

Silvicultural regimes should be “close to nature,” and the use of clearcutting is substantially constrained. (8) Budgeting of public funds for forestry is much more programmatic with objectives specified, progress monitored, and financial incentives available.

Obviously, many of the trends in European forest policy are comparable to trends in North America. But there is much more to be learned from a close reading of the 35 papers. For example, there is strong commitment among virtually all the countries to sustainable forestry and environmental protection. Furthermore, there is a lack of awareness of the difference between policy development and policy implementation, especially among the Eastern European countries. Finally, the author on recent Ukrainian forestry legislative developments admits that, in his judgment, the forestry sector in his country was simply not ready for a major transition, that “mechanical transfer of market regulators to the Ukrainian economy . . . can have negative impacts.”

Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry will be useful to analysts interested in comparative forest policies. Its reading will reveal many commonalities and differences among European forestry and environmental laws, which could be systematically structured for scholarly analysis and further research. The addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses of the authors contained near the end of the document provide many useful sources of information.

Forging a New Framework for Sustainable Forestry is a good read. While the translations are clumsy in places, their reading is well worth the time and effort for the perspectives they offer.

Dennis LeMaster is Professor and Head of Purdue University Department of Forestry and Natural Resource, and Chair of the Pinchot Institute Board of Directors. You may order a copy of the book discussed in this article by writing to: IUFRO Secretariat, Seckendorff-Gudent-Weg 8, A-1131 Vienna, Austria. Tel.: +43-1-877 01 51; FAX: +43-1-877 93 55; or via email: iufro@forvie.ac.at; website: <http://iufro.boku.ac.at>.

Of Politics and Chiefs

Char Miller

When Jack Ward Thomas became the Clinton Administration’s choice to replace Dale Robertson as chief of the Forest Service in 1993, forest supervisors and administrators disapproved of the politics of his selection. Because Secretary of Agriculture, Mike Espy, had elevated him over career forest managers and the “senior executive service,” it appeared that Thomas had been selected for reasons external to the organization. “With all due respect,” wrote 70 forest supervisors the president, “we oppose this course of action,” for it would “set a precedent for all future administrations...” Far better to adhere to what these supervisors claimed to be the traditional approach for selecting a chief, in which only internal, professional qualifications mattered.

But leadership selection has long been politicized. No one appreciated the significance of this more than Thomas. He acknowledged his debt to this contentious past when in his discussions of the Forest Service’s agenda he evoked the agency’s controversial founder, Gifford Pinchot. Although Pinchot claimed that the agency must insulate itself from outside political pressures, he also undercut these assertions when one of his successors did not conform to his well-defined sense of the agency’s mission; by so doing, he helped establish the complicated heritage surrounding Thomas’s contested ascension.

Behind the Throne

This tradition’s origins can be traced to the carefully managed conclusion of Pinchot’s tenure. Fired in 1910 for insubordination, he urged agency staff to remember that “the work of conservation, to which they were devoting their lives, was greater than any one man or any administration, and should be carried on despite all obstacles.” He was gone, but they must keep the faith.

They could more easily do so because Pinchot and others worked behind the scenes to insure that Henry Graves, a close friend, would become the second chief. This made for a smooth transition and allowed Pinchot to remain a force in the agency, giving rise to a complex relationship between it and the first ex-chief.

His was not an every-day presence. After 1910, Pinchot threw himself into electoral politics, yet he regularly gave advice on matters small and large. In 1914, he was called in to squelch a personnel dispute. More publicly, he chastised Graves and staff for establishing a closer alliance between public forestry and timber companies. Shocked when the agency released a report that he believed was a "whitewash of destructive lumbering" and compromised the public interest, he argued that such accommodation meant capitulation.

A series of Pinchot-inspired dust-ups with Graves only intensified when William B. Greeley became the third chief in 1920. The almost decade-long struggle between these men turned on different constructions of the Forest Service's professional ideals, social significance, and political agenda. As Greeley put it: Pinchot "saw an industry so blindly wedded to fast and destructive exploitation that it would not change. I saw a forest economy overburdened by cheap raw material. Mr. Pinchot saw a willful industry. I saw a sick industry." And when they fought over these positions, they gave no quarter, making them more alike than they might have been willing to admit.

The third Chief was not Dead On Arrival. Adept at challenging Pinchot's claims to define the profession, Greeley reshaped public foresters' sense of their duties, especially by establishing a cooperative relationship with industry. His deft handling of a series of legislative initiatives that ultimately produced the Clark-McNary Act, which Pinchot stoutly opposed, demonstrated that the new chief also knew how to work the political process to his advantage.

This had ramifications for the agency's internal culture: Greeley's perspectives muted other voices. The most striking example of this was Raphael Zon. A Pinchot ally, he was eased out of

the Washington office to the Lakes States Forest Experiment Station. With the Society of American Foresters hewing to the non-regulatory line of the Greeley-led Forest Service, Pinchotites felt isolated. By the late-1920s, disillusioned with the American Forestry Association, rarely asked to write for professional forestry publications, Pinchot felt cut off from the world he had helped create; he even stopped attending meetings of the Society of American Foresters. Greeley had uprooted the founder.

This did not stop Pinchot from slapping out at his antagonist. Periodically, he testified in Congress against some of Greeley's legislation. He also wrote a stinging preface to, and financed the publication of, George P. Ahern's *Deforested America* (1928), a savage critique of the timber companies' environmental depredations. The "[l]umber industry is spending millions of dollars to forestall or delay the public control of lumbering," Pinchot claimed, "which is the only measure capable of putting an end to forest devastation in America. It is trying to fool the American people into believing that [it] is regulating itself."

From distant St. Paul, Zon roared his approval—"Bravo! At least there are two militant voices raised against the camouflage spread about the practice of forestry by private timber land owners." Yet he doubted their angry voices would become anything but "a cry in the wilderness."

Still, Pinchot fought on against the self-congratulatory posture of the contemporary leadership of the American forestry movement, and was delighted when Greeley resigned in April 1928 to become executive secretary of West Coast Lumbermen's Association. About Greeley's years as chief, Pinchot was emphatic: his administration had been "pitiful." With his "malign influence" removed, "the foresters [are] returning to what they had known all along was the right point of view." However self-satisfied, this claim gave Pinchot hope that foresters now would embrace his conception of their work.

For his part, he reactivated his membership in the important Washington chapter of the Society of American Foresters, once again pressed the case of national regulation of private forestry practices,

and cheered on R.Y. Stuart, Greeley's successor. The "time is ripe for a great advance in forestry in America," he wrote his professional colleagues, urging them to reject the "counsels of overcaution, inaction, and delay, and turn to the aggressive pursuit of clear cut objectives" that would put "an end to forest devastation."

Of primary concern was "public control of the axe," Pinchot reaffirmed; it is "our central problem." Pleased that Ferdinand Silcox, who became chief in 1933, shared his views, he applauded Silcox's liberal faith in forestry's social obligations. Comforted and reinvigorated, Pinchot was eager to restore the Forest Service's embrace of the public good.

After Life

There has never been an ex-chief quite like Gifford Pinchot. Only his death in 1946 stopped his long, often combative, association with the Forest Service, and even then supporters such as Raphael Zon posthumously used his name to rally support for or opposition to shifts in agency policy. Fifty years later, Jack Ward Thomas regularly invoked Pinchot during his energetic attempts to sharpen its commitment to the principles of Ecosystem Management. These changes would catapult the Forest Service back to its rightful place at the forefront of the environmental movement; being on the cutting edge, Thomas asserted, was "our birthright, our heritage, and our destiny." But that avant-garde status could only be reclaimed if the service recovered what he called "the Pinchot thrust of leadership."

Char Miller is professor and chair of history at Trinity University in San Antonio and is a Senior Fellow at the Pinchot Institute. This essay is drawn from his article, "Chiefly Politics: Contested Leadership in the USDA Forest Service," published in the Earth Day 2000 issue of the Electronic Green Journal <<http://egj.lib.uidaho.edu/egj12/index.html>

Perspective

The Seventh American Forest Congress: Time for a Pulse Check

V. Alaric Sample

The Seventh American Forest Congress, held in Washington DC in February 1996, was the culmination of a two-year effort involving more than 6,000 individuals all across the United States. Unlike in the previous six Forest Congresses, the first of which was held in Washington in 1905, the vast majority of participants in the Seventh American Forest Congress were not natural resource management professionals. Most were average citizens, from many different walks of life, brought together simply by a shared interest and sense of concern for the future of forests and forestry in this country.

Seldom, if ever, has such a number or diversity of citizens come together to collectively articulate their vision for the future of our forests, and to develop basic principles by which they wish to see these forests conserved and cared for. Therein lies the great value of the Vision and Principles that emerged from the Forest Congress, along with the fact that participants wisely chose not to become mired in the specific forest policy controversies of the moment, but to focus upon enduring values that can provide continuing guidance to policymakers and natural resource managers in the ongoing ebb and flow of issues.

As such, the Forest Congress Vision and Principles can also serve as a sort of yardstick against which to evaluate trends in forests and forestry since the Forest Congress took place. Do today's forest conditions and practice of forestry look more like—or less like—those described by participants in 1996 as their vision for the future? Are the trends during this past five years lead-