Chapter 9. The Southwestern Region and the Environmental Revolution: 1960-86

The enactment of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act in 1960 reflected the growing urbanization of America and the recognition by a wide spectrum of the public and the Congress of the need for balanced and diverse uses of forest resources. Both these trends were especially evident in the Southwest, where a warm climate, dry clear air, and 300 days of sunshine per year attracted ever-increasing numbers of people from the north and east. By 1960, Phoenix had a population of 440,000, and both Tucson and Albuquerque had populations of more than 200,000. This trend continued over the next 20 years. By 1980, Phoenix had a population of more than 750,000, and Tucson and Albuquerque each had more than 330,000. The newcomers joined the older residents in the region in taking advantage of the recreational, game, fish, wildlife, and wilderness resources available in the national forests.

The Forest Service had sponsored and encouraged the Multiple Use Act in the belief that it would provide the framework for the next decade and satisfy the various users of national forest resources. It has served this purpose well. The concept of multiple-use, however, became involved in the environmental revolution that characterized the 1960’s and the 1970’s.

The roots of the environmental revolution can be traced back to John Muir and the Sierra Club, which he founded in 1892.[1] By the 1960’s, this organization had expanded to become a national organization and, led by the energetic David Brower, sought to involve itself in all matters concerning the physical geography of the United States. The National Wildlife Federation also expanded its scope of interest and lobbied for a variety of public causes. The Audubon Society and The Wilderness Society (founded by forester Bob Marshall) likewise greatly increased their memberships and became active advocates of the environment and its protection. Historically, conservation organizations had supported the Forest Service policies and had favored the acquisition of additional lands to be managed by the Forest Service. They had also favored the proposals of Chiefs Pinchot, Graves, and Silcox to regulate cutting practices on industrial forest lands. In the 1960’s, these same groups became the vocal critics of the Forest Service on certain issues.

Silent Spring

Rachel Carson, a trained marine biologist and experienced writer, published *Silent Spring* in the summer of 1962. It was, perhaps, the catalyst that set off the environmental revolution. *Silent Spring* was an argument against the excessive use of the new hydrocarbon pesticides, such as DDT, which threatened to “kill everything in sight.” She pointed to the incidental damage to nontarget insects, birds, small animals, and eventually humans by the large-scale spraying with ever-more-powerful insecticides. She demanded a halt to indiscriminate spraying, which she termed inhuman, undemocratic and probably unconstitutional.[2] Beyond these specifics was a philosophical protest against humans’ arrogant interference with nature and the tendency to “over- kill” anything that stands in the way. In this she echoed Aldo Leopold’s viewpoint that the whole earth is an intricate, interrelated, interdependent fabric, and that you destroy any part of it at your peril.[3]

The impact of Silent Spring throughout the country was tremendous. Students in schools and universities rallied and protested against real or fancied crimes against the environment. They

held sit-ins and celebrated “Earth Day” at parks, forests, and campuses. Organizations such as the Sierra Club assumed leadership roles in a crusade against excessive tampering with nature. Many popular writers, including Barry Commoner, Paul Ehrlich, and Richard C. Lillard, expanded the indictment of sins against nature to include topics ranging from detergents in lake water to hasty urban developments built to accommodate the rapid urban population growth. Many of these writers also protested the further testing of atomic weapons and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.[4]

Protests, Confrontations, and Lawsuits

The Southwest, and the Forest Service in the region, experienced protests, confrontations, and lawsuits similar to those taking place in other parts of the country. In June 1969, the Forest Service used helicopters to spray a section of the Tonto National Forest near the town of Globe, AZ, with silvex, or 245—TP, to thin chaparral as a means of decreasing the fire hazard, improving water yield, and in- creasing forage yield. Sparked by the concerns of Billee Shoecraft of Globe, whose husband owned and operated a radio station, there were numerous protests from residents of Globe that the spraying had contaminated their water, damaged crops, and made livestock ill. People of the town complained of vomiting and dizziness. Residents filed suits totaling $4.5 million, and the Federal courts eventually enjoined the Forest Service from using any of a number of herbicides.[5]

Somewhat farther north, the Forest Service had earlier encouraged Southwestern Forest Industries to construct a pulp and paper mill at Snowflake near the Sitgreaves and Apache National Forests. This plant utilized ponderosa pine thinnings and chips from local sawmills and provided employment for several dozen workers. Residents then welcomed the new industry and praised the foresight that had brought a new and profitable business to a region that previously lacked an adequate industrial base. By the late 1960s, however, environmentalists demanded that the mill “clean up its act,” that is, eliminate smoke and fumes in the air and recycle the water to remove pollutants before returning it to a dead stream bed that could release pollutants into the Little Colorado River. Under threat of a court order, the paper company did so at a cost of several million dollars.[6]

New Regional Forester

The 1960’s also saw a change in leadership for the Southwestern Region. Fred H. Kennedy had served as regional forester since 1955 and had dealings with the early environmentalists. After his retirement in 1966, William D. Hurst from the Intermountain Region became chief officer of the Southwestern Region. Hurst had grown up in southern Utah, in or near Panguitch. He had the unusual distinction of being a third generation forester, as his grandfather had served under Gifford Pinchot as supervisor of Beaver National Forest and his father had been a ranger on the Dixie National Forest (both in Utah). After completing his general and professional education at Utah State University, Hurst joined the Forest Service in 1937. He worked his way up from his first assignment on the Wasatch National Forest and came to the Southwestern Region as regional forester in February 1966. Hurst brought not only a keen mind and almost 30 years’ experience but also a pride in the history and traditions of the Forest Service and a genuine concern for the well-being the people and the forests—his new responsibility.[7]

The new environmentalists placed a high value on areas of untrammeled wilderness and sought an immediate act of Congress formally setting aside substantial areas to remain in their wild state. They sought to provide means to add other acreage to those so designated. The Forest Service had been involved in the protection of wilderness for at least 40 years and had set aside numerous

wilderness areas by administrative directive. Indeed, you will recall that the Southwestern Region had designated the first official wilderness. In the pantheon of environmental pioneer Aldo Leopold, Arthur H. Carhart, and Bob Marshall are considered founders of the wilderness movement.[8]

To the environmentalists of the 1960's, this was not sufficient. Pointing to reports that the Forest Service had reduced the size of the Gila Wilderness to 433,000 acres (largely during the administration of Regional Forester A. Otto Lindh in the late 1950's), they demanded that Congress pass a law that would establish wilderness areas and thus take away from the Forest Service the authority to create, reduce, or eliminate wilderness areas.

> As William D. Hurst explained:
>
> The Gila Wilderness was not reduced to 433,000 aces as stated. This is what happened: The original Gila Wilderness of approximately 732,000 acres was created in 1924 by administrative action, as you have pointed out. Later, all of the original Wildernesses and Primitive areas were subjected to a study to determine their wilderness suitability. That part of each area that qualified under the criteria then in use was classified as Wilderness under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. (Later this classification was made by the President.)Those parts which did not qualify for Wilderness were reserved as Primitive Areas. The result of this action on the Gila National Forest was the creation of the 438,626-acre Gila Wilderness, the 137,388-acre Gila Primitive Area and the 182,216-acre Black Range Primitive Area, for a total of 735,000 acres. These three units constituted the original Gila Wilderness. At about the time this classification took place, and during the public discussion, a road was constructed through the full length of the Gila Primitive Area, roughly from Roberts Lake on the south to Beaverhead on the north. To accommodate this road a very narrow corridor was removed from Primitive Area status. So, in reality the size of the Gila Wilderness was not reduced appreciably as some allege. Today, both the Gila Primitive Area and the Black Range Primitive Area (now the Aldo Leopold Wilderness) have been classified as Wilderness. These, along with the Gila Wilderness have a combined acreage of 760,000 acres which is greater than the original Gila Wilderness.[9]

1964 Wilderness Act Passed

Under the leadership of Senator Clinton P. Anderson (D, New Mexico), Congress passed the Wilderness Act of 1964. It directed the Secretary of Agriculture to establish guidelines for wilderness. The Forest Service was to define and administer 54 wilderness areas, plus other "primitive areas" that were to be studied and, if suitable, later might be added to the wilderness system.[10] Within the Southwestern Region in 1964, there were 11 wilderness areas totaling more than 1,100,000 acres. In addition, there were six primitive areas of some 580,000 acres that were to be further studied to determine their suitability for classification as wilderness.[11] Thus, a misunderstanding contributed in some part to public pressures for new wilderness preservation legislation.

The word *wilderness* means many things to different people. To Aldo Leopold, wilderness had been both a condition of geography and a state of mind. There, he frequently recounted, man could exist with nature in all of its "infinite variety." Bob Marshall defined wilderness as having no permanent human inhabitants and no means of mechanical conveyance. It should be "sufficiently spacious that a person could spend a week or two of travel without crossing his own tracks."[12] Richard E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service from 1952 to 1962, pointed out that the establishment 14 million acres of wilderness was not just for some 450,000 people who would

backpack in wilderness areas but looked ahead 50 or 100 years when the number will be multiplied. "If we are to have wilderness at all," he counseled, "you cannot have wilderness with a few acres. It takes large areas. That is inherent in the nature of wilderness."[13]

The enthusiasm for wilderness brought about a major confrontation between the Forest Service and environmentalists regarding the Santa Fe National Forest. In 1963, Regional Forester Fred Kennedy, officials in the State government, and local citizens decided that it was desirable to build a highway from Las Vegas along the southern slope of Elk Mountain, through a portion of the Santa Fe National Forest, and on to the west end of the Pecos River Road in Pecos Canyon. Described as a "scenic drive," it would open up a spectacular section of country and provide access to potential new ski slopes on 11,600-foot Elk Mountain. The road would also make it feasible to let cutting contracts on about 60 million board feet of mature, old-growth ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir, which would provide employment for several hundred residents of northern New Mexico, one of the poorer sections of the State. The officials in Washington approved the project as did Governor David Cargo, who promised to raise the necessary 20 percent matching funds for a combined Federal-State highway project. His successor, Governor Bruce King, also supported the project. Both New Mexico senators favored the project, as did most local residents.

Conservationists Oppose Highway

Conservation groups, however, announced their opposition to the proposed highway and formed the Upper Pecos Association (UPA) to fight it in the courts. Calling the region south of Elk Mountain a "de facto" wilderness, James B. Alley, attorney and spokesman for the UPA, charged that the real purpose of the road was to open up the region for the lumber companies who were eager to get to the prime ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir timber. He said everything else was merely window dressing. If the road went through, he predicted this area would suffer a blight of paper plates, soft drink cans, pop tops, and lines of chemical toilets. Furthermore, the paved highway would damage the Pecos Wilderness, which lay just to the north. The New Mexico Conservation Coordinating Council (NMCCC) joined in opposing the road. Their combined members were able to exert considerable pressure on the State government. The UPA filed a suit in Federal court against Robert Peterson of the Economic Development Administration, which had agreed to fund the project. By this time, Congress had passed the Environmental Policy Act (1969), and the Forest Service had to provide an environmental impact study statement, thus further delaying the beginning of construction. Eventually, the Forest Service and State of New Mexico abandoned the entire proposal, and the Elk Mountain road was not built.[14]

Throughout the country, environmental groups used protests, confrontations, and Federal lawsuits to prevent the Forest Service from awarding timber contracts, building fire lanes, and cutting diseased stands of pine. They were especially adamant in their opposition to clearcutting a stand and then replanting to secure an even-aged forest. Many of these cases, though in other regions, directly or indirectly affected the national forests in the Southwestern Region. In north-central Colorado, the Forest Service planned to log an area some nine miles north of the ski resort town of Vail and build an access road. Wilderness advocates sought to prevent any logging and sought an injunction until Congress could consider the merits of adding this area to the wilderness reserve in Colorado. Plaintiffs kept this case in the courts from 1964 until 1970 when the Federal court at last enjoined the Forest Service from cutting any timber in the disputed area. Known as the Parker Case, this decision had to be borne in mind whenever the Forest Service wished to utilize the resources on any land that was contiguous to a wilderness or primitive region. In a similar case in Montana, the "Lincoln-Scapegoat" controversy had nationwide importance. This rugged region of forest land, popular with hunters, fishermen, and backpackers, lay south of the

Bob Marshall Wilderness. The Forest Service planned to develop the forest region, build a road into the back country that would facilitate entry by a variety of recreational groups, and advertise several stands of mature timber for sale. Led by Cecil Garland, a sporting goods merchant at Lincoln, the local conservation group opposed the scheme and appealed to their representative to stop the roadbuilding until a further analysis could be made. The national Wilderness Society soon became involved and successfully stalled all action until the Forest Service was directed to "take another look." Eventually, environmental-minded friends in Congress pushed through a Scapegoat Wilderness Act in 1972. Thus a "de facto" wilderness moved into the national wilderness system.[15]

In the East, the famous "Monongahela" decision (1973) in West Virginia prohibited all clearcutting and intensive timber harvesting as contrary to the Organic Forestry Act of 1897. This decision, if applied nationwide, would have severely limited or prevented the Forest Service from managing the national forests for "wise use," as had been its policy and goal for more than 70 years.[16]

Somewhat later, in 1981, a controversy arose in the Lincoln National Forest over the leasing of some 9,000 acres, including a part of the El Capitan Wilderness, for oil and gas exploration. Despite the insistence of Interior Secretary James Watt that the explorations go forward (approved with conditions by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service), a congressional committee first stalled and then the oil company modified its application to exclude that portion of the lease within the wilderness.[17]

Forest Service Freedom Reduced

These and other cases severely reduced the Forest Service's freedom to manage the national forests according to the multiple use-sustained yield philosophy. Wilderness groups lobbied tirelessly to add additional lands to wilderness classification. The constant agitation effectively prevented the Forest Service from developing or following a long-range management program for the forests under their care and direction. It was as Chief McArdle said, "some enthusiasts want to put a fence around every acre of federal land and call the whole thing wilderness."[18] It is not surprising that forestry officials bemoaned that they had "lost control and leadership of wilderness philosophy." Local merchants, environmentalist lawyers, and popular writers were making decisions and drawing boundaries that the Forest Service, with its experience and training, should have been doing. Indeed, the Forest Service seemed trapped between the preservationists and the users of renewable resources.[19]

All of the Federal agencies in the Southwest were involved and affected by the proposal to build two new dams on the Colorado River within the Grand Canyon as part of the Pacific Southwest Water Plan. Earlier, the Federal government had constructed the Hoover Dam below the Grand Canyon and in 1956 had authorized the Glen Canyon Dam above the park. In 1963, the Bureau of Land Management outlined a project to build Marble Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon Dam (later renamed Hualapai) within the Grand Canyon National Park. The Kaibab National Forest lay directly north and south of the lake sites and would be directly affected by the dam itself and pipelines and towers that would be constructed to convey the water and electric power generated by the projects. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson both supported the planned development, and Interior Secretary Stewart Udall (from Arizona) outlined the proposal to Congress and recommended its approval.

Dam Projects Opposed

Immediately, most national conservation groups and societies joined in stoutly opposing the project. The Sierra Club ran advertisements in the New York and Washington papers urging concerned citizens to write their senators and representatives, expressing their views and protesting any construction in Grand Canyon National Park. When the Internal Revenue Service threatened to take away the Sierra Club's tax-exempt status for lobbying regarding a proposed act of Congress, many additional thousands of citizens were outraged. Environmentalists quoted John Muir's protests back in 1915 against the Hetch Hetchy Dam in Yosemite National Park and repeated Aldo Leopold's philosophical comments about humanity's tendency to destroy the very things that have made life on the earth worthwhile.

In the midst of a great nationwide outpouring of protests by conservationists—everyone knew about the Grand Canyon; many had visited it; and most others had admired its magnificent vistas on film or picture—Congress held hearings on the project in the spring of 1967. Congressman Morris Udall (D-Arizona), brother of the Secretary, sought to find a compromise that would permit at least one relatively low-level dam to be built. To this, Brower of the Sierra Club and other environmentalists were adamant: "No dams! Leave the Colorado as a free-flowing river through the Grand Canyon."

Faced with united opposition from all sides, the Johnson Administration put the canyon dams "on hold." Later that year, Secretary Udall and his family took a raft trip through the Grand Canyon, imitating John Wesley Powell's pioneer exploration a century earlier. Returning from this tremendous experience, Udall announced that he had been mistaken about dams in the canyon and had changed his mind; he now opposed any such project. Although power and water advocates continued their efforts, the mood of Congress definitely turned against any obstructions within the Grand Canyon. The Congressional Act of 1968 funding the Central Arizona Project specifically prohibited dams within the Grand Canyon.[20]

Wild and Scenic River Act

The same year (1968), Congress passed the National Wild and Scenic River Act providing for the protection of certain rivers to remain in their "free-flowing" natural state. Of the initially designated eight "wild and scenic" rivers, one lay in the Southwestern Region, the Upper Rio Grande. Beginning at the Colorado border, this river flows south through rugged country, skirting the Carson National Forest and the Pueblo de Taos Reservation almost 50 miles to the vicinity of the town of Taos. This stretch of "white water" adds to the recreational attractions offered by the facilities of the Carson, Wheeler Peak Wilderness, and the ski and hiking properties of the Red River resort.[21]

As regional forester, Bill Hurst inherited a particularly troublesome problem in northern New Mexico involving parts of the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests. Although there had been old Spanish land grant claims and counter-claims, and litigation concerning land titles for more than a century (certainly since 1848), the Forest Service and the native population, Indian, Hispanic, and Anglo, had gotten along well, and there had been good cooperation on all sides in previous years. Hurst and his immediate predecessors had made a practice of appointing rangers and fire guards to the Carson and Santa Fe who could speak Spanish as well as English and could relate to the local farmers and ranchers. Elliott Barker, one of the bilingual rangers, explained his experience: "four-fifths of our dealings were with Spanish-speaking people. They would listen to a person who could talk their language, . . .but if it was done in English or through an interpreter, you could never put it over at all."[22] Some rangers who had Spanish-American heritage, such as Chris

Zamora, Joe Rodriquez, and Paul Martinez, knew the region well and were friends of the residents.

The Alianza Federal

This cooperative atmosphere changed completely with the rise of the Indo-hispanic orator and leader Reies Lopez Tijerina in the middle and late 1960's and the formation of the Allanza Federal de Los Pueblos Libres (the Federal Alliance of Free City States). Tijerina and his followers were determined to take over National Forest System lands that they claimed were part of their early land grants, regardless of Federal court decisions dating back to the last century.[23]

In October 1966, Reies Tijerina, his brother Cristobal, and several hundred followers drove into Echo Amphitheater, a Forest Service picnic ground in the Carson National Forest. This picnic ground was located on land that was once a part of the San Joaquin del Rio de Chama Land Grant. They ignored requests from the rangers on duty for the regular $1.00 daily use fee and swarmed into the central area. They then roughed up and threatened the rangers (Phil Smith, Chris Zamora, and Walt Taylor). Tijerina proclaimed the new state of San Joaquin del Rio de Chama, declared that court was in session, and proceeded to try two of the rangers for trespassing, disorderly conduct, and public nuisance. Tijerina had publicized this adventure well in advance, and his party had been accompanied by television and news cameramen who recorded his speeches and the "take over" of part of the Carson National Forest. The rangers were eventually rescued by the State police. The next day, forestry officials swore out warrants against Reies Tijerina, his brother, and other leaders who were arrested and then released on bond. The leader proclaimed that he was satisfied with the publicity his brief occupation had produced and predicted that his case would go to the Supreme Court.[24]

Courthouse Raid

The next year (1967), Reies Tijerina and his followers made a raid on the courthouse at Tierra Amarilla where arraignment proceedings for the previous seizure were scheduled and where several Alliance members, including Cristobal Tijerina, were incarcerated. Alianza members roughed up court employees and shot and wounded a State policeman and two sheriff's deputies. They also seized and disarmed the sheriff, kidnapped several officials, and held them as hostages. During this disorder, the mob shot up parked police cars, broke windows, and destroyed other property. Needless to say, they thoroughly disrupted the court. Tijerina talked about making "citizens' arrests" of Governor Cargo and 10th Federal Circuit Judge Warren Burger (who later became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court), but he never carried out these threats. During all this time, he basked in the publicity that accompanied his every move. Eventually, when the court convicted and sentenced Tijerina and the other leaders for the Echo Camp disorders, their attorney appealed to the U.S. Circuit Court, and, pending appeal, the court released them on bond.[25]

In the ensuing months, someone murdered a Tierra Amarilla deputy sheriff, and a mob burned signs and destroyed other property on the Carson National Forest. This resulted in the Federal judge revoking the bond for Tijerina and other leaders and placing them in prison. After more than a year of legal maneuvering, the court eventually found Reies Tijerina guilty of three counts: assaulting a police officer, destroying government property, and assaulting Forest Service rangers. The judge sentenced him to three years in prison on each count. Later, in 1969, the court also convicted the other leaders and sentenced each to prison terms.[26]

During all of this turmoil, confrontation, and litigation, Regional Forester Bill Hurst sought to maintain the region on an even keel and keep the morale of the foresters high. He urged supervisors, rangers, and guards to become active citizens in the communities where they lived and to get to know the local citizens and their problems. Although it was a “bureaucratic” agency, the Forest Service was fortunate to have “on-the-ground salesmen” who could create a favorable, positive image of the Forest Service. He suggested that foresters do more with newspaper items and television and radio appearances to accent the many desirable and favorable things that come from the Forest Service and play down the negatives and the no’s that they had to hand out on occasion. Hurst stressed “traditional values” of the Forest Service, such as professionalism, pride in the Forest Service, its history and traditions, high standards of integrity, honesty, and hard work by all employees, a deep concern for the individual people who were dependent on the national forests, and a strong bond of “family” among the Forest Service members for each other. He also stressed the important role the Spanish-Americans had played in the management and development of the Forest Service in the Southwest, both as members of the organization and as users of the resources of the National Forests.[27] In 1972, Region 3 adopted the Northern New Mexico Policy with directives that the uniqueness and value of Spanish- American and Indian cultures must be recognized and preserved.

Land Exchange Problems

One of the continuing problems of the Forest Service in the region was land exchange. In 1960, D.D. Cutler returned to the region from service in the Washington Office and took charge of land classification and adjustments. He continued in this capacity during much of the Hurst era until his retirement in 1973. In Arizona and New Mexico, the problem of land exchange was especially critical and troublesome because of the large-scale “checkerboard” pattern of Federal land grants in mile-square sections that were awarded to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe and other railroads in the late 19th century. Cutler worked out a number of important land exchanges, including the Rio Grande and Hondo grants on the Carson, the Ghost Ranch ex change on the Carson and Santa Fe, the Zuni on the Cibola, and the Coconino exchange in Arizona. Looking back at the land tangle in the Southwest from the vantage of a century of hindsight, it is apparent that neither the government, the railroads, nor the settlers were well-served by the alternate section system of selling or granting public lands in the West. What would have been a large family farm east of the Mississippi was a totally inadequate parcel of land in the arid West. All parties had to resort to exchanges, additional purchases, or diverse schemes or subterfuges to acquire a block of land usable for ranching, lumbering, development, or other purposes. It was a classic example of eastern lawmakers drawing up legislation affecting western lands that they knew nothing about and most had never seen.[28]

In 1976, Jean Hassell, who had been forest supervisor on the Carson during many of the Tijerina disturbances, succeeded William D. Hurst as regional forester. Hurst had managed well during a difficult and turbulent time of rapid change. In turn, Hassell, who was young and robust, accepted the challenge and the prospect of further change in stride. In a message to the region’s foresters in 1984, he set forth his philosophy as manager of the region’s forests.

> Change is the stock in trade of the professional manager and more is on the way. We have advances in technology, changes in organization and in the way we do our work, but the biggest change, and the one that concerns me most, is the burgeoning public interest in almost everything the Forest Service does.
>
> The region is doing outstanding work. Our accomplishments are admirable in many fields. Yet there seem to be more and more people who challenge our judgment, appeal decisions,

> and at times haul the Forest Service into court. Much of the concern comes from people who are new to the Southwest and the number of newcomers grows daily. Many of them come from cities in the East and Midwest and getting their first exposure to the "outdoors." . . . What we must do is get acquainted; make them believe that we are trustworthy and competent and that what we do is not destructive or contrary to the people's best interests.
>
> We also must not forget that new people bring new ideas that may very well offer new ways to deal with problems.
>
> To keep up with the times we can build on the traditional values of honesty, hard work, dedication and professionalism. Our professionalism, however, must be demonstrated by a willingness to accept new concepts and to generate a good share from within the organization.
>
> Change will continue at a growing pace as we move through the 1980s. Our challenge is to manage change to our advantage. These are exciting times that I feel we are ready to meet head on. There have never been greater opportunities to make our mark and to show that the Forest Service is the best resource management organization in the world.[29]

Despite the changes that have occurred, the history of Region 3 has a certain timelessness and continuity that over- rides the changing time and technology. Today's work is built upon the foundations laid by such men as Arthur C. Ringland and Aldo Leopold, and perpetuated by the count- less foresters, administrators, specialists, and just plain people who followed in their footsteps. Today's foresters do much the same work that was done over a half-century ago, and much of the timber that they protect and that is cut by modern lumbermen is there because of what the people who worked in the Southwestern Region did long ago. The deer, the squirrels, the fish and the fresh water, and the artifacts and ruins of ancient cultures are still there because of the continuing work of the Forest Service. The conservation of the natural and cultural resources of the Southwest through preservation and wise use is an unending task.

In retrospect, Forest Service personnel in the Southwestern Region have been unusually dedicated and hardworking men and women. There has been a distinctive sense of loyalty to the Southwest, as much as to the Forest Service. People who came to work in the Southwest most often stayed there, and if they left, many came back to retire there. Those people have developed in the Southwest a tradition of public service that has extended to personal community involvement as well as professional services. Working with the Forest Service in the Southwestern Region tended to be an "extended family' experience. Although the traditional values of the Forest Service are clearly under the stresses and strains of modern society and modern technology, those values and the mission and dedication of the Forest Service are, with the distinctive cultural and natural resources, a vital part of the timeless heritage of the Southwest.

Reference Notes

[1] Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973), pp. 122-160. Many writers would carry the origins back to Henry David Thoreau.
[2] Donald Fleming, "Roots of the New Conservation Movement," *Perspectives in American History 6* (1972): 7-14.
[3] Nash, *Wilderness*, pp. 195-197; Aldo Leopold, *A Sand County Almanac* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), pp. 237-263.
[4] Fleming, "Roots of the New Conservation Movement," pp. 40-45.

[5] Jack Shepherd, *The Forest Killers: The Destruction of the American Wilderness* (New York: Weybright and Talley, 1975), pp. 221-222.
[6] Richard C. Davis, *Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History* (New York: Macmillan, 1983), vol. 1, p. 29; Bob Bowman to writer, February 24, 1986.
[7] William D. Hurst with Henry C. Dethloff, Albuquerque, NM, May 10, 1985 (interview).
[8] Nash, *Wilderness*, pp. 182-187.
[9] William D. Hurst, Bosque Farms, NM, to Henry C. Dethloff, College Station, TX, April 8,1986.
[10] USDA Forest Service, *Search for Solitude, Our Wilderness Heritage* (Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, 1971), pp. 8-9.
[11] These were the Chiricahua, Galiuro, Mazatzal, Mount Baldy, Sierra Ancha, Superstition, Gila, Pecos, San Pedro Parks, Wheeler Peak, and White Mountain Wildernesses. The primitive areas listed were Blue Range, Pine Mountain, Sycamore Canyon, Gila, Black Range, and Blue Range (NM). Forest Service, *Search for Solitude*, pp. 28-29.
[12] Leopold, *Sand County Almanac*, pp. 265-279; Roderick Nash, “The Strenuous Life of Bob Marshall,” *Journal of Forest History*, 10 (October 1966): 19-23.
[13] Richard F. McArdle and Elwood R. Maunder, “Wilderness Politics: Legislation and Forest Service Policy,” *Journal of Forestry History 19* (October 1975): 166-179.
[14] Shepherd, *The Forest Killers*, pp. 182—210.
[15] Dennis M. Roth, *The Wilderness Movement and the National Forests: 1964-1980* (Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, 1984), pp. 19-22, 25-34.
[16] *Isaak Walton vs. Butz*, 376 F. Supp., (N.D., W. Va., 1973). This decision led to the enactment of the National Forest Management Act of 1976, which restored some measure of control and discretion to the Forest Service but provided stricter guidelines. See Thomas R. Cox, Robert S. Maxwell, Philip Drennon Thomas, and Joseph J. Malone, *This Well-Wooded Land: Americans and Their Forests From Colonial Times to the Present* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), pp. 256—257.
[17] Michael Frome, *The Forest Service,* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984), pp.296-297.
[18] McArdle, *“Wilderness Politics,”* p. 176.
[19] Roth, *The Wilderness Movement*, p. 32.
[20] Nash, *Wilderness*, pp.227-254.
[21] Frome, *The Forest Service*, p. 141.
[22] Edwin A. Tucker and George Fitzpatrick*, Men Who Matched the Mountains: The Forest Service in the Southwest* (Washington, DC: USDA Forest Service, 1972), P. 289.
[23] *Ibid*., pp.276-277.
[24] “Summary of Alianza Activities,” Forest Service Archives, October 21, 1969, Regional Office, Albuquerque; Tucker and Fitzpatrick, *Men Who Matched the Mountains,* pp. 276—288.
[25] *Ibid*.
[26] *Ibid*.
[27] William D. Hurst, Paper to R-3 Staff Officers and Forest Supervisors, April 1, 1969; William D. Hurst, Speech, “Traditional Forest Service Values,” 1984 (USDA Forest Service, Regional Office, Albuquerque, NM).
[28] D.D. Cutler, letter to Henry C. Dethloff, March 21, 1985; USDA Forest Service, “Land Exchange in the National Forest System,” USDA Forest Service, Regional Office, Albuquerque, NM; William S. Creever, *Arid Domain: The Santa Fe Railway and Its Western Land Grant* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1954), passim.
[29] Jean Hassell, “Change Management Essential,” from *Southwestern Region Administrative Bulletin*, December 1984.