination that certain virgin stands would find their highest use as a part of the national park rather than as a commercial cutting area.

Schrepfer: But most of it went to the lumber companies.

Robinson: Well, the purchase unit situation was a funny one. Although there was one big block of it north of the Klamath River, there were also some scattered chunks of it south. I felt, although the Forest Service did not, that it was a rather small area anyway, too small for efficient forestry administration. I thought the experiments they were carrying out were desirable. It did not hurt my feelings at all to use it for trading purposes, because you are up against the problem again of how much it would cost, and that it votes in Congress. Besides it made some more lumber available to the area. All I want to know is if the swap is a good one from the point of the best utilization of the resource.

Schrepfer: I gather that now that the park has been created, there is some opposition to the idea of transferring the state parks to the national government.

Robinson: Oh, I think that is a matter of bargaining. I have talked to Ike Livermore on it, and it is just a matter of Yankee horse trading.

Schrepfer: You think that eventually they will do it.

Robinson: Yes. I think Ike is right; he wants to know what can we get from the federal government in the way of state parks, like the big beaches that they own on some of their military reservations, or some of the

Bureau of Land Management lands that ought to be part of a wilderness area. His viewpoint is one of making a good Yankee horse trade. Meanwhile, it will still be park whether state or federal.

Land-Use Planning: Mineral King

Schrepfer: Shall we go on to Mineral King, an issue in which you played a prominent role?

Robinson: Yes. Well, my viewpoint on Mineral King has been one of land-use planning. My basic idea of land resources is that they should be used so as to contribute the most to the American way of life <u>and</u> its variations, because it is pluralistic. For that reason I've always felt that both skiing and wilderness camping were very valuable contributions to the American way of life and that we had to provide ski areas that were adequate and that would accommodate, by one process or another, the number of people who wanted to go skiing.

I had no use at all for the argument that there was something superior in the wilderness use and that the skiers should be considered a second-class use. To me they were both very valuable forms of outdoor recreation. Some people want to ski, and some want to camp in the wilderness. Others, like myself, wanted to do both. And I had no use at all for the argument that some corporation is going to make money, as if the conflict on Mineral King was between the Disney Corporation making money and the campers in Mineral King being purists.

I looked over a good deal of the Sierra. I had skied over most of the length of the Sierra in the winter, camping out on the snow. I had taken lots of trips back into the southern Sierra. What I was interested in was how we were going to accommodate this growing sport of skiing, something I had been in since 1919 when I came back from World War I, when skiing was considered a foolhardy sport that you were going to be killed in.

Let me say, also, that I had been active in the ski organizations. I have been on the board of directors of the California Ski Association, now the Far West. I was also on the board of directors of the National Ski Association; I was its first vice-president and chairman of its Committee on Equipment and Technique.

I was equally active in preserving wilderness. And my idea was, What portions of the Sierra Nevada can accommodate the most skiers so that we would not have a demand for every headwall of every river canyon to be devoted to skiing. I wanted the minimum number of areas that would accommodate the maximum number of skiers. You have a series of them around Tahoe and Donner Summit. Then you had another fine area, for southern California, in the Mammoth area, and it was capable of much expansion.

But on the west side of the southern Sierra, I could find no place that had the advantages of Mineral King, primarily because, instead of a single headwall, it branched out into a series of bowls. Its carrying capacity in terms of number of skiers was far greater than any other river head or headwall area that I knew of on the west slope of the Sierra.

Then there was the question of the scenic value, which should always be preserved. The canyon bottom was nothing distinctive at all. It was just a typical, rounded U-valley. It was not like Yosemite, which was an old lake that had filled up with a beautiful flat, or like Hetch Hetchy, which was the same thing and which was unfortunately covered with water by San Francisco. You had in Mineral King an ordinary valley. You had typical slopes; some of them fairly heavily timbered part way, but most of the slopes were fairly open, which made it desirable from a skiing standpoint without any very extensive cutting of the forest areas.

The mountains surrounding the area were typical High Sierra jagged peaks, and they were outstanding. It was one of the outstanding views, whether in summer or winter, afforded by the Mineral King valley. So it seemed to me that here was an ideal place for skiing as long as the village was constructed of something that I would call Tyrolienne village architecture, which is what is being proposed by the Disney people after some vigorous objections to another type of architecture

that they came in with first.

I thought that the second thing was that there should be no straight cutting of any of the timber. If you had to cut through the timber for a ski trail, it should be irregular; in other words, throw the transits away. Thirdly, the top of the ski lifts should never extend over the visual skyline, because the peaks were outstanding. I have never changed my viewpoint.

I also proposed that there should be no parking lot in the valley or hopefully even below it, but the Forest Service objected, though Disney was willing. The Forest Service insisted on a highway up to the bottom of the valley. They had reasons for it. I argued it out with them. The Disney people tried their best to accommodate parking by saying that, instead of a big parking lot in the floor of the valley, we will put a parking building in the bottom of the canyon, making it as unobtrusive as possible.

I still visualize the darnest parking jams after the lot was filled. Just how would you turn back a group of enthusiastic skiers in their car with their skis on top? You would have to have an army of highway patrolmen, and I don't think they would succeed. So you would end up with the darnest traffic jams when it came time to go home on Sunday night, whether they made the highway narrow or broad. And, of course, the idea was to make the highway as narrow as possible for conducting the traffic.

So I have always been for the idea that there should be a cog railroad. The Disney people planned a cog railroad from their parking building down in the canyon up to the village. So at least there would not have been a huge scar of a parking lot right in the floor of the valley. So I was very happy when the Forest Service relented on the idea of a parking building.

Schrepfer: Why did they want one?

Robinson: The argument was that you needed to have automobile access to the ski area so as to take care of the dear people who want to go up by automobile. My own viewpoint was, well, let them change their habits a little bit. I had seen what had occurred in Europe.

I had been on some of the cog railroads in the Alps. There was plenty of parking in the meadow lands, and then you go all the way up by cog railroad. And I had not seen any real objection.

In fact, with such a system you can control the number of people if you ever wanted to--although in fact I don't think it would ever be feasible--by simply saying, no more tickets, boys. But I don't think that would be feasible; I think you would just have to let them crowd in there.

So now I am doubly pleased about the way the thing sits. You will have a cog railroad from the bottom of the canyon all the way up. You have an attractive village planned--different kinds of roof lines and such--down in the bottom of the valley. So as far as I am concerned, the village will be more attractive than the floor of the valley is now. After all, Tyrolienne villages are very attractive; we take a lot of photographs of them.

The cog railroad is a good idea, and with the proper system of public ownership--although it will probably be operated by Disney as a matter of good operations--it won't cost any more to pay your way on the cog railroad than it would to pay for parking in this expensive concrete structure. So the cost would be the same.

One thing I am still insisting on is that the summer camp proposed in the Forest Service's original plan also be used as a winter camp. So those who can not afford the Disney winter rates can set their campsite and have access. They might need hot water, but that's all.

Schrepfer: Did you feel that the Forest Service's grant was legal?

Robinson: The total validity of the program involved, not only the question of acres, but also the question of a powerline into the canyon. There was a provision in the act creating Sequoia National Park that certain types of powerlines would not be allowed without express consent of Congress. Then there was the question of whether the road, when it went across the park, served a park purpose or whether it served only the purpose of bringing people into another facility, a Forest Service

facility. There were a number of such questions.

I felt that these were serious questions. So I had no quarrel with a Sierra Club suit being started to find out the answers to the legal questions. If I were sitting as a judge I would have answered all those questions in favor of the permit. But I knew they were close and could well result in a difference of opinion, as they did. The federal trial judge favored the Sierra Club viewpoint, and the circuit court of appeals overruled the club's viewpoint, which meant that there was a legitimate difference of opinion.

What I did quarrel with the Sierra Club on, was using these legal questions for stalling. They sent me a copy of the original complaint, and I wrote back a letter in which I said I hit the roof. "You have clearly not alleged at all," I said, "the point that gives you standing in court." All you have to say is that we have conducted trips there and plan to continue to conduct future trips there and our members use the camping facilities every year. That would give them clear standing in court. They made no such allegation.

The reply I got was that they wanted to test the idea as to whether or not a conservation organization without any special interest in the area could come in and have standing in court. I took the position that that was nuts, because you can always get on in by finding some local property owner or some local club that does have this special interest. So all they were doing was stalling. There was no reply by the club to that comment of mine.

What they did, through the expenditure of time and money, was test their standing in court. The trial judge in the district court said they had standing. By a two to three decision the circuit court of appeals said that they did not have standing. The U.S. Supreme Court, by a split decision, decided that they did not have standing. As far as results are concerned, all that time and money were wasted.

They, of course, amended their complaint to put in the allegations that I urged them to put in origially that give them standing in court. So now they are getting around to the points that have meritorious arguments. They are at a disadvantage because the circuit court, though split on the question of standing,

was unanimous that there was no merit to the various legal points involved.

Under the technicalities of procedure those points can be raised again, simply because the original decision was on an injunction and not theoretically on the merits. So they just decided that the injunction should not have issued. That does not decide the issue conclusively. Even though the injunction doesn't issue, there can be a decision on the merits. My objection is that they wasted all this time and money, which was not the way a responsible organization should behave.

Schrepfer: It was a stall?

Robinson: I think it was.

Schrepfer: Did they think that perhaps Disney would give up?

Robinson: Maybe they dreamed it, but Disney simply said it will cost more to put in the improvements, so the rates will have to be higher. But with the increase in the gross national product, they can pay the higher rates. The rates are controlled by the Forest Service and would be based upon a reasonable return on the capital investment plus operating costs.

Schrepfer: Did not the Sierra Club originally take a stand favoring the development of Mineral King?

Robinson: It did. When it came up again there had been a lot of changes in personnel. The second time it came up, all the past presidents on the board favored the Disney proposal. But it was not a majority of the board. The vote was badly split. The newer members of the board decided they had a right to look at it from the new viewpoint of the Sierra Club, and that was a majority.

Schrepfer: One of the History Committee members interviewed Harold Crowe. He felt somewhat bitterly that the Sierra Club had given its word and then gone back on it.

Robinson: Yes, he felt that very strongly. Some of the rest of us never changed our viewpoint that this was desirable as the best use of the area. I also thought that the Sierra Club was losing standing with

the governmental organizations when it would approve a particular proposal and then turn around and disapprove it when action was about to be taken on it. It was not the way to develop responsible relations with governmental agencies.

Schrepfer: Didn't they do more than approve it? Didn't they almost suggest it? I understood that several members of the club conducted a survey of the Sierra Nevada looking for the best area for a ski development and decided upon Mineral King.

Robinson: I don't know the words. The decision was simple. It was simply that this was a logical place for the location of a ski area.

Schrepfer: Disney had not come to them at that time.

Robinson: No, definitely not. As I recall, for several years there was a definite question as to where ski resorts should be located. One of the proposals in the south was the utilization of Mount San Gorgonio. So we did have a real study--a study in the form of a lengthy discussion, because most of us knew the country very well--of where the southern Californians should ski. Obviously, on one side of the Sierra you have Mammoth, and Mineral King was the logical place on the other side as soon as the number of skiers warranted its development.

Then the question came before the advisory committee of the Forest Service as to whether or not they should put out a prospectus with regard to the development. Being sort of the recreation member on that committee, I strongly advocated that they should put out a prospectus but retain very firm control over design and rates. So they put out the prospectus. There were a number of people who wanted to get in on it and submitted proposals. It got down to two, of which Disney was one. Disney was selected as adequately financed, with evidence of the most responsibility in wanting to do a good job in conservation.

Schrepfer: How is it that you became a member of the Disney advisory committee?

Robinson: They wanted to set up an advisory committee and actually talked to me about it. I said I would go on it. Then they asked various others. In fact, they

talked to me first about it, I think, because they thought I was a contact with the Forest Service and I had shown myself very strong for the development, under proper controls, of Mineral King. I suppose from that standpoint I was a natural candidate.

Schrepfer: Who were the other members?

Robinson: There's the former head of the National Park Service, Horace Albright. We did have on another former member of the Park Service, but his health is bad now and he hasn't appeared for a while now, so I guess he is off. We have Professor Craighead; he is the father of the two Craighead boys who have done so much up in Yellowstone. Then you have the executive secretary of the National Wildlife Association and the executive secretary of the American Forestry Association. So it is broadly based.

As a matter of history, when they set it up they asked me about having members of the U.S. Forest Service or National Park Service who were still on active duty. And I say, "Wrong." An advisory committee should never include members of the organization that they give advice to. It is perfectly all right to have them present and argue things out, but you can not have an advisory committee composed of personnel who accept or reject the advice. For the same reason there should be no one on it from Disney; of course, he is going to be there.

Schrepfer: Do you think that there is merit in the argument that Mineral King is not wilderness, anyhow?

Robinson: Mineral King is not roadless, no question of that.

Schrepfer: How about abandoned mines?

Robinson: There were certainly some abandoned mines and dumps that you can see, but they do not amount to much. It is not wilderness because it has road access. It would be called undeveloped camping country. I have another reason for this development in there, and this is for summer use. I am concerned that as the summer use of the Sierra gets heavier and heavier, we have got to get tougher and tougher on the use of horses because horses tear up the trails and eat up the meadows. We can not abolish them, but we should do all we can

to encourage backpacking.

One of the beauties of the proposal is that, instead of a fellow coming from his deak in the city and having to put a pack on his back and climbing several thousand feet, he can go up in the summertime with his pack on these ski lifts, substantially to the top of the pass, and then he can walk downhill, use up the contents of his pack, wander around, get hardened and acclimatized to the altitude. This would encourage backpacking, which is the most desirable use for our wildernesses, and at the same time it would not create medical problems.

I am not one of those who believe that the wilderness areas should be just set aside for the scientists. I would rather have five times as many people get ninety percent of the wilderness experience than one-fifth of the people getting one hundred percent. Then if somebody really needs to get the feeling that there is no one within earshot of him, let him go up to the Yukon Territory or Alaska. But I want wilderness to contribute to the American way of life. That is what all the areas are for in the mountains.

CHANGES IN THE SIERRA CLUB IN THE 1950s AND 1960s

Grass-Roots Opinion?

Susan Schrepfer: In all the things that we have been talking about, it is obvious that the Sierra Club underwent a very significant change in its orientation, say, from the time of the Dinosaur National Monument conflict up to the present.

Bestor Robinson: It has. And what I can't answer is whether or not there has been any such change with regard to the membership of the club, as distinguished from the board of directors. I am not quarreling with what I call their being too far out in left field. They have a right to express their opinion.

But the only time we had a real contest on that question was--this was supporting the board of directors, but still it was against Dave Brower and a minority of the board--in connection with the atomic power plant for Diablo Canyon. The vote was better than two to one on a referendum in favor of saying, okay, build it in Diablo Canyon as long as you get off of Nipomo Dunes.

I think that what has happened has been that those who have been very active, and they have been, have moved up to the board, but I don't think they truly represent the cross-section of the over one hundred thousand members. I think that the average viewpoint of the members would be somewhat to the right of the board.

Club Leader, Richard Leonard

Schrepfer: This might be confirmed by that fact that Richard Leonard has received such a high percentage

of the votes right up to the termination of his years with the board. He must represent what a majority want.

Robinson: I think so. Dick Leonard represents the cross-section. His and my viewpoints are essentially the same. I might add a little incident to show how much they are the same. When Pearl Harbor started, I had been chairman to the Advisory Committee on Arctic Warfare that the War Department had set up. So when I got the telegram, "How about coming back into uniform?" I went back. And they said, "We want you to organize a whole department for mountain and arctic warfare, and there will be other things added later," which they did, like jungle warfare and desert warfare and amphibian movements.

So I needed a good executive officer. I knew that Dick Leonard had gone back into the service. So I got a preemptory order, without consent of commanding officer, that he was to report to Washington. Of course, I had corresponded with Dick and knew that he wanted to do this. He already had his stuff aboard a ship heading for the Orient as a captain in charge of a company of Negro work troops. There was nothing wrong with that job, but he could contribute more elsewhere. I just felt that I could rely upon his judgement. When I was trying to push different things through with top army staff, why, he could run the show with all of our personnel. I did not have to worry about what his decisions would be.

We would get into real discussions at times on philosophical matters where we would disagree. He argues that nature has rights. I argue that nature does not have any, but we human beings have a whale of a duty to act as good trustees of everything that we have in nature. We come up with the same answers.

Schrepfer: How would you describe Leonard's role in the club?

Robinson: I would describe it as being a real leader and a hard worker.

Schrepfer: He seems to have attempted at times to act as conciliator.

Robinson: Oh yes. He believes in the system of developing

a consensus through reasonable compromises. You don't abandon principles, but you don't elevate to a principle what is purely a strongly held personal opinion. A principle is something that is self-evident and fundamental.

Schrepfer: Can you suggest anything that I might ask him about specifically?

Robinson: You might ask him about his philosophy that nature has rights. From that standpoint he might even follow Barry Commoner that nature has the best answers. I think nature is rather dumb in some of the things that it works out, such as population control by catastrophe.

Ecology is a Science!

Robinson: I also have an argument, not with Dick Leonard, but with those who call themselves ecologists. To me ecology is a very fine science that determines the relationship between the inorganic resources and all the plant and animal life occupying an area and the impact of any human change on that. But it is a science. I have a real quarrel with the protagonists of what they call the natural calling themselves ecologists. This is a legitimate political movement. But it is not the science of ecology, and they have foisted upon us things that are proven to be false, like the theory that more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is going to result in the melting of all the ice caps. This has been thoroughly disproved, with the best report coming from MIT.

Scientists have proved that you get exactly the same temperature in a greenhouse made with panes of fused salt, which transmits infrared rays, as you get with glass panes that do not transmit it. As a matter of fact, it has been shown that if we could double the amount of carbon dioxide in the air, with adequate water and fertility of the soil, we would get more green growth. Commercially, carbon dioxide is now being added to some greenhouses to hasten plant growth! So maybe we need to triple the amount of carbon dioxide. The

MIT report shows there would be no appreciable increase in temperature and it would perhaps increase the amount of oxygen.

My quarrel here is not with Dick Leonard, but with these people who call themselves ecologists and haven't done their homework. Why I saw some reports on a golf course that was going in down in San Leandro--a very desirable development along the water--that gave objections from some people who call themselves ecologists. The objections were that the development would mean the occupation of a strip of salt marsh, which we call pickle weed, that served as a habitat for certain insects and mice. Well, we ought to have some salt marsh like that, but they don't have to keep every bit of pickle weed around the bay in order to give the scientists a place to carry out their scientific experiments. It also produces mosquitoes [laughter].

David R. Brower

Schrepfer: Did you play a role in the efforts to oust Dave Brower?

Robinson: Yes, I played a role in the hiring him originally and in getting rid of him. Hiring Dave was Dick Leonard's idea; he felt we needed a full-time secretary. I was all for it. I still appreciate tremendously his abilities. But then when it came down to the real showdown, I felt he was wrong. I am not talking about his making certain false statements that we brought out.

Rather, my quarrel with Brower was that he felt free to publicly oppose decisions of the board of directors. You just can't do that. The hired staff has got to follow orders or get out. Secondly, he did not prove an adequate administrator or executive as the club grew and had to have a big staff. He just did not know how to delegate jobs, to oversee the work of others but not make all their decisions himself. So he had those two failures.

We tried our best to get him to take over the book department, because he does an excellent job on books. Also, he could do some public presentations, because he speaks well. But he should not be the overall administrator for all the details--billing, determining whether or not a book is at least approximately going to pay its way, keeping account of all incoming and outgoing monies--necessary to keep the club in balance.

As of now, the latest figures show that the club is making progress on its financial affairs. It is actually broke; its liabilities are actually greater than its assets. That is an inheritance from the Brower days. He did not know how to follow a budget, because it did not mean anything to him. This is not a quarrel with the fact that he has great abilities, but just like every human being his abilities have limits. He was not an executive. He felt so strongly about certain conservation ideas, he would not follow the orders of the board of directors.

Schrepfer: You are referring to the ad in the New York Times?

Robinson: That was done without authority.

Schrepfer: And the last couple books?

Robinson: That's right.

Schrepfer: Were there any other such incidents?

Robinson: I think those were the major ones. It was a pattern.

Schrepfer: How about his basic purist philosophy?

Robinson: This was not an issue. I don't think anybody would have quarreled with his philosophy. We just wanted to have it fit into the organization so that it could contribute to well-run, financially solvent organization. It could have been fitted in. He would still have had to take orders from the board and not publish books without authority and not spend money unless it was within his publication budget.

Schrepfer: It is amazing, when you look back, to see the Sierra Club, which was almost completely a local group,

becoming the national leader in conservation.

Robinson: I think that Dave contributed a great deal to that. I think it was also one of those situations where there was this growing grass-roots interest in conservation, so we exploited--and I am using that word properly--a growing interest in that field.

The real crux was the difference of opinion on the board of directors as to whether there should be a limit on the number of chapters in the club. I got firmly into that argument. I felt that the club should grow and become national. There was a split vote on the board of directors on the subject. But I think that could have been carried on without Dave Brower being executive director. In fact, I think we could have done better if Dave could have been utilized only where his talents were the greatest--in publications and in connection with presentation of viewpoints approved by the board. I think he decreased his usefulness to total conservation by extending his talents into fields where he was not competent. That is a sad thing.

Schrepfer: By fields you mean capacities not conservation fields, such as national as opposed to local conservation issues?

Robinson: I agreed with him that we should get into national issues. One thing I do disagree with the Sierra Club is that I think the Sierra Club should stay within its field of competence. It should not get into economic questions. I think that on energy policy they are going to get a backlash, because they keep talking about how we can cut down on the use of energy. I can't figure how I am going to do with a lower level of lighting in the house. I don't think my wife is going to give up the electric dryer or electric washing machine and the other electric equipment we have, just because speeches are made on it.

How will energy be produced? There are some decisions to make. But you don't just say, "Let's just have less energy." It is unrealistic, and I don't think the Sierra Club has any competence in determining what are going to be the future needs for electric energy. I know there are going to be some tremendous increases. Our BART system takes a lot of power. But it cuts down on the gasoline use and the air contaminates

from exhaust. Likewise, your modern sewage disposal plants take a lot of energy for pumps. They may take a lot more if they decide that the best way of purifying the affluent is by x-ray or hard ultraviolate light, which does kill all the germs. Our present chlorination system does not kill all the virus.

Schrepfer: You said that it was a split vote on the question of the club's growth. Who voted for and who against?

Robinson: I don't recall. Francis Farquhar was against it. In fact, the primary argument--a good-natured argument--was between Francis and myself. He just felt that the club should remain small, and, of course, from a social standpoint that was better. But I felt the club should be a force in the total problem of setting aside certain lands in parks, wilderness areas, and in environmental problems. So I wanted to see it larger and stronger.

I don't recall what the vote was. Of course, some of those in the minority know they have already lost even before the final vote is taken, and they decide they won't vote no. But it was a good argument and a hot one.

Club's Loss of Tax Status

Schrepfer: How about the tax question?

Robinson: Well, it was perfectly obvious that they were running squarely into the prohibitions of the Internal Revenue Act with regard to activities in legislative matters. Dick Leonard was the one who called me sometimes and said, "Shouldn't we have a foundation and be pure?" I agreed with him immediately and immensely, because we always discussed some of the problems we were running into. But some of the fellows, like Brower, who had no legal training said, oh, no, no, no; their wishes were father to their conclusion. All the lawyers on the board agreed with Leonard, along with

Francis Farquhar whose training as a CPA involved tax law. We all recognized that this was exactly what we were running into. We could not say that as a result of litigation we might squeeze by; we knew it was too great a hazard. So Dick organized the foundation.

Schrepfer: That was quite a few years prior to the actual loss of the tax status.

Robinson: Oh yes. We saw the hazard coming, and Dick came up with the answer--the Sierra Club Foundation.

Schrepfer: From talking with those within the club I gather that some feel that Brower lost the club's tax status against the wishes of the board of directors.

Robinson: That is right.

Schrepfer: So the directors still hoped to keep that tax status, and if Brower had not run that ad in the paper they would have done so, is that correct?

Robinson: Yes. By watching our p's and q's, we thought we could avoid any issue on it. The Sierra Club Foundation had been established, but we did not want the club to lose its tax-deductible status for gifts and bequests, and we kept warning Brower about it. This is again one of the places where he would not follow the warning of the board of directors. He just felt that somehow or other he knew more about law than the lawyers and tax accountants did.

Schrepfer: Do you feel that the Internal Revenue Service was gunning for the club? A common opinion expressed is, If the National Rifle Association still has their status, why did the club lose its?

Robinson: Let me put it this way, if it had not been for that advertisement, the issue would not have arisen. That practically forced the IRS to take action. We were on dangerous ground, but when that ad ran, we were on doubly dangerous ground, and they were practically forced to take the action on it.

Schrepfer: Doesn't the National Rifle Association lobby on gun control measures and such?

Robinson: Well, I don't know whether or not the association has the Three-C exemption. You see, the club

still has the exemption as a nonprofit organization for income. The exemption we lost was tax exclusion for people who give to the club, from the income or the estate tax.

Schrepfer: An employee of the Internal Revenue Service has said that what Brower did was "too gauche" to be ignored by the IRS.

Robinson: That is my viewpoint. The same thing would happen with any other organization that was right up against the boundary and then came out with a big advertisement, it is an invitation for the IRS to come in.

Schrepfer: Has this division between the club and the foundation been beneficial in the long run?

Robinson: I think it was beneficial even in the beginning before the club lost its tax-exempt status, because there was a real question in the minds of attorneys even then with clients who wanted to leave money to the club as to whether or not they might not be denied exemption on a big bequest, because that also raises the question in the minds of the tax authorities. With an organization, such as the foundation, that insisted upon staying completely clear, well, then a wealthy client would not be concerned.

Schrepfer: Has it been beneficial for the club to now be able to lobby in a forthright manner?

Robinson: I think there are some benefits to it. I don't think it was necessary. There are plenty of ways of, in effect, lobbying on legislative matters without appearing before committees or buttonholing congressmen. You can use grass-roots action, which is the most important way. Congressmen want to know what their constituents think.

Anyway, in practically all these matters there is administrative action. The position of the club can be stated on the administrative phase of it. Of course, it is always brought up before the committees. For instance, if you are going to have a national park created, you have all your administrative investigations and so forth. The club, in the old days, took action and said, "We had reviewed the boundaries and determined that the area was highly suitable for national

park purposes," and urged the secretary of the Interior to approve the recommendation of the Park Service. Well, that gets before Congress. You don't have to have somebody go before the committee to tell them that; it would be in the report of the secretary urging the establishment of the park.

Schrepfer: How was it that it was the Sierra Club and not the Wilderness Society or some other organization that became the national leader in conservation?

Robinson: First of all, we had a good record. Secondly, we had a chapter organization. Now, I am a member of the Wilderness Society, but I don't feel that I have any participation except being a member. Your chapter organization is where you develop your enthusiasm.

INDEX

Advisory Committee on Arctic Warfare, 51

advisory committees,
- Arctic Warfare, 51
- Disney, 14, 47
- Forest Service, 32, 39
- Interior, 10-2, 16

African wildlife management, 17-8

Agriculture, U.S. Department of, 7

Albright, Horace, 14-5, 48

American Forestry Association, 48

Arcata Redwood Lumber, 34

Arizona, 26-7

bears, 15-6

Bogachiel River, 8

Bridge Canyon, 24-7

Brower, David R., 22-3, 26, 37, 53-5, 57

Bull Creek, 36

Butz, Earl, 7

California, 26, 30, 35, 42, 47

California Ski Association, 42

California state legislature, 4

California State Parks Commission, 14, 36-7, 40-1

Cascades National Park, 28-30

Chapman, Oscar, 21

clear cutting, 2

Colorado River, 23-5

Colorado River Compact, 19

Commoner, Barry, 52

Connaughton, Charles, 31

Craighead family, 15, 48

Crowe, Harold, 46

Defense, United States Department of, 7

Department. For all governmental departments, see under state or nation: e.g., United States Department of Agriculture or the subject with which they deal

departmental reorganization, 7-8

Diablo Canyon, 50

Diamond Creek, 26

Dinosaur National Monument, 13-4, 19-23, 50

Disney advisory conservation committee, 14, 47

Disney Corporation, 41-8

Drury, Newton, 9, 13-4, 31, 36

Dubos, Rene, 15

Echo Dam, 19-20

ecology, 52-3

Eisenhower, Dwight D., 11, 12

elephant, 17

elk, 16

energy sources, 55-6

see also hydroelectric power

Far West Ski Association, 42

Farquhar, Francis, 56, 57

Flaming Gorge Dam, 19-20

flooding, 36-7

see also water reclamation

Forest Service, U.S., see United States Forest Service

Georgia-Pacific Corporation, 34

Grand Canyon National Park, 23-7

Glen Canyon Dam, 19-20 23-5

Green River, 19-20

Hearst Castle, California State Park, 14

Hetch Hetchy Valley, 42

hydroelectric power, 25-6

Ickes, Harold, 4-5, 6, 9

Internal Revenue Service, U.S., 57-8

irrigation, 4, 26

see also water reclamation

Kings Canyon National Park, 3-6

Kings River, 4

Kuchel, Thomas, 32, 35

Lake Mead, 27

Land Management, U.S. Bureau of, 41

Leonard, Richard, 23, 50-3, 56-7

Little Colorado River, 25

Livermore, Norman B., 40

lumber industry, 8-9, 31-5, 38, 39-40

Marble Canyon, 24, 27

McConnell, Grant, 1

McQuire, John, 31

Mill Creek, 31, 38-9

Mineral King, 41-9

National Geographic, 34

National Park Service, see United States National Park Service

national parks, 4, 8-10, 14, 16, 27, 31, 40

National Parks Association, 5

National Rifle Association, 57

National Wildlife Association, 48

<u>New York Times</u>, 54

Nipomo Dunes, 50

Nixon, Richard M., 7-8

Olympic National Park, 8-10

Pinchot-Ballinger affair, 7

Rainbow Bridge, 23

Reclamation, U.S. Department of, 14, 20-7

reclamation water projects, 4, 14, 20-2, 23-7, 34, 36-7

recreation, outdoor, 3, 20, 30, 44, 48

- water, 20, 25, 37
- winter, 41-4, 47-8

Redwood Creek, 31, 38-9

Redwood National Park, 31-40

Redwood Purchase Unit, 39-40

redwoods, 31-40

Robinson, Bestor

- on U.S. Forest Service, 1-3
- Kings Canyon, 4-6
- Olympic Park, 8-9, 13-4
- Interior advisory committee, 10-2, 16
- nature philosophy, 15-6
- Dinosaur Monument, 13-4, 19-22
- Glen Canyon, 23-7
- Grand Canyon, 23-7
- philosophy of conservation, 23, 26-9
- Cascades, 28-30
- skier, 42
- Redwood National Park, 31-9
- Forest Service advisory committee, 32, 39
- Mineral King, 41-9
- on the Sierra Club, 50-9
- Advisory Committee on Arctic Warfare, 51

Roosevelt National Monument, 14

Salt River, 26

San Gorgonio, Mount, 47

Save-the-Redwoods League, 31, 35-8

scenic preservation, 2, 3, 42

Sequoia National Park, 44

<u>Sequoia sempervirens</u>, 31-40

Sierra Club,

- Cascades, 29-30
- changes in, 50-9
- Glen Canyon, 23, 25-6, 28
- Grand Canyon, 25-6, 28
- Kings Canyon, 4-6
- Mineral King, 45-7
- Olympic Park, 10
- Redwood National Park, 31, 35, 38-9
- tax status, 56-9

<u>Sierra Club Bulletin</u>, 21

Sierra Club Foundation, 57-9

Sierra Nevada, 41-2,
47-8

Simpson Meadow, 4

skiing, 41-4, 47-8

Split Mountain dam proposal, 20

standing in court, 45-6

Stone, J. Herbert, 30-1

Tapeats Creek, 24, 27

tax-deductible status,
56-9

Tehipite Valley, 4

The Last Redwoods, 38

timber management,

U.S. Forest Service,
2, 32, 39-40

Truman, Harry S., 12

University of California, 9

United States Bureau of
Land Management, 41

United States Bureau of
Reclamation, 14,
20-2, 23-7

United States Congress,
2, 5, 10, 20, 23, 26,
34, 35, 44

United States Department
of Agriculture, 7

United States Department
of Defense, 7

United States Department
of the Interior, 10-4,
16, 21-2, 27, 29

United States Forest Service,

advisory committee, 32,
39
Cascades, 28-31
decentralized, 1
Kings Canyon, 4
logging practices, 2
Mineral King, 43-4, 47-8
multiple use, 1-3, 30
pressures on, 3, 13
redwoods, 32, 39-40
reorganization threats, 7

United States Internal Revenue
Service, 57-8

United States National Park
Service,

and Forest Service, 3
Cascades, 28-30
Dinosaur Monument, 13-4,
19-22
Kings Canyon, 4-6
Mineral King, 48
Olympic Park, 9, 13
organization of, 1
Redwood National Park,
31-40
wildlife management, 15-7

United States Supreme Court,
26, 45

Utah, 19

Verde River, 26

Washington, state, 9

watershed management, 1, 20,
36-7

see also water reclamation,
flooding

water reclamation, 14, 20-2,
23-7, 34, 36-7

Wayburn, Ed, 38

wildlife management, 1,
15-8

Wilderness Society, 59

World War I, 41

World War II, 10

Yampa River, 19

James E. Rother

THE SIERRA CLUB IN THE EARLY 1900s

An Interview Conducted by
Ann and Ray Lage

Sierra Club
History Committee
San Francisco, California

1974

INTRODUCTION

This is an interview with Mr. James E. Rother, a member of the Sierra Club for sixty-three years. Mr. Rother first joined the club to participate in the 1909 summer outing to Yosemite National Park. During the following years he explored the Sierra Nevada on numerous other club outings and on private excursions with club members. He was also an active participant in the club's local walks in the San Francisco Bay Area and served as chairman of the local walks committee in the 1910s.

In addition to granting this interview, Mr. Rother has generously donated his scrapbooks with photographs of club outings and local walks during these early years to the Sierra Club collection in the Bancroft Library, at the University of California, Berkeley. His experiences in the club vividly reveal the meaningful part that the exploration, enjoyment, and preservation of the Sierra Nevada played in the lives of early members.

This interview is being conducted on November 26, 1972, at Mr. Rother's Berkeley home. The interviewers are Ann and Ray Lage, representing the Sierra Club History Committee.

Ann and Ray Lage
Sierra Club History Committee
February, 1974

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION iii

OUTDOOR EXPERIENCE AND THE SIERRA CLUB 1

Early Country Life 1
Joining the Sierra Club 2
July, 1909, Club Outing to Yosemite 4
John Muir in the Mountains 8
Recollections of William Colby and the Campfires 9
Environmental Considerations on Club Outings . . 10
Local Walks Committee Chairman 11
Character of Club Hikers 14

CONSERVATION AND THE SIERRA CLUB 17

Division over Fate of Hetch Hetchy Valley . . . 17
Relations with the Board of Directors 18
Tamalpais Conservation Club 19
Family Acquaintance with Horace Albright 20
Old Guard's Opposition to Club's Course 21
Wilderness Experience 22

INDEX 23

OUTDOOR EXPERIENCES AND THE SIERRA CLUB

Early Country Life

Interviewer: Mr. Rother, you told us you were a native Californian. Where were you born?

James Rother: I'm a native Californian. I was born in Sonora, Tuolumne County, August 25th, 1881.

Interviewer: That makes you ninety-one now?

James Rother: Ninety-one years past now.

Interviewer: Where were your parents from?

James Rother: My mother was also a native of Tuolumne County. She was born on a big ranch about ten miles south of Sonora. My father was of German descent. He came to Tuolumne County with his parents in about 1855. He was an infant about a year old.

Interviewer: Almost a native. Did you live on a ranch?

James Rother: Only school vacation time, part of it. It was a large property known as the Berger Ranch.

Interviewer: So you had a lot of introduction to the outdoors as a child.

James Rother: Oh, yes, it seemed like I belonged to the country.

Interviewer: What about your occupation as you got older. What field did you go into?

James Rother: Well, my first real job was as a clerk in a local bank there in Sonora. I left Sonora in 1902 with an uncle, John L. Bourland, and went with him to his home in Bishop across the mountains. Mr. Bourland, by the way, had been sheriff of Tuolumne County from 1864-1868, and in some way Horace Albright was related to the Bourlands.

Interviewer: So you went to Bishop. Then when did you come to San Francisco?

James Rother: Well, I was in Bishop about the better part of a year, and then I left there and came over to the coast again, first to Los Angeles, and then Watsonville, where my sister lived, and then up to San Francisco. It was a difficult time for a young man to find a job then, but I did finally pick up two or three temporary jobs and then finally found my place with the Wholesale Dairy Produce firm. I was with that firm for eighteen years until the senior member of the firm passed away, and the business was sold to some New York people.

After that I dabbled in real estate and building a little in Berkeley for one or two years and then went back to the produce business by being employed by the Poultry Producers of Central California, which was a large farmer's cooperative. I remained with that firm for thirty years until I decided to retire.

Interviewer: I see. Do you remember the exact year that you came to San Francisco?

James Rother: I think it was sometime in late 1902. I was married in San Francisco on October 7, 1903--the young lady I had met in Bishop.

Joining the Sierra Club

Interviewer: Then did you and your wife both join the Sierra Club together?

James Rother: No, at that time membership of one was sufficient. She benefited from my membership and was quite active with me in the local walks.

Interviewer: I see. Now you said you joined the club in 1909. Can you remember what prompted you to join the club?

James Rother: Yes. I had a very serious illness in the winter of 1908 and 1909, and a neighbor, a Mr. J.M. Church Walker, got me interested in the Sierra Club. My first interest was because of the doctor telling me that I must get out of the office for a while, get into the country. Mr. Walker was a member at that time, and he loaned me two or three of the Sierra Club annual Bulletins which I read very carefully and was very much pleased with. From that I decided to join the club, and he presented my name which was accepted.

Interviewer: Did you have to meet with any membership committee before they allowed you to join?

James Rother: No.

Interviewer: There was no formal procedure?

James Rother: No, nothing formal about it. One had to be sponsored by someone who was a member, and that was about all. I guess they made their own check; I don't know what they did. Anyway there wasn't any difficulty connected with my becoming a member.

Interviewer: What had you heard about the club? Did you know anything of the club except from Mr. Walker prior to joining?

James Rother: No, my first information was from Mr. Walker. He and his wife were active in local walks at that time. He had two sisters who were quite active. They were unmarried; they lived in the same area. We were in North Oakland, down on Regent Street between Woolsey and Alcatraz.

Interviewer: Had you heard of John Muir?

James Rother: Yes, I had heard of John Muir before because I had a distant relative who was employed

in the Muir home in Martinez while I was still in school. Maggie Ousley was her name. She worked there on account of the children, I guess; the two Muir daughters were then growing up, they were just children--that's Wanda and Helen. She apparently enjoyed the Muir home. She was there I don't know how long, maybe a couple of years. She gave me a book of John Muir's, The Mountains of California, and as long as I could read, I'd pick it up once in a while and go over some of it. I enjoyed it very much. I don't know whether that was his first book or not, but I'm inclined to think maybe it was. Later I obtained two or three others. I enjoyed very much My First Summer in the Sierra.

Interviewer: So you were familiar with John Muir and some of his writings when you joined the club?

James Rother: Yes, well the principal one was The Mountains of California. The others I obtained after I joined the club.

July, 1909, Club Outing to Yosemite

Interviewer: Now, you went on that 1909 outing to Tuolumne Meadows. Do you have any outstanding memories?

James Rother: Yes, Mrs. Rother was with me on that trip. We went by train up to El Portal, up the Merced Canyon. It was a very warm morning that we went up there. Then we went by stage from El Portal into the valley. They were I think six-horse stages.

Interviewer: How long a trip was that stage trip?

James Rother: I don't remember the mileage, but it wasn't too long, I imagine probably a couple of

hours. Mrs. Rother got very sick on the trip, and as soon as we got into camp there, she had to lay down on our sleeping bags to recover, but she did recover in a matter of a few hours.

Camp was established along the north side of the Merced River, not a very great distance from Camp Curry, probably not far from where the Sierra Club lodge is now, only the lodge is on the south side of the river.

Interviewer: Then did you hike on up to Tuolumne Meadows?

James Rother: We stayed in the valley for two or three days, as I remember.

Interviewer: And that was your first visit to the valley?

James Rother: That was the first time I had been in the valley. We did a little hiking around the valley. I remember we hiked up to Vernal Falls and Nevada Falls and then across over to Illilouette Falls and Glacier Point. We called that the Eleven Mile Trail, and as I recall, we came down from there by another trail that was called the Ahwahnee Trail that brought us down by the village. We also took another hike up above the Yosemite Falls and around the rim to El Capitan. I walked out to the edge of El Capitan.

Interviewer: You got quite familiar with the valley, then.

James Rother: Yes, I did, and I've loved it ever since. I've forgotten just how many days we spent there, but it was several days. Then the main party moved on up the Merced River to go over Vogelsang Pass into Tuolumne Meadows country. At that point was where that picture was taken of John Muir talking to that little group.

Interviewer: This one on your wall here?

James Rother: Yes. I was not in that group because I had started with the Ritter party. We went on up

the Merced Canyon, and Mrs. Rother went with the main party over Vogelsang Pass to the Tuolumne Soda Springs camp. With the Ritter party, we went up past Lake Merced and Lake Washburn, then over the summit and down into one of the forks of the San Joaquin River, and then across that and up the Ritter side to a snow covered plateau-like place near the base of Mt. Ritter. Then we made the climb of Mt. Ritter without difficulty.

I've forgotten just how many there were; as I recall, there were about a dozen in the party. It was led by Ernest Mott. In the picture of the party--from the 1909 picture book that my cousin has--there was Ernest Mott, I am the second one, and then others that followed. I recall some of those others, not too many. One of them was Carl Pohlman, who was a German and very active in Sierra Club local walks. In that party was Glen Miller, a young man and son of Mr. and Mrs. Miller who were in the main party. The only mishap we had on the party was with young Miller who fell on the snow and rolled down about three or four hundred feet, but beyond wrenching his shoulder and having to carry his arm in a sling for practically the rest of the trip, everything went on fine. It was a bright day on the morning we went up to the top.

Interviewer: Was that the first mountain climbing you had done?

James Rother: That was my first mountain, first big mountain. From Mt. Ritter we turned northward over snow-covered terrain, where the snow was in hummocks and it had started to melt. Early morning it was quite easy to travel, but as the sun came out and it warmed up, the snow became soft on top, and it was a case of slip and slide. We got through to an area near Thousand Island Lake. Thousand Island Lake had some icebergs floating around, but it was not frozen solid.

Interviewer: Was this in June?

James Rother: This was in the early part of July, and this year they had a very heavy snowfall. From

Thousand Island Lake we went over another pass called Thousand Island Pass, I believe, to Rush Creek basin. Rush Creek flows eastward into the Mono Lake Valley. Then we climbed out over Donohue Pass. That brought us down to the head of the Lyell Fork of the Tuolumne River at the base of Mt. Lyell. We could see Mt. Lyell, but we didn't climb it that day. We had had enough. We went on in to join the big party at the Soda Springs. As I recall now, the snow had just melted away on the Lyell Fork, and the mosquitoes were very plentiful. They gave us a bad time for a little while.

Interviewer: Did you have any stock with you on that trip?

James Rother: Well, in camp they did. There were approximately two hundred people in the main trip, and they employed packers and had mules for carrying in the luggage. A few people had horses, not very many. John Muir was one; he rode horseback.

Interviewer: When you left the main party and went up over Mt. Ritter and Thousand Island Pass, could you describe for us what kind of food supplies you brought along? Today they have freeze-dried foods, and they emphasize taking everything light.

James Rother: We did that, too. We had a lump of cheese maybe and a package of raisins. I don't remember what else, but nothing that had very much weight to it. I know we divided it up. I was supposed to be the weak one of the party, I guess, because I only had to carry fifteen pounds, and that included my bedding, which wasn't very heavy. The others' packs ranged maybe five pounds more than that; there might have been twenty pounds on some of them.

Interviewer: Then you fished as you went along to add to your food supply?

James Rother: No, we didn't do any fishing on that trip.

Interviewer: It sounds as if you ate light?

James Rother: We did, but we had all we needed, I guess. I can remember our first camp was up at the head of Merced Canyon, and I don't remember if we made camp anywhere between there and Tuolumne Meadows or not.

Interviewer: That was a strenuous trip.

James Rother: It was, very strenuous, but I came in fine.

John Muir in the Mountains

Interviewer: Was it at Tuolumne Meadows that you met John Muir?

James Rother: Well, I had met him in the valley before we went over to Tuolumne Meadows. He rode his horse, and we got quite well acquainted, especially Mrs. Rother did, because he seemed to like her very much. He used to find, on his walks around, little flowers and special things he'd bring her. He loved flowers. That's how she's sitting right next to him in that picture there.

Interviewer: What impression did you have of John Muir?

James Rother: Well, a very kindly sort of man, gentle and affable. He was not a hard man to meet.

Interviewer: Was he outgoing?

James Rother: I think so. He liked to wander around quite a bit by himself and then come into camp and talk with different ones in the camp.

Interviewer: Was he a very large man physically?

James Rother: No, he was average height. As you know

by his pictures, he wore whiskers. I'd say he was about my size.

Interviewer: Apparently he had a great deal of endurance and stamina.

James Rother: He did, no doubt about it. He used to tell stories about how he wandered by himself through the mountains carrying a little bag, a flour sack, with a loaf of bread and maybe a package of tea.

Interviewer: And no sleeping bag?

James Rother: That was about all he had.

Recollections of William Colby and the Campfires

Interviewer: You said you met Will Colby on this trip, too.

James Rother: Yes, I knew Mr. Colby. I didn't know him before I joined the club, but I met him after I joined. His office was right across the hall from the one room the club had, and I went to see him one time on some legal matter; I don't know what it was now, but it wasn't very important. I was very much impressed with him. He was a large man, clean shaven, gentle disposition, very friendly, and he had a good deal of humor which was displayed at times during the meetings of the campfires.

Interviewer: Did he organize the campfires?

James Rother: Well, he was the leader of the party and in complete charge of the party throughout. Mrs. Colby was with him on that trip.

Interviewer: What kind of activities took place at

the campfires? Were they organized campfires?

James Rother: They organized committees for entertainment in the evenings, and they would arrange something for the rest of us to enjoy. Some of the folks were good lecturers, and Mr. Colby always made a little talk about the organization, the objects of the club, particularly how members should act on the trips. On a big trip like that, they had to divide up the camp. They had one section for the unmarried women, another one for the unmarried men, and sort of a middle one for the married folks. We were cautioned, of course, to keep our proper places, but everything went very smoothly, no problem at all.

Environmental Considerations on Club Outings

Interviewer: Was there any awareness that a group of this size, two hundred people, could damage some of the environment as you passed by?

James Rother: Well, I suppose there was, but they were cautioned to be careful of the environment, and we all had a respect for things as they were. We had to keep the camp clean. I think that was one of the things that was taught to all of us, whether it was on the local walks or in the high mountains. It was important that we left things pretty much as we found them, so that those who came after would enjoy what we enjoyed.

Interviewer: Did you get an idea of what some of the purposes of the outings might be aside from just the enjoyment of the outdoors?

James Rother: In a general way we had the idea, of course, that it was a matter of conservation and preservation of the wilderness, but we couldn't envision what the club finally grew into. It

took a long time for that. As the years went by, it just gradually grew. At that time I would say our membership was a little below the two thousand mark.

Interviewer: Now Hetch Hetchy was an issue about that time, was it not?

James Rother: Yes, there was some discussion of that, but it seems to me that followed a little later, mostly.

Interviewer: It wasn't discussed on your trip?

James Rother: No, I don't remember that it was discussed on that trip at all. I think we talked more about that on the 1915 trip. The members I knew on the local walks and on the 1915 trip were divided in their views about it, but we never had any heated discussions about it. Each respected the others viewpoint and let it go at that.

Local Walks Committee Chairman

Interviewer: Let me ask you about the local walks. You mentioned you were the committee chairman for the Sierra Club local walks.

James Rother: Well, I was for a time, I don't remember how long. It was maybe a year or two after I became a member that I became a member of the local walks committee.

Interviewer: What areas did you visit?

James Rother: Mostly Marin County, Mt. Tamalpais area, and Muir Woods. We went down a steep ravine to the ocean, and we went over what we called Potrero Meadows on the northwest side of

the mountain. I remember some of the flowers that grew there--the wild iris. Then there was another place they called Rock Springs along the Lone Tree Trail. Then we had a place on the east side of the mountain called Camp Tucker. We varied the trips. We went on a little farther north in Marin on an electric railroad that used to operate; we went up to a place called Camp Taylor. It's a state park up there now.

Interviewer: Samuel Taylor State Park.

James Rother: Well, it wasn't a state park at that time--we called it Camp Taylor. From there we'd hike out into the hills and back again. Then we took other trips. We went up to Mt. St. Helena one time. There used to be an electric line that ran from Napa up to Calistoga. We'd go up on that and then hike from Calistoga up Mt. St. Helena. Near the summit of Mt. St. Helena there's a divide where you go over into Lake County. There was a little resort--well it wasn't much of a resort, but a place where we could stop and stay and get meals--called Molly Patten's. That particular trip we took our sleeping bags, and we slept around the woods there near Molly Patten's. I think we had breakfast there and went on up to the top of the mountain and then down back to Calistoga again.

Then out where there now is Lake Berryessa there was a kind of a valley called the Craters, and we'd take a hike over into that country. Other times we'd go the other way; we went up to Mt. Diablo at midnight one night. We had arranged with someone to take our baggage up with a wagon; we didn't have to carry our baggage all the way up there, although our baggage was not much more than our sleeping equipment. We enjoyed sunrise there on Mt. Diablo and then went back to Danville to get an electric train again to come in.

Interviewer: How large a group usually went on the hikes?

James Rother: The local groups varied from maybe a dozen up to twenty-five or thirty.

Interviewer: Did a lot of the members participate or was it the same twenty-five or thirty on most of the trips?

James Rother: I'd say the same ones mostly, although it varied. There were some on some trips who were not on others. Usually about the same ones, quite often.

Interviewer: So of the two thousand members in the club, not all of them participated in these activities.

James Rother: No, No. Some of them probably not at all. Of course, a few of the members were residents of the eastern part of the country. For instance, on this trip in 1909 we had Mr. and Mrs. Miller. They were from the Midwest. Mr. Miller was a wagon manufacturer. His firm was called Miller and Miller, Not Brothers, No Relation, Inc. He explained why--he used to be asked so many times about his brother, so that's the way they handled that [laughter.]

Then we had some other people who were from the Boston area. There was a lady there who had been a school teacher, I can't recall her name now, and a younger woman with her, a Miss Little. I remember Miss Little was very fair, and she got sunburned a little bit and put a postage stamp on her nose--just went around with a postage stamp on her nose [laughter.]

Interviewer: It sounds as if you had quite a lot of fun.

James Rother: Oh, we had lots of fun. There was a Mr. Chamberlain from, I think, Austin, Texas. He had a son with him, I don't know what his business was. So there were a few people from the eastern part of the country who were learning about the Sierra Club and becoming interested in it.

Interviewer: I see, I hadn't realized that. What would you say the purposes of the local walks were? Were they mainly social?

James Rother: They were mainly for the exercise. Most of the people worked in offices in San Francisco. Some from on this side of the bay, of course. I lived on Regent Street in North Oakland, and Mr. Walker did. It was a matter of getting outdoors and walking and exercise and enjoying things as they were. People were office men in San Francisco. I remember one man very well, J.H. Cutter, who was very active. I don't think he ever missed a trip; a very fine looking man with military build, but I think he was an accountant.

I remember one trip. We went down to San Mateo County to Kings Mountain. A Mrs. King had a place there at the summit, as you go up from Woodside. I was a little late getting down there that trip, I don't know what caused it. I worked late at the office, I guess. Mrs. Rother went along with the main party, and I came up just about dark to Mrs. King's place and walked in. There was Mr. Cutter at the head of the table with a big turkey in front of him and all the party gathered around; there were, I suppose, fifteen or sixteen. It was a nice occasion that we all enjoyed very much. I guess someone in the party, probably Mr. Cutter, had made arrangements with Mrs. King to get things all ready for us.

Character of Club Hikers

Interviewer: Tell me, you met a great many members of the Sierra Club on the local walks and on the outings. Could you say if there was a typical Sierra Clubber? Did they come from varied walks of life?

James Rother: Yes, they did. I guess most of them were people who worked in offices.

Interviewer: Did you have anybody who worked with their hands, laborers?

James Rother: No, I don't think so, not very many. Well, of the people I knew, Carl Pohlman was a draftsman and was employed by the Pelton Water-wheel Company in San Francisco. Another one, Will Solari, was a lawyer. By the way, he was born in my same county, Tuolumne. He was born and raised in Columbia, four miles from Sonora, and I never met him until I met him in the Sierra Club.

Interviewer: Were they all of a similar age or was there a wide age difference?

James Rother: No, they varied from young folks, oh I'd say eighteen or twenty, up to pretty old men. I recall one man, a Mr. Perry. He was an old gentle-man at the time that I knew him. He must have been seventy-five years old or more, and he wore a shortly cropped beard. Then there was Ernest Mott. He wore a grey beard, rather pointed. When I joined the club he was, I suppose, pretty close to middle age.

Interviewer: Was there very much variation in their ethnic background?

James Rother: They came from different nationalities, in a way. Pohlman, of course, was German. Mott, I guess, was as near American as anyone could be without being an Indian. He was a very large, handsome man. Joe Astredo was of Spanish descent, and he was a probation officer in San Francisco. We had a Harry Allen, who owned the Allen Press Clipping Bureau, and a Brooks Palmer, who was em-ployed by Harry Allen.

Brooks Palmer really was a lawyer, but he'd never practiced law. He later married Miss Anita Gompertz, one of the Gompertz family of Berkeley; they were an old family here, and I think her sister was the wife of Professor Joe LeConte, Little Joe they called him. We had a Professor McAdie, who was a weather bureau man and used to go on some of the trips. We had a couple of dentists --a Dr. Novisky and a Dr. and Mrs. Kelly.

Interviewer: Did the members ever discuss politics?

James Rother: Not very much, I don't think there was any inclination to. The most interest was in the trees and the flowers and the trails and the importance of keeping the trails clean--things that pertained to conservation.

Interviewer: I see. Tell me, what kind of women belonged to the club? Were they more or less emancipated women?

James Rother: No, no. Well, I'd say they were all very nice.

Interviewer: Were they a little bit more adventuresome than the average woman?

James Rother: Well, they might have been. They liked the outdoors, and they were pretty active. Some of the trips were pretty strenuous for them. Now I think in the case of my wife, they might have been a little too strenuous and I didn't realize it, but she enjoyed it.

Interviewer: What kind of outfits did they wear on these trips?

James Rother: Well, they dressed pretty well. On the outings they'd all wear dresses. They didn't dress at all like they do now. I would say they were very modest in all of their habits.

CONSERVATION AND THE SIERRA CLUB

Division over Fate of Hetch Hetchy Valley

Interviewer: It seems that as a member your primary interest was in hiking and getting to know the outdoors. Can you say something about the part you played in conservation? You mentioned that you were a member of the Tamalpais Conservation Club?

James Rother: Well, I never got into conservation very much, except that I kept up with the club's activities in a way. And I became interested, not only in the Sierra Club, but I became a member of the Save-the-Redwoods League and the Wilderness Society. Incidently, Horace Albright is quite active in that. And then I took magazines--the National Geographic and that of the Audubon Society.

Interviewer: You kept up with the actions of the board of directors and their conservation concerns?

James Rother: Yes, I think I was in step with them on practically everything. It was only in the later years that there came to be a division on the board.

Interviewer: You mentioned there was some division over Hetch Hetchy. Do you recall some discussion among the members over that?

James Rother: I remember there was a great deal said about what San Francisco was going to do about beautifying the area. If they were allowed to put in the dam, they were going to build roads and trails around Hetch Hetchy. That never has been done. Maybe the only excuse is that they didn't have the money, but that was just dropped after they got what they wanted. Many thought that the lake would not be very pretty with the rise and fall of the water as the seasons advanced. As summer came on, a rim around it would be bare of vegetation and bleak.

Interviewer: And yet some club members did favor San

Francisco getting the water?

James Rother: Oh yes, this Mr. Mott, for instance, was one. He talked to me about it some.

Interviewer: What had been his field?

James Rother: He was a lawyer and a court reporter for one of the superior courts in San Francisco.

Interviewer: So he was interested in the city.

James Rother: Yes, he was interested in the city's angle. I don't think I discussed it very much with any of the others, just maybe casually.

Relations with the Board of Directors

Interviewer: Do you recall if the board of directors ever polled the members to see how they felt on these issues?

James Rother: No, I don't think they ever did. No one ever called on me to ask for an opinion on it.

Interviewer: Did you have a chance to vote for the board of directors?

James Rother: Well, there was a nominating committee that nominated certain ones for the board, and they sent those to us. Usually there were about double the number that were actually elected. It was up to us to mark a ballot and send it back. That's the way we voted. We didn't have any solicitations from anyone; this committee just chose people they thought would be good for the club and in line with what they wanted for preservation and care of the environment. I remember some of the members of the board of directors. Of course, Will Colby was secretary. And we had a Mr. Parsons, who was a sales representative for one of the large

stationery houses, and his wife, Marion Randall Parsons, who was quite a writer. She used to write articles for the club Bulletin that were very interesting. She was an interesting person and an interesting writer. She was on the 1909 trip, as was her sister, Miss Mary Randall, who was a teacher in Berkeley, whether in the university or the high school I don't know.

Tamalpais Conservation Club

Interviewer: You mentioned that you were a member of the Tamalpais Conservation Club. What did that entail?

James Rother: Well, there was a group of us interested in blazing the trails, keeping the trails open and clean and free of litter, the placing of receptacles for garbage, and so on. We formed this little club. I don't know if I was one of the charter members or not, I think I probably was. I belonged for a number of years. We had little badges--the Custodians of the Mountain.

Interviewer: Was this about the same time you were active in the Sierra Club, about the 1910s?

James Rother: It was around about that time; it was a year or two after I joined the Sierra Club. It was pretty much the same ones that went on the outings on Sundays and holidays and whenever we could get away from the offices. We worked half a day on Saturdays, but once in a while we took an overnight trip, going out on Saturday evening and coming back the next day.

Family Acquaintance with Horace Albright

Interviewer: You mentioned that you knew Horace Albright through your family.

James Rother: Yes, I knew the family in Bishop. His father was a carpenter and also an undertaker at the time I was there in 1902. Horace had two brothers. His brother, Leslie, died in Spain, I believe. He was still a college boy and went to complete his studies in early California history, I think, and he was taken ill and died somewhere in Spain.

His brother, Dewey, followed his father's footsteps and became an undertaker there in Bishop, and he lost his life in an automobile accident in or around Los Angeles. Horace is the only survivor. There were just the three boys, no girls in the family. The family was very well thought of; my folks, Mr. and Mrs. Bourland, were very fond of them.

Interviewer: Did you know Mr. Albright in the later years, also?

James Rother: Yes, he's been to see me a couple of times. Of course, he knew my wife better than me because she was from Bishop. He used to call once in a while. I think he's only called on me once since she passed away, but I've talked to him on the telephone a couple of times since.

Interviewer: Did he seem to be a capable person?

James Rother: Oh yes, he was very capable. He studied law and boarded with an aunt of mine on Walnut Street here in Berkeley while he went to college at the University of California. Then he graduated in law and went into a prominent law firm in San Francisco. From that he got into the national parks system. I believe he knew Stephen Mather. He succeeded Mr. Mather as a director of the parks and was director for a number of years. He married a Berkeley girl, Grace Noble, and had one son and, I think, a daughter.

Old Guard's Opposition to Club's Course

Interviewer: There've been a great many changes in the club since you first joined in 1909. Are you pleased with the expansion that has taken place?

James Rother: I think it's probably inevitable. As we go on through life, changes take place. When there's been a division on policy within the club, I've stood with the old guard, some of whom I knew. Not only that, but I thought the opposition was going a little bit too far in some directions.

Interviewer: Do you remember some of the issues that the old guard rebelled on?

James Rother: Well, becoming involved in things outside our immediate vicinity. They became involved in conservation all over the world; they made trips to South America, to India, and other places. I guess we were a little bit too narrow-minded; we couldn't see that far. We felt that maybe we were spreading out too thin and too far.

Interviewer: Are you talking about controversies in the 1960s or before that?

James Rother: No, this has come along since then, I think.

Interviewer: Did you get involved in the Dave Brower controversy?

James Rother: No, I never got involved in that, only except that when there was a division in the board, I stood with the old board in opposition to Brower.

Interviewer: Tell me Mr. Rother, the club has evidently been quite important to you over the years. Can you say something about what the wilderness experience and the outdoor life has meant to you?

Wilderness Experience

James Rother: It's meant about everything, I think. I love to get into the mountains. I haven't done any traveling alone. I don't believe in that; one can become hurt and make a problem for other people. Usually with several members of a party, I've enjoyed it. I've especially enjoyed the Kings River and Kern River country with smaller parties, all Sierra Club members, but under the leadership of Ernest Mott.

Interviewer: So it has been an important party of your life?

James Rother: Oh, very important.

Interviewer: I would say that doctor in 1909 gave you some good advice. Thank you very much for talking with us today. We've enjoyed it.

INDEX

Albright, Dewey, 20

Albright, Horace, 1, 17, 20

Albright, Leslie, 20

Allen, Harry, 15

Allen Press Clipping Bureau, 15

Astredo, Joe, 15

Audubon Society, 17

Bancroft Library, i

Berger Ranch, 1

Bourland, John L., 1, 20

Brower, David, 21

Calistoga, 12

Camp Taylor, 12

Camp Tucker, 12

Colby, William, 9-10, 18

conservation, 16-8

Custodians of the Mountain, 19

Cutter, J. H., 14

Diablo, Mount, 12

Gompertz, Anita, 15

Hetch Hetchy Valley, 11, 17-8

High Trip, Yosemite, 1909, 4-11, 13

Kern River, 22

Kings Mountain, 14

Kings River, 22

LeConte, Joe, 15

Local Walks Committee, Sierra Club, i, 2, 6, 11-4

Marin County, 11-2

Mather, Stephen, 20

McAdie, Professor, 15

Merced Canyon, 4-5, 8

Miller, Glen, 6

Miller and Miller, Not Brothers, No Relations, Inc., 13

Molly Patten's, 12

Mott, Ernest, 6, 15, 18, 22

Mount. See names of individual mountains.

Mrs. King's place, 14

Muir, John, 3-5, 7-9

Muir home in Martinez, 4

Muir Woods, 11

My First Summer in the Sierra, 4

National Geographic, 17

Noble, Grace, 20

Ousley, Maggie, 4

Palmer, Brooks, 15

Parsons, Edward, 18

Parsons, Marion Randall, 19

Pelton Waterwheel Company, 15

Pohlman, Carl, 6, 15

Potrero Meadows, 11

Poultry Producers of Central California, 2

Randall, Mary

Ritter, Mount, 5-6

Rock Springs, 12

Rother, James E.

- childhood, 1-2
- early work, 2
- joins Sierra Club, i, 2-4
- Local Walks Committee, i, 11-4
- 1909 Yosemite High Trip, 4-11, 13
- on John Muir, 3-5, 7-9
- on club members, 14-6
- on conservation, 16-8
- Tamalpais Conservation Club, 19
- changes in Sierra Club, 21
- wilderness experience, 21-2

Saint Helena, Mount, 2

Samuel Taylor State Park, 12

San Mateo County, 14

Save-the-Redwoods League, 17

Sierra Club

- board of directors, 18
- changes in, 21
- character of members, 14-6
- conservation, 16-8
- History Committee, i
- Local Walks Committee, i, 2, 6, 11-4
- Yosemite 1909 outing, 4-11, 13

Sierra Club Bulletin, 3, 19

Sierra Nevada, i

see also Yosemite National Park

Soda Springs Camp, 6

Solari, Will, 15

Tamalpais, Mount, 11, 19

Tamalpais Conservation Club, 17, 19

The Mountains of California, 4

Tuolumne County, 1

Tuolumne Meadows, 4, 5, 8

University of California, Berkeley, i, 20

Walker, J. M. Church, 3, 14

Wilderness Society, 17

Wholesale Dairy Produce, 2

Yosemite National Park, i, 4-6

see also High Trip, Yosemite, 1909