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FOREWORD

These reflections are of public service in the conservation of natural and human resources, a service that spans the years from the early 1900's to the 1950's: in the beginning as one of Gifford Pinchot's young students of forestry, and subsequently, after graduation from the Yale Forest School, as a charter member of the United States Forest Service; here an interlude for service with the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I in France and Belgium; and in the end, as one of Herbert Hoover's World War I European veterans, participating as a foreign affairs officer in the State Department with Charles P. Taft, Committee Chairman, in the unending drama of the forty loaves and fishes, the aftermath of World War II.

To record, when in retirement, the events of long ago and in places far away, demands a search, archeological in character, in the Old Curiosity Shop, that is, the attic of the home. There, in dim light, one steps gingerly around three-legged chairs and what-nots, and brushes the dust off old trunks with the engaging label "Not Wanted On The Voyage." There remains to be explored as well a fascinating area, the attic of the mind! Dust is there too, but there are no barriers to the exercise of a fertile imagination to embroider a recital of just what happened - when and where. A pleasant sadness pervades such a search; to look at the faded photographs of colleagues now all gone, and to read the wrinkled and yellowed papers of reports and letters.

There is consolation in the thoughts, happily recurrent, of the rewarding association enjoyed at home and abroad with conservationists and humanitarians of the day, selfless men who sweat for duty and not for mead, who met mountains and did great things, in challenging times of historic import.

Mrs. Jasper Ingersoll, Dr. Thelma Dreis, and Mrs. Amelia Fry, collaborators in the Regional Oral History Office of the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley, have been my mentors. Their skillful guidance, patience, and unflagging interest have made possible the recording of these reflections.

Arthur C. Ringland
July 29, 1969
This interview was made possible by a grant from Resources for the Future, Inc., under which the Regional Oral History Office of the Bancroft Library at the University of California at Berkeley embarked on a series of interviews to trace the history of policy in the U. S. Forest Service. Dr. Henry Vaux, Professor of Forestry, University of California, Berkeley, is the Principal Investigator of this project. Copies of the manuscripts are on deposit in the Bancroft Library of the University of California at Berkeley; also in the Department of Special Collections, UCLA Library; in the Forest History Society, Yale University; and in the library of Resources for the Future, Washington, D. C.

The Regional Oral History Office was established to tape record autobiographical interviews with persons prominent in the recent history of the West. The Office is under the administrative supervision of the Director of the Bancroft Library.

Willa Klug Baum, Head
Regional Oral History Office

Regional Oral History Office
Room 486 The Bancroft Library
University of California
Berkeley, California
DESCRIPTION OF SERIES

Interviews: A Documentation of the Development of the U.S. Forest Service 1900-1950

This Resources for the Future interview series on the birth and development of the Forest Service began as a sudden disturbance in the ever-active brain of Ed I. Kotok in early 1964. One wintry day in early 1964, as we were putting away the tape recorder after one of our last sessions together, I mentioned casually that I would not be in the Bay Area for the summer: I had to go East.

Ed's eyebrows shot up. It was obvious that a final piece had fallen into place in a mental jigsaw that he had been carrying around for some time. He said that there were quite a few of his retired colleagues still in Washington, D.C., some of whom were the original "Pinchot boys." If only, he mused, the Oral History Office could find financing for an entire series on the Forest Service, maybe from a foundation like Resources for the Future.

Henry Vaux, then Dean of the School of Forestry at Berkeley, was the logical one to turn to. He gave advice and counsel on a priority system for selecting the men to interview. From deep in his perspective of specialized knowledge of forest policy, he saw the opportunity to preserve information that would otherwise be permanently lost.* At best, the tape-recorded memoirs could reveal, more frankly than annual reports and official letters, some of the political and economic facts of life that influenced the development of policy in the agency. The actual decision-making process, told first-hand and linked with the official rationales and actions on particular issues, could be useful in appraising contemporary policy questions and their multiple alternatives. Today, as in 1905, forest policy is a field where special interest pressures are in a state of varying equilibrium with the public interest. To see the policies and decisions of the past materialize, to witness through the administrators' eyes the expected or (more often) the surprising effect of those actions in the past—such a visible continuum could provide a depth of experience for those who are presently wrestling with the economic and political disequilibriums of resource management.

Horace Albright, a veteran interviewee of oral history operations, lent his encouragement to us and probably his enthusiasm to his friends on the board of Resources for the Future. We contacted three top-priority potential interviewees to see if they were willing to indulge us in our tape recording scheme, and we received a yes, a no, and a maybe. This changed to two yeses and, in place of the no, a substitute interviewee equally as valuable. By late spring, a modest grant to the Oral History Office marked the beginning of the series, Henry Vaux agreed to be Principle Investigator, and we were off.

* See appendix, Letter from Vaux to Fry, March 20, 1964.
Structure of the Series

The series, with a working title of "The History of Forest Service Policy, 1900-1950", began and ended as a multiple use project. Its major aim was to provide tape-recorded interviews with men in the Forest Service who during most of the half-century had been in policy-making positions. The series also served as a pilot attempt to try the relatively new technique of oral history as a method of gathering primary information within a specific subject field (one which might be defined here as the origins, operations, and effects of policy in public administration). The method, in turn, was hung on the superstructure of a list of retirees who were considered to be able to contribute the most to that subject.

Each major interview contains the standard stock of questions on Service-wide controversies of the past: the attempts to reorganize the conservation agencies - specifically, to transfer the Forest Service out of the Department of Agriculture; the efforts to get passage of federal legislation that would have regulated timber management on private lands; the competition with other agencies and with private owners for land acquisition determinations; on-going issues, such as competing land uses like mining or grazing, which often reflected years of patient negotiation with and bearing up under the pressures of well-organized special interest groups.

Each interview covers as well topics that are unique to that particular person's experiences, so that tracing "policy in its origins, operations, and effects," necessitated a detective job to discover, before an interview took place, those policy questions with which the particular individual had had experience. It was here that an interviewee's own contemporaries frequently gave guidance and counsel; advice was also provided by academic specialists in forest economics, recreation, fire control, silviculture, and so on.

Given questions on the same subjects, the interviewees sometimes speak to them from contrasting points of view, and thereby provide a critique of inner validity for the series. For instance, while Lee Kneipp and Ed Crafts comment on the informal power in Congress of the Forest Service's widespread constituency, other men (such as Ed Kotok) who actually had been in the field and involved in local public relations verify how the system worked.

The structure of an oral history series depends on many factors beyond the control of the oral historian: the health of the interviewee, his willingness to interview, and how much he can or will say about his career. The fluid state of our interview list caused our cup to runneth over more than once with more interviewees than we could add to our original list of three. Twice the list was enlarged - and fortunately funded further by Resources for the Future. The phenomenon of expansion was due largely to the tendencies of a few memoirists (especially Christopher Granger, Lee Kneipp, and Raymond Marsh) to touch lightly on events in which he had only slight involvement, then refer the interviewer to the man who could tell the whole story from a leader's eye view. The result is that some of the interviews on the accompanying list are one-subject, supplemental manuscripts.
Results

One will find more comprehensive and general information in the longer interviews of Christopher Granger (who was the head of timber management), Ed I. Kotok (Research; state and private forery), Leon F. Kneipp (land acquisition and management), Arthur Ringland (field activities in setting up the new forests under Gifford Pinchot), Tom Gill (international forestry), Ed Crafts (Congressional relations), and Samuel T. Dana (Research; forestry education), the latter interviewed in cooperation with Elwood Maunder of the Forest History Society. Earle Clapp (research, Acting Chief), shunned the tape-recorder and is currently proof-reading his own written account of his career, a manuscript that will be deposited in Bancroft Library along with the other interviews.

The single subject interviews consist of Paul Roberts on the shelter belt project of the New Deal; R. Clifford Hall's account of the Forest Taxation Inquiry, coupled with H.B. Shepard's story of the Insurance Study. A view from without is provided by Henry Clepper of the Society of American Foresters and Fred Hornaday and Kenneth Pomeroy of the American Forestry Association - a trio who provide a fitting introduction to the series for the reader. George B. Hartzog, Director of the National Parks, comments on the relationship of the two agencies; Earle Peirce gives a first-hand account of the first time the Forest Service stepped in as principal agent in salvage operations following a disastrous blow-down on both state and private timberlands. John Sieker and Lloyd Swift both contributed a telling picture of their respective divisions of recreation and wildlife management. Without these shorter, from-the-horses' mouth accounts, the series would have sacrificed some of its validity. There are of course still other leaders who can give valuable historic information on policy development, men who perhaps can be included in the Forest Service's current efforts to further document its own Service history.

With a backward glance at the project, one can say that the basic objective of tape-recording, transcribing, and editing interviews with top men in the Forest Service was realized. The question of quality and value of the interviews must be decided later, for the prime value will be measured by the amount of unique material scholars use: the candid evaluations of leaders by other leaders, the reasons behind decisions, and the human reflections of those in authority; how they talked in conversation, how they developed trends of thought and responded to questions that at times were neutral, at other times challenging. The value of the series also depends on how many leads lie in the pages of the transcripts - clues and references that a researcher might otherwise never connect in his mind or in the papers and reports he reads.

Since this series was built with tentative hopes that in the end it could justify itself both as a readable series of historical manuscripts and as a valuable source of easily retrievable, primary material, a master index of uniform entries from each volume was developed after the transcripts came out of the typewriter and landed on the editor's desk. Dr. Henry Vaux helped in setting up the broad areas of subjects to be included, and as entries were
added, the Forest History Society at Yale became interested. At present the development of the index is a cooperative enterprise between the Oral History Office, the Forest History Society, and the U.S. Forest Service. A master index of uniform headings from each volume is available at the Oral History Office and at the Forest History Society.

By-products

One frequently finds that the oral history process is a catalytic agent in the world of research. First, it stimulates the collection of personal papers and pictures which, while valuable during the interview in developing outlines and chronology, are later deposited either with the transcript in Bancroft Library or with related papers in another repository.

Another happy by-product comes from the more literate who are motivated by the interview to do further research and writing for publication. Thus, Paul Roberts is currently writing an entire book, complete with all the documentation he can locate, on the shelter belt, its whys and hows. Ray Marsh is meticulously combining both writing and recording in a painstaking, chapter-by-chapter memoir which will cover his earliest reconnaissance days, the administrative posts in New Mexico, the fledgling research branch, and his work with Congress; his stories of those earliest years have already appeared in American Forests. Tom Gill, fortunately frustrated by the brevity of the interviews, which were condensed into the short travel schedule of the interviewer, is writing a more comprehensive treatise that will no doubt be unique in this or any other forest history: Tom Gill on Gill and international forestry.

Also, there is the self-perpetuation phenomenon--oral history begetting more oral history. The interview with National Park Director George Hartzog has led to serious efforts on the part of the Park Service to establish a regular annual interview with the Director--not necessarily for publication. Also under consideration is a Service-wide plan for oral history interviews of all its major leaders, which could serve as a continuation of the series conducted by Herbert Evison in the early 1960's.

Ed Kotok did not live to see the finished series. Just as Lee Kneipp never saw his finished manuscript, and Chris Granger's final agreement, covering the use of his manuscript, was found still unmailed on his desk after his death. All other contributors, however, were able to devote hundreds of man hours to the reading, correcting, and approving process required in finishing a manuscript. Although Ed did not get to read and approve his own transcript, all who knew him will agree that the series stands as one more symbol of his propensity for plunging in where few have tread before.

(Mrs.) Amelia K. Fry
Interviewer - Editor
Mrs. Amelia R. Fry
Regional Cultural History Project
486 General Library
Campus

Dear Mrs. Fry:

The significance of the proposed project for securing information from certain selected people long associated with the development of the U. S. Forest Service rests on two facts. On the one hand, there are a small number of men still alive whose personal experience and memory covers virtually the entire history of the growth and development of the Forest Service since 1905. If we are to secure the best possible insights and understanding of the history of the Forest Service as a conservation agency the recollections and mature viewpoints of these men who were associated with the Service throughout their careers would provide unique and invaluable source material. The time remaining during which this information could be collected is obviously limited. A second justification is found in the fact that to date there has been no comprehensive historical evaluation of the role of the Forest Service as a conservation agency.

Ise has published a critical history of National Park policy under the sponsorship of Resources for the Future which serves as an initial evaluation of the National Park Service. About 1920 Ise published a study on forest policy but that is obviously now confined to only a very small part of the significant history. A series of views such as are suggested in the present proposal could provide both new source material and the inspiration for a critical historical evaluation of the Forest Service.

The results would of the greatest importance to the field of forest policy. The Forest Service pioneered both the articulation and the implementation of the concepts of sustained yield and multiple use as policies for natural resource management in the U. S. It instituted numerous innovations in the organization and administration of programs of handling federally owned resources. It developed on a large scale new techniques for cooperation with state and local units of government in such matters as fire protection and landowner education. It pioneered in a number of respects in the development of research as a functioning guide to operational policy of the government. Each of the contributions just enumerated are of the greatest possible significance for forest policy and for important implications going far beyond the natural resources field. The project here proposed would throw much light on the way in which each of the innovations noted above developed and would contribute greatly to our understanding of them.

Very sincerely yours,

Henry J. Vaux
Dean
THE RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE SERIES

tape recorded interviews on

THE HISTORY OF FOREST POLICY, 1900-1950

1. Clepper, Henry, Executive Secretary, Society of American Foresters.

2. Dana, Samuel T., Dean, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan


4. Granger, Christopher, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, national forest administration.

5. Hall, R. Clifford, Director, Forest Taxation Inquiry.

6. Hartzog, George B., Director, National Park Service.

7. Hornaday, Fred, Executive Vice-president of American Forestry Association; and Pomeroy, Kenneth, Chief Forester for A.F.A

8. Kotok, I. E., Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, state and private forestry; research.


10. Marsh, Raymond, Assistant Chief of the U. S. Forest Service under Earle Clapp.

11. Peirce, Earl, Chief, Division of State Cooperation, USFS.

12. Ringland, Arthur, Regional Forester, Region 3; Executive Secretary of National Conference on Outdoor Recreation; founder of CARE.

13. Roberts, Paul, Director, Prairie States Forestry Projects;

14. Shepard, Harold B., in charge of Insurance Study, conducted by the Northeastern Experiment Station with Yale University.

15. Sieker, John H., Chief of Division of Recreation and Lands.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

It was Horace Albright who, in 1966, first mentioned that Arthur Ringland would be a rich source of information, especially regarding the issue around the false mineral claims on Bright Angel Trail in the Grand Canyon. When I arrived in Washington, D.C., in July to begin the Resources for the Future series, Tom Gill* again urged that Arthur Ringland be interviewed--this time for his contribution to international forestry and, coincidentally, to foreign relief programs. Mr. Ringland and I met briefly that summer, but we agreed to await the results on a long and complex series of physical tests he was undergoing; once that was over, series plans were made for an interview.

A few months later, we asked Mrs. Edee Mezirow, who was living in Washington, to try to set up an interview with Ringland, perhaps with his old friend Tom Gill sitting in as an enticement. Ringland was demurring, I think because he was unconvinced that tape recorded interviews could be precise and accurate enough. He wanted first to go through his papers and take great care in documenting his statements, a procedure with which we were in hearty agreement. The negotiable question was: how much "ad libbing" should there be? In the meantime, Mrs. Mezirow moved to Los Angeles, and Mrs. Fern Ingersoll became the interviewer.

In March of 1966, Ringland tape recorded, alone, some of the information he had collected from the "attic" of both his house and his mind. He and Mrs. Ingersoll worked together closely, combing through his papers and holding one or two recording sessions a month through the summer and fall, whenever they had amassed a detailed enough outline to tape. So detailed, in fact, was their pre-interview work that often Ringland's notes amounted to verbatim script for the interview.

That winter, Ringland underwent an eye operation which, while successful, forced him into an inactive life for a while. When the laborious research-and-recording process was resumed, spring was turning into summer of 1966, but Ringland managed to finish his forestry history comments and began what came to be called the section on "conserving human resources." The story of CARE and also of his State Department work was tackled during this period. The tapes were mailed to the Berkeley office as they were completed and, with the aid of accompanying notes, were transcribed.

In late July, 1966, Mrs. Ingersoll acceded, under some pressure from our office, to continue on the job through the editing process with Mr. Ringland, for the Ringland/Ingersoll combination had been a happy one--

productive and meticulous. The summer was long and hot and rainless and not conducive to long, persistent work. But the two were at it again September 20, and their modus operandus for editing included inserting large amounts of material that did not get in the first time around. Additional tapes were made—one on November 28 and one December 6, 1966—to "fill in gaps."

Our funds were running low, and toward the end of the year we had applied to Resources For the Future for an extension of both time and money. Correspondence nervously flew back and forth between us regarding the progress or at least the prognosis of the grant extension, and finally in the spring of 1967 it was granted. Meanwhile, work had continued, except for a short illness of Ringland's in late winter. Mrs. Ingersoll was due to leave for Thailand with her husband in June, and the work on the manuscript reached a furious pitch to finish the editing by June and send the much-interlineated document to our office in Berkeley for final typing and processing.

Ringland found new pieces of material, however, before final typing froze his story into unchangeable form, and during a visit with Mr. Ringland in Washington a few months later, it became apparent that neither of us wanted to close off the manuscript with valuable material omitted. We decided that the thing to do was to mail the material back to Washington so that he and Mrs. Thelma Dreis—Mrs. Ingersoll's successor—could go through it and insert the additional papers and commentary.

As we both knew, there was a great deal to insert: the more that was put in, the more that was pertinent to add. Always with encouragement from this end, the two went at it with scissors and typewriter—taping four more sessions, too—and finally, in the fall of 1968, they began mailing back sections of the manuscript to be final typed in Berkeley.

Then began the process of notes flying back and forth, determining names, the meaning of footnotes, the position of appendix items, and checking dates and spellings. In the final assembly, which was done in the Berkeley office, we decided that the most convenient format for the many appendices was to insert each batch of papers after the section of the transcript to which it referred, and number the appendix pages with supplemental letters: "27a, 27b," etc. The problem of inadequate, unreadable reproduction of some of the appendices from Ringland's files was never solved, and those that were too dim therefore could not be placed in all copies of the interview; hence, only the Bancroft Library copy has all appendix items.*

This office's role was mainly that of sending research notes and outlines on Ringland's life to Mrs. Mezirow when the idea of an interview was first being negotiated, plus additional notes to Mrs. Ingersoll when the interview was underway. Once begun, the interview material was worked out by Ringland and the interviewer. As tapes were completed, they were mailed to this office for transcription. The final typing and processing were also done here.

The index items were listed by Ringland and Mrs. Ingersoll before the latter left for Thailand. They were expanded to include the material...

* Because of binding problems, all these appendix items were not included in the Bancroft Library copy.
added later and underwent certain alterations in our office to comply with the entries on a master forest history index worked out, for all the forestry interviews.

Ringland and Thelma Dreis uncovered the rich illustrations of the early forestry days, partly in his own files and partly in the Washington Office of the Forest Service. All he sent are included here, except for a handsome portrait of President Herbert Hoover (Inscribed, "To Arthur Ringland with the Kind Regards of Herbert Hoover") and a striking photograph of Chief Forester Gifford Pinchot similarly signed. These were returned to Ringland to be kept in his personal files, on the theory that such photographs are available for copying to researchers elsewhere, while their intangible value to the recipient and his family is probably very great. The originals of the remainder of the photographs, after being copied in Berkeley, were also returned to Ringland.

Amelia R. Fry
August 1969
Berkeley, California
THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

Fern Ingersoll and Thelma Dreis have each described the setting of their work with Mr. Ringland and the methods employed in recording the memoirs.

FERN INGERSOLL

"Ring" and I made our first appointment at the Washington Cosmos Club, of which he has long been a member. With us was Tom Gill, author and long-time friend of Ring's, who on several occasions during the months ahead gave me books on matters concerned with the conservation aspects of Ring's career and suggested topic questions which Ring himself might be too modest to bring up.

After this first meeting we met almost every fortnight for two years. Accompanied by Churchill, the family dog, Mrs. Ringland drove Ring to my house. Often Mrs. Ringland went on to a project or meeting of the garden club in which she has been active for many years.

Beginning from a list of topics supplied by Mrs. Amelia Fry of the Oral History Program, we wrote and rewrote outlines as new documents showed up. These were "pegs" as Ring expressed it, on which he could hang his many memories. Some of these documents came from files in his attic, others from documents he looked up in the National Archives, still others from former colleagues to whom we wrote. When a particular episode in his career seemed fairly clearly outlined, we talked about it, recording as we went. Often a current newspaper article brought back a memory of a similar problem in the past, for Ring's reading and thoughts are very much the concerns of the present and future, seen with but not limited to a perspective of the past.

Although Ring's life was divided into distinct phases by his varied work, no chapter was ever finished; people, such as Hoover, influenced more than one part of his career. A letter from one period would bring back a memory not only of that stage of his career but of an earlier one, so we went back together to insert his thoughts in a chapter we had previously done. How pleased I
was when on a frosty morning he would appear with a suitcase of documents and say, "You know, last night I found a letter I think will throw some light on a matter we talked about some months ago." Because of this ever-growing, ever-deepening memory of the past which emerged from Ring and because of his vitality and spark of warm humor that I came to enjoy so much, I was very regretful to have to complete my part in the project when my husband's research took us to Thailand in 1967.

Fern Ingersoll
October, 1969

THELMA DREIS

The way was paved for my work with Ring by Mrs. Fry, and it was he who called me to set up an appointment. I went to his home in Chevy Chase to work with Ring. He showed me the manuscript that had come to him for clearance and the numerous papers he would like to work in or attach. I was invited to read the first 64 pages and to edit or to ask about any part that did not seem clear to me. Meanwhile, he worked on other sections. He had made numerous inserts in his own handwriting, and at first I found his script difficult to read. After completing my review I checked with him to make sure the copy would be readable for final typing.

Mrs. Ringland made lunch and the three of us ate together in the large kitchen, looking out on the beautiful garden. We talked of the children and grandchildren and of Mrs. Fern Ingersoll, my predecessor now in Thailand, whom I had not met but whom Mr. Ringland admired very much. He mentioned that when he worked with her he had gone to her home.

We worked at Mr. Ringland's for only two sessions. There were interruptions by the maid and the dog and cat, so I suggested working at my apartment in Washington. From then on, Mr. Ringland did the travelling, arriving promptly at the appointed hour and working in any way that seemed helpful to him. Occasionally we began our work before noon and I served a light lunch. More frequently, however, we would work in the afternoon, breaking the session with some light refreshment. I watched the clock and tried to hurry my co-worker off before the government workers would be going home and crowding the buses; but in his eagerness to get the work done, he was occasionally caught in the traffic.

It was our practice to walk to the bus together, a distance of only one and a half blocks. Now, being free from our work, we bantered a bit as we walked, Mr. Ringland often responding to a remark with a pun--an art, he admitted, that he had cultivated with his daughter, Susan.
Our project was practically finished within the year; however, a few pictures, attachments, or supplements continued to call for attention. It was with regret that I completed my last task, in September, 1969, expressing in all sincerity to my employer, "What a pleasant experience this job has been."

Thelma Dreis
October, 1969
INTRODUCTION

The pressing need . . . is for men who will see things for themselves and try to see them freshly; men who can do their thinking without imitating the faults of their elders; men able to form reliable opinions without turning the covers of books or referring to the newspapers. Such men develop judgment; such men make discoveries, begin new industries, take the sting out of ancient ills; such men are men of ideas, and by them the enlightenment of an age is extended.

Sir Harold Bellman

For years Arthur C. Ringland carried these words in his pocket. As he now looks back over his life, he feels that they apply to the two men who most influenced his career: Gifford Pinchot and Herbert Hoover. Yet it would seem difficult to find a life more clearly reflecting the import of these words than that of Arthur Ringland himself.

Beginning a career in the Forest Service at the very turn of the century, he amassed wide field and office experience at the time of a great national crusade to save the public domain from individual greed. He saw the building of a unique government service. Thus he was able to view this Service from the varied perspectives of a student assistant, a forest assistant, a district forester, an assistant in the organization of a forestry regiment in World War I, the executive secretary of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, a European forestry representative, a conservation liaison officer with the CCC, and the chairman of the Flood Control Coordinating Committee.

Other positions held during his career were associated with "taking the sting out of ancient ills" -- directing post World War I relief to Czechoslovakian children and later to Russian refugees in Constantinople, investigating (as consultant to the National Defense Advisory Commission) the extent of disturbance to human life when farm land was taken for military sites, and coordinating the activities of American voluntary relief agencies before, during, and after World War II.

With cumulative experience, sometimes successful, sometimes frustrating, as the following pages indicate, he was able to draw ideas from his own past experience, always adding, when possible, the innovations necessary for the differing needs of the new situation (i.e., World War I relief to Europe and the organization of CARE in World War II).
What has gone into the life of a man who, in his eighties, has developing views on national and world affairs and who is still consulted by the nation's policy makers? Frequently in the course of these interviews, the schedule was changed because of Mr. Ringland's attendance at a meeting of the board of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, or a meeting with his successors in the State Department, or with the Citizen's Committee for Natural Resources. At other times the subject of an interview was changed because of a current concern he was expressing at a meeting or in a letter to an editor.

These interviews were a growing project taking place over the period of roughly two years (spring '65 to '67). Throughout this period the original outline was revised and lengthened by Mr. Ringland and myself as we went over his personal and professional papers in the light of his own memory of events. The originals of these documents, referred to as the Ringland Papers in footnotes to these interviews, have been given by Mr. Ringland to the Bancroft Library in the University of California at Berkeley for the use of scholars. Copies of many of these which bear closest relevance to the text are included in appendices to each of the chapters. Fuller appendices exist in the Bancroft Library's copy of the transcript.

A variety of techniques, mostly resulting in tape recorded interviews, were used in the course of this project. At times Mr. Ringland responded spontaneously to spontaneous questions. Sometimes he wrote out whole sections which were later incorporated into the typescript of the interviews. Sometimes he responded to written questions based on his documents but needing his personal perspective. Behind all of these techniques were hours of consideration which he gave to outline topics, both for detail and wider significance, between interviews. Finally, after I had drawn together material from the typescript on similar subjects and had indicated gaps, Mr. Ringland went over the entire typescript, making considerable additions before giving it his final approval.

After original planning sessions in the Cosmos Club and in the office of Tom Gill, an old friend of Mr. Ringland, who originally did much to inspire these interviews, "Ring" and I worked at my home in Takoma Park, Maryland. On some occasions he made the trip from his Chevy Chase home on the bus; more often he was chauffeured by his wife, Dorothy Ringland. On these occasions he was often still in the mood of some lively discussion Mrs. Ringland and he had been having as they drove through Rock Creek Park, perhaps of a current topic such as home rule for Washington, D.C., or of personalities such as Catherine Breshkovski or Alexander Kerensky whom they had both known in Europe, or of family concerns of their son and daughter, their grandchildren, pets, or garden. Mrs. Ringland's concern and ability with gardening seems a fitting complement to the life of a man whose original career was determined by a desire to be out-of-doors.
rather than to "sling ink" in an office.

During the interviews, Mr. Ringland would from time to time ask that the tape be turned off. His reasons appear to me now as highlights of his personality. The off-switch might be clicked when he felt that a passing memory, unsubstantiated by documents, might present a distorted picture of his own part in some highly successful effort. Again it might be clicked upon his request when he couldn't resist telling a good story which he recognized as rather far from the point at hand. Most often it occurred when he felt unsure of facts, particularly if these might be derogatory to the reputations of others involved in situations. The reader will find few reputations scarred. The qualities indicated in Mr. Ringland's request that the tape recorder be turned off were the same qualities coming through during the recording ... humility, humor, and deep humanity.

This interview forms a part of the collection of autobiographical interviews conducted by the Regional Oral History Office with persons prominent in the field of conservation, supported by a grant from Resources for the Future.

Fern S. Ingersoll,
Interviewer - Editor

1 June 1967
ERRATA
Arthur Ringland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6 from bottom</td>
<td>Hotten to Hatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>para 3, last line</td>
<td>Glowdown to blowdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>para 3, last line</td>
<td>Quercus Toumeyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>para 2, next to last line</td>
<td>Hoover should be Coolidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>para 4, line 13</td>
<td>Franklin to Theodore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>para 4, line 3</td>
<td>Coolidge instead of Hoover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>para 5, next to last line</td>
<td>Von to Van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>para 1, last line</td>
<td>haricots verts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>para 1, next to last line</td>
<td>khaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>last para</td>
<td>Advising to Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>para 3, next to last line</td>
<td>boulevardier instead of boulbardier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>para 3</td>
<td>$450,000,000...$1,000,000 should be $45,000,000...$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>para 2, line 13-14</td>
<td>strike out &quot;and a member of the Executive Committee for Natural Resources&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adventure Determines Decision

Ingersoll: What lured you into forestry in the beginning?

Ringland: It was the spirit of adventure; I lived in a suburb of New York, the town of Montclair, New Jersey. That's where I was reared. I knew what I did not want to do. In the town of Montclair, many people did business in New York; they commuted. It was about fifteen miles outside of the city. My father was one of those who commuted. He moved the family from Brooklyn to Montclair in 1888 in order, as we were told, to get away from the crowded city and enjoy some semblance of the out-of-doors. I didn't want to "sling ink," let's put it that way. I liked to roam around, and we had plenty of opportunity there, with the mountains and woods of the Watchung Range. We killed Indians, and all that sort of boyhood thing.

I remember at one time reading an article in the old Cosmopolitan about banana plantations. I wondered if I should look into that. And I remember thinking very seriously of going to sea. Well, there again, it was the idea of not going into business, that is. I can't tell you that at that time I was inspired with any zeal to serve the public interest; I was just a young man interested in the out-of-doors and the adventure that goes with it. I think that is what motivated me most; I'm sure it was. There was nothing else--there was certainly no money as an incentive.

Ingersoll: Did you consider other paths?

Ringland: In 1900 when I was graduated from Montclair High School, I thought of entering Harvard. At that time
Ringland: my brother Robert was completing his first year as a student in the famous College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University, and the family finances did not permit college for anyone else at that time. I might note parenthetically that his subsequent brilliant career as a general practitioner was evidence that he had attained his boyhood ambition to be a doctor. He was once given a beautiful silver box from Colonel Lewis, the inventor of the Lewis machine gun of World War I, on which these lines from Ovid were engraved: "It is a pleasure appropriate to man to serve a fellow man, and gratitude is acquired in no better way."

Ingersoll: What brought forestry to your attention?

Ringland: I think it was reading about the newly established school at Cornell University under Dr. Fernow, a famed German forester.

Washington Work

Ingersoll: How did you begin in your forestry career?

Ringland: I applied for the position of student assistant in the old Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. [In 1901 it became the Bureau of Forestry] Much to my astonishment I was told to come to Washington and report in person October 23, 1900 to the Chief of the Division of Forestry. I'm still astonished.

First Impressions

Ingersoll: What were some of your first impressions when you got to Washington?
I had never been in Washington. I remember looking thoughtfully at a brass marker in the floor of the old Pennsylvania Railroad Station, at that time on the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 6th Street N.W. It marked the spot where Garfield was shot.

The office of the Division of Forestry was in a red-brick Victorian building which stood on the site of the present Department of Agriculture south of the Mall and at that time housed all of the Department's activities. James Wilson was the Secretary of Agriculture and was popularly known as "Tama Jim." It was he, this canny Soot, who, when given an inadequate appropriation for a new building, erected two wings and bided his time for money to complete the center. The old Department was to my youthful eyes a noble example of architecture, much like the old Corcoran Art Gallery, now the Court of Claims, on Pennsylvania Avenue.

It was Winston Churchill, I believe, who said that, while men make buildings, buildings make men. So we have the inspiration of the Lincoln Memorial and the utilitarian, yet beautiful, Federal Reserve Building on Constitution Avenue. Yet some of our modern buildings, both Federal and private, remind me in their uninspired monotony of the cardboard structures with holes punched for windows which my brothers and I put together in our childhood.

The approach to the Department of Agriculture was a path and driveway stretching as far as the present Constitution Avenue and lined with ginkgo trees. It afforded a pleasing vista as one walked along. Near the entrance to the building stood a tall and imposing cross section of a giant sequoia which served as a natural belvedere to view the Mall.

I was impressed with the simple dignity of the entrance to the Department. There were no armed guards at the doors in those days. A helpful official directed me to the office of a pleasant gentleman with an imposing beard. I assumed that he was Mr. Pinchot, the head of the Division of Forestry. But in fact he was the likeable Otto J.J. Luebkert, the chief clerk, and it was he before whom I took the oath of office, a solemn and impressive occasion for me. Mr. Luebkert was known
to my fellow students as "Jumping Jesus." The principal staff officers at that time were Gifford Pinchot, Forester, known as "G.P.," Overton W. Price, Superintendent of Working Plans, and George B. Sudworth, dendrologist.

Duties of Student Assistants

What was the work of a student assistant?

Pending field assignments, our principal work was to compile the data submitted by the field parties for the development of working plans for forest management which the Division had contracted for with some of the private lumber corporations. That was before the Division had any responsibility for the administration of reserved forested public lands. In the afternoons we would study, and we did. I spent many evenings in the Reading Room of the Library of Congress. It was my university.

Was this study relevant to forestry?

Well, yes and no. I studied forestry, of course; but I read avidly and omnivorously.

Were all the rest of these student assistants doing pretty much the same thing at that time?

At that time, yes. There were not many of us.

Do you remember the names of any of the men who were with you in Washington or in the field at that time?

Waha, du Bois, Clinton Smith, Kent, Peck, Guthrie, Foley, Kinney, Keach, Riley, Hodge, Hodson, Hotton, Homens, Mulford, Besley.

Do you know how any of the other student assistants got into the work?

Some time and not too long after I became a student assistant, an article appeared in a Saturday
Ingersoll: Evening Post which did attract some men. I recall that Allen S. Peck and John D. Guthrie, classmates and recent graduates, and A.O. Waha had all read it.

Ingersoll: Do you think the article was written by someone in the Division of Forestry?

Ringland: Certainly someone familiar with it. All I remember is that some of my colleagues said, "Oh, we first read about the work in the Saturday Evening Post."

Modest Living

Ingersoll: How did you live in those days?

Ringland: For this contribution to the public good, we received $25 a month. But it should be borne in mind that $25 went quite a way in those days for a young man with no cares. Our boarding expenses were modest. A bountiful, free lunch was possible for the price of a beer. And an evening at the Baked Apple Club in G.P.'s home, where the newly organized Society of Foresters (Nov. 30, 1900) met, was a gastronomic, as well as an intellectual, treat.

Baked Apple Club

Ingersoll: How did this Club figure in your life while you were a student assistant in Washington and while you were back in the city between timber evaluation surveys?

Ringland: The student assistants were invited to attend the sessions of the now legendary Baked Apple Club. We were interested because of the men who were
In the early days, well before 1905, or more than 50 years ago, most of us were student assistants in the Division.
of Forestry or later the Bureau of Forestry. The number of professional foresters was small. As students we received an honorarium of $25 a month. It will be understood that as descendants of Adam we eagerly fell for the apple and with it the gingerbread.

The Baked Apple Club soon became an institution, and met frequently in this library after the organization of the Society in 1900. The first decade of its existence was one to be remembered for it covered Gifford Pinchot's administration as Chief Federal Forester. As an institution it made a lasting contribution in two major respects:

First, the means were afforded for an informal exchange of ideas that led to the developing philosophy of the conservation of natural resources. And ideas in those days fell on fertile soil! Out of these meetings fundamental policies were developed and put into execution—for example, studies of the public land laws leading to remedial legislation; the great expansion of the forest reserves through boundary surveys, especially in the last two years of T.R. when action by executive order was possible; plans for the productive management of the open range; the transfer of the forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; the historic Governors' White House Conference of 1907 on conservation; the decentralization of the administration of the newly designated national forests by the establishment of six field districts in the West.

In so far as I know the Forest Service was the first Federal civil agency to decentralize control with ample authority delegated to the forest officers to take action and settle action without undue reference to Washington. It is appropriate, therefore, to quote William Blake:
Ringland:  Great things are done when men and mountains meet. These are not done by jostling in the street.

The second major contribution of the Baked Apple Club was the esprit de corps engendered—something, however elusive, that has carried its influence to this day. I had occasion to discuss this with an old timer. He spoke of the good old days when morale was high but took a dim view of the present. That night I telephoned him and read what another old timer had said of the good old days several centuries ago. I read this from "As You Like It":

O good old man how well in thee appears The constant service of the antique world When service sweat for duty, not for mead!

The old time foresters did indeed sweat for duty. We had the advantage of working in a new field under extraordinary leadership. T.R. and G.P. inspired one another, and they us. Today in ways perhaps less dramatic foresters are carrying on in the public interest with the same sweat for duty that activated those of us of the "antique world."

The ideas which were voiced in this library more than 50 years ago and continuing for some years found their inspiration in the association of men of imagination and public interest—some of these headed by T.R.¹ and G.P.—Garfield of Interior, Newell and Davis of Reclamation, McGee of Agriculture, Gannett of the Geological Survey, Nelson and Palmer of the Biological Survey, Hopkins of Entomology, and our own Overton Price, Albert Potter, Will Barnes, George Sudworth, Herbert Smith, Fritz Olmstead, Wm. L. Hall, Henry Graves, Ralph Hosmer, E.T. Allen, Major Ahearn, Shaw, P.P. Wells, R. Zon, Sherrard, and George Woodruff—I could go on—all spoke in this room of men

¹T.R. was a guest on March 26, 1903.
and mountains. Their ideas found fruition in practical application in the field itself, laying the foundation for an informed public opinion and conservation as we know it today. But not without a fight in the White House.

This brings to mind a commencement address I read many years ago when in England. It was in a provincial paper and I have kept the clipping all of this time. I would like to read a paragraph or two:

Ideas may prove a difficult possession. The man of ideas never leads a humdrum life. Excitements gather around him as adventures happen to the adventurous. Almost always he is a disturber of the peace; for either he disturbs his own peace of mind or is considered a nuisance by his neighbors. A modern writer has said that God offers every mind its choice between truth and repose, but that a man cannot have both. Jeremiah put the thought in more Oriental fashion when he said that the word was in his heart, as burning fire shut up in his bones. An original thought is never killed by doing away with its champion, and never will be. The most determined cohorts will still be defeated by a single idea.†

There you have a picture of G.P., the founder and the host of the Baked Apple Club.

†Sir Harold Bellman, speaking at Truro School, as quoted in the Times, Tavistock, Devonshire, England.
Ingersoll: When you went into the Division of Forestry to work as a student assistant, who were the professional people who were there at that time? Did they have any of the same spirit in those days that they had later?

Ringland: The group working there in 1900 was still small. I'm not sure just how many there were, but I've read that two years before, in 1898, there were just six in scientific work and six in clerical positions. I've already mentioned three of those doing scientific work, and although I can't remember the names of the other three, I do have the recollection that they were all professional men of the highest competence. They were not foresters as such, but they were doing research in the natural sciences related to forestry. Mostly, they worked as individuals rather than as members of a team with its own spirit, as was the case later on under Pinchot. Many learned papers had been issued long even before that by some of the earlier chiefs of the Division of Forestry. We must not overlook men like Eggleston, Hough, and Fernow, for example. These were scientists of the highest level.

Ingersoll: Did these men have the spirit, the feeling, for conservation that came a little later when the thing really got rolling, or was that yet to grow in those days?

Ringland: Well, it was yet to grow, but consider men like John Wesley Powell with his vision and philosophy, his explorations in 1867 and 1868 of the Grand Canyon, and his monumental work on the arid lands of the West in 1877 and 1878. Or consider men like George Perkins Marsh, who wrote Man and Nature. And surely Carl Schurz. Those men had the vision, of course they did. I have high admiration for Schurz and his devotion to the public welfare when he was in office as Secretary of the Interior. Those men planted the seeds, the ideas, and then it took some time for germination.

Then, very fortunately, there were men with extraordinary ability for organization and action
Ringland: like Pinchot backed by Roosevelt. It may well be doubted if he could have accomplished his objectives under any other President. Yes, T.R. and G.P. made a team.

Of course, what G.P. was leading to was a chance to put forestry into practice. He could do it to a certain degree. He and Henry Graves, later dean of the Yale University Forestry School, and chief of the U.S. Forest Service, worked in cooperation with private corporations to develop basic working plans here in the East. But ahead was the great public domain that was untouched, or where it was touched, it was by private exploitation.

Ingersoll: Do you think that during those early days, the early 1900's, when you were there, Pinchot was working toward moving in and administering the forested areas of the public domain?

Ringland: Oh, no doubt about it, because he had made a number of field trips to the West and was quite familiar with the public domain and had served in the late nineties on the National Forest Commission, the genesis of the movement to conserve the forests of the public domain. He met of course Albert Potter in Arizona, who became his associate in the Bureau of Forestry and in the Forest Service, and an authority on the grave problem of the conservation of the range.

Then we must not forget G.P. 's part in the reservation of water power sites. Here too he was looking forward to the control of exploitation for the public good.

**Timber Evaluation Surveys in the Field**

Ingersoll: In addition to your Washington office work, you did field surveys. Those must have whetted your adventurous spirit. Where did you go? Can you give us a feeling for what the field life was like?
Ringland: From time to time until I entered the Yale Forest School in the fall of 1903, I served with Bureau of Forestry parties on timber evaluation surveys for private lumber companies in East Texas, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Maine. In course, we veterans were promoted, and gloried in the title of forest expert at $40 a month!

The life of a student assistant in the field was in some respects like Gilbert and Sullivan's policeman. He was rolled out in the stygian darkness of dawn. It was always the camp cook who was the Lord High Executioner of our sleep. Each cook had his own reveille.

I remember that the cook in one camp in the long-leaf pine belt of East Texas was of fundamentalist persuasion; as he walked among the tents he bellowed in the impassioned tones of a sawdust evangelist, "And the cook crowed thrice and ye denied me thrice." But our camp leader, Hugh Curran, better known as "Strenuous," permitted no denial, not even once for he was something of a martinet.

The cook in our Tennessee camp was colored, and his reveille was one of compassion: "Captain calls me and Ah calls you. Ah knows you're tired and sleepy too. Ah hates to call you, but Ah has to. Rai-se up! Rai-se up!" The cook of our Maine camp, on the other hand, was a huge Finn, Mike, and he stood for no nonsense. Sometimes he carried a canoe paddle, which he applied vigorously to the posteriors of the sleepy-heads.

Techniques

Ingersoll: What were your survey techniques?

Ringland: Our field work was to provide the basis of working plans for the forest management of particular timberlands. There were these initial phases: strip surveys of forest stands, stem analyses of
tree cross sections, and height of typical trees; in sum to determine the species, composition, reproduction, volume in board feet, and growth.

A survey crew consisted of four men—a tally man, who dragged a 66 foot surveyor's chain on a given compass course; two men who, one on each side of the surveyor's chain, calipered for a width of 33 feet the diameter of every tree at breast height above a given diameter, and called out to the tally man; and a fourth man in the rear who kept the chain clear and carried the lunch packs. At the end of ten chains the tally man would shout "Acre" (10 chains in length and one in width equalled an acre) and the crew would take advantage of a few minutes rest while the tally man completed notes on the character of the area traversed.

The crewmen developed legs of steel and took sadistic delight in breaking in newcomers. I can hear the cry now of the tally man, "Lead on McDuff and damn to he who first cries hold enough," as we struggled through dense rhododendron and laurel in an Appalachian cove, a cypress swamp in East Texas, or a spruce Glowdown in Maine.

On July 1, 1902, I was instructed by Forester Gifford Pinchot in a letter dated June 1902 "to assist Mr. C.A. McCue in a study of white pine, hemlock, and hardwoods near Shady Tennessee." Others in the party were Waha, Burdick, Cleland and Tunis. I recall a survey in a remote Appalachian cove in Tennessee. The natives thought we were "revenoers," but we assured them we were timber cruisers. One day some of them followed us. We decided to satisfy their curiosity by calling out the tree species to the tally man by their Latin names. I remember the astonishment of one of the spectators, "Well, I'll be dog-goned!" when our man calipered a poplar tree and shouted "Lirio dendron tulipifera 23."

---

1 See Appendix I.
Ingersoll: I imagine these timber evaluation parties were pretty spirited young men.

Ringland: Camp life had its times of lightness. In the Texas camp one Sunday morning Ovid Butler, my tent-mate, who was later to become the distinguished editor of American Forests, was referee of a pancake contest. "Doc" Erdman was the acknowledged champion, his tent-mate was John Semmes. He acquired his doctorate by entertaining us with merry matutinal tunes, especially one in praise of Dr. Lyons of toothpowder fame, and parodies of Princeton Triangle songs. That Sunday morning "Doc" ate 19 platter-size pancakes!

And so did his challenger, Ringland by name, who staggered out of the dining tent, fell under a tree, and hoped for death. "Doc," still apparently hungry, helped himself to a generous bowl of oatmeal. He then proceeded with sadistic glee to present the bowl, as if it were a vintage wine, to the miserable wretch under the tree and professed to seek permission to eat. And eat he did! The whole bowlful! The astounded Ovid, as referee, declared "Doc" the Paul Bunyan of the Gridiron!

The next Sunday morning there was no pancake contest—indeed, there was no breakfast at all. The cook waited until there was an expectant and hungry group of contestants, among them the Belgium Prince Henri de Croy, and then while untying his apron, he declaimed with an air of benediction: "I am a Texas bastard and a Colorado son of a bitch, and I want my time." He was a good cook and like all good cooks tempermental.

In Maine we established a series of camps as bases for timber evaluation surveys flanking the West Branch of the Penobscot River, the tributary

---

Ringland: lakes, and Mount Katahdin for the Great Northern Paper Company. C. S. Chapman was the chief for a party of 25 men.

Lake Ambejejus was a favored camp, so much so that each of three canoe crews, which crossed each morning to pick up the survey line of the day before, looked forward eagerly to being first in camp at the close of day. This gave time for a swim and a loaf. It was the custom as a canoe crew approached camp to call out: "Ambejejus!" If there were no reply, it meant that this crew was first home and first to enjoy the amenities. But sometimes the cry would come back echoing from the beach: "Ain't by Jejus!" And in disgust the disappointed crew would reply: "Well, by Jejus!"

There's a bit of doggerel originating at Lake Ambejejus, Maine, appropriate for the work we did in those days:

Sing me a song of the Survey,
Pull that chain along,
Forester ain't half so happy
As when he's singing a song.
Stem-analysis crew for the loafers,
The Height-crew for a snap,
But if you want the best of fellows,
The Survey's the best on the map.¹

Experience as a student assistant with many field parties, the influence of my associates, and the inspiration of my chief Gifford Pinchot and his brilliant associate forester Overton W. Price, fortified my decision to follow the profession of forestry. It was with this background that I entered the Yale University Forest School in September of 1903.

Tell us a little bit about those years at the Yale Forest School, Mr. Ringland.

I should say that my experience there, particularly under the direction of Henry Graves, carried through the many years I served in the U.S. Forest Service after graduation. I entered the school in September, 1903, convinced by experience in the field, dating back to late 1900, that the profession of forestry was something I wanted to pursue. At that time (I'm speaking now of 1903), even then, professional instruction was well established at Cornell, where it was subsequently abandoned, and at Yale. Our class, the class of 1905, was the fourth. It was clear to me that if one expected to make a career in forestry, it was necessary to have the necessary professional training.

Were there any of the senior men on any of the survey parties or in Washington who were urging you to go on to get more forestry education at that time?

I suppose that the thought was commonly expressed, because by 1903 the Pinchot leadership had been pretty well established, and the men who were working closely with him had been educated abroad in either the German or French schools of forestry. They encouraged the young recruits to take advantage of the new training opportunities here in America, first at Cornell and later at Yale. At Yale, the school was made possible through a first endowment by the Pinchot family.

When I reported, I also registered for certain courses in the Sheffield Scientific School, an integral part of Yale University. So I lived, I think it was on York Street, with the freshmen of that year. I wanted in particular to carry on some of the undergraduate work because, although I
Foresters at work, Pocohontan County, West Virginia - 1903.

Ringland: was admitted to the Forest School, I had not yet the credits for an academic degree. My intimate associations were naturally with the forestry students.

Fellow Forestry Students

Ingersoll: These forestry students: had most of them some forestry experience somehow similar to your own?

Ringland: I suppose, yes, in some form or another the greater number had. There were about thirty in my class. They had served in various field trips, usually in the summer during their vacations from their undergraduate studies. At this moment I'm looking at a photograph of my class of 1905, and also I'm painfully aware of the fact that there are only about six of us left in that group. They are Harry Hill who divides his time between New England and Florida; Harry Neal, chairman of the board of the Jefferson Memorial Park in Pittsburg; Jacob Levinson, an outstanding landscape architect on Long Island; Truman Woodbury of Berkeley, California, who plays golf; and Forsythe Sherfessee living in luxury on the Riviera as a next-villa neighbor of Somerset Maugham.

Ingersoll: Can you tell about any of the men in the photo who went on in the Forest Service later?

Ringland: Oh, yes, in looking at the photograph there I might pick out, because he reached the highest grade of all in the Forest Service, F.A. Silcox, who subsequently became Chief Forester.

Ingersoll: What was he like as a young man at Yale?

Ringland: He was an outgiving, likable sort of fellow who loved to talk, though intelligently; he made Sigma Xi,  

---

1"Yale Forest School News," April 1949 cover. Appendix and Ringland Papers.
Capitan, New Mexico - 1905; Federal Building at left, headquarters of Lincoln National Forest.

Early day transportation problems in the Forest Service. Arthur Ringland with back to camera - 1912.
Ringland: the honorary national scientific society. I saw a great deal of him at that time, and even later when he was still serving in a lesser capacity in the Forest Service. He eventually became a regional forester for the northern Rocky Mountain area.

I recall a meeting we had at Salt Lake City. There was always an annual meeting of the regional foresters from the six regions of the West, and the staff would come out from Washington, headed by the Chief Forester. As in all organizations there would be the usual interplay of who would get what in the way of allotments and appropriations. At one meeting under Chief Forester Graves, Coert du Bois, then one of the regional foresters, was clever with a pencil. He drew a picture of Sil, as we called Silcox, occupying as a regional forester the greater part of the eleven Rocky Mountain states, and all the rest of us, the other five regional foresters, in little borders all around it.

Sil resigned shortly before the First World War but during the war took an active part in the settlement of labor troubles. He became a protege of Rex Tugwell, zealous and brilliant exponent of the New Deal. When Tugwell became Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Silcox became Chief Forester of the U.S. Forest Service, following the death of R.Y. Steuart in 1933. The tradition of always having a professionally trained forester as chief was maintained and has been ever since.

Ingersoll: Just parenthetically, Mr. Ringland, could you say any more about the influence of Rexford Tugwell in the appointment of Silcox as Forest Service chief?

Ringland: I met Tugwell only casually—at the Cosmos Club—in appearance he was handsome and keenly alert in expression. No doubt it was the sharing of a common philosophy (the New Deal) that brought him and Silcox together.

Ingersoll: How about some of the rest of them in this picture?

Ringland: Now I'm looking at my fellow student, a Filipino. He was a relative, I believe, of the famed Filipino
Ringland:  Aguinaldo and after graduation entered the Philippine service.

Ingersoll: The Philippine Government service?

Ringland: Yes.

Ingersoll: Did he go on in forestry in any way?

Ringland: Why, I suppose so, but I lost track of him, I must say. I'm looking now at Billy Sherfesee. His given name was actually Forsythe. Sherf, as we called him, was something of a sybarite, though like Silcox he made Sigma Xi. He served a short while in the Forest Service and then went overseas and became one of the principals of the Philippine service under Major George Ahearn of the Army, a pioneer in forestry and conservation.

Ahearn, a West Point graduate, when a lieutenant in the regular Army, gave the first instruction in forestry at the state university in Bozeman, Montana in the late nineties. It is believed he was the first in this respect. I knew the Major quite well after his retirement from the Army because of his active conservation interests and his association with Gifford Pinchot. I enjoyed his friendship and sage philosophy. He once told me that if he lunched at the Army and Navy Club instead of the Cosmos he would indeed be retired.

After serving under Major Ahearn, Sherf, whom I was speaking of, became financial advisor to the old Chinese government.

Looking at the picture, I see Jack Nelson [John Marbury Nelson], who went on for a short while in the Service, then organized his own lumber company in Baltimore and became very successful. And there is Herbert O. Stabler popularly known as "Hoss" and famed for his remarkable memory. Seated near him is Stanton Gould Smith. In later years I enjoyed seeing them for they lived so close to Washington. Smithy eventually moved to Maine when he retired where he became a consultant in forestry at Bowdoin.
One of the faculty there was well known. That was Roy Marston. We used to have a little ditty about Roy, who was always late, even beyond the usual academic leeway of five minutes. So sometimes the refrain would go up: "Good morning, Roy, the hour is late. But never mind, the class will wait."

It sounds as though there was a rather close relationship in those days between the students and the faculty. Was this generally the case?

I think, looking at it now, there was a close relationship with men like Dr. James Toumey, a distinguished scientist, and with Gifford Pinchot and Henry S. Graves, one of the founders of the school. Dr. Toumey was a man whom we all were keen about. He not only knew his subject, but he had the ability to convey that knowledge to the students. So he was highly respected. And, more than that, I think we all had a deep affection for him. There was in fact an oak named after him, the Querus Toumeyi.

Can you be a little more specific about how he was able to get across his subject to students?

As I say, in the first place he knew what he was talking about and knew how to convey that in talk. Isn't that the essence of teaching?

What did he teach?

He taught a wide field of silviculture. Outside of New Haven the city water company had quite a large forest of more than 20,000 acres which the school had agreed to manage. There we would carry on field studies with Dr. Toumey. I remember one time in the nursery when we were all sweating under his direction but were amused when he would call out, "Don't hurry, but please work fast." That became a sort of a slogan we carried all of the time.
Ingersoll: Brewer was one of the professors there at the time, wasn't he?

Ringland: Yes. In the University. Of course, we drew on the whole faculty of the university in the field of natural and social sciences. Yes, Dr. Brewer was a great geographer, and his lectures were always well attended. Every bench was full in the little theater, listening to him. He was quite an old man, with a gritty, deep voice.

It became a legend when he stopped abruptly in one of his lectures and pointed up to the top bench. He said, "That young man will live forever!" And we turned and looked around, and this fellow was sound asleep. Sound asleep at one of Brewer's lectures, that was heresy!

Ingersoll: I think you mentioned once that Brewer was one of the men who had considerable influence on you in the early days.

Ringland: He did, not on me alone. I think that's probably the reaction in any college or university, that if certain members of the faculty have that power, and Brewer was one of them, you are glad you sat under them.

Ingersoll: This was more than just a matter of reputation, wasn't it?

Ringland: Sort of like an intellectual evangelism. Does that explain it?

Ingersoll: Is Graves in the picture you have?

Ringland: He wasn't in the picture, but he was dean of the school and many of my classmates served under him when he succeeded Gifford Pinchot as chief of the U.S. Forest Service; as dean and a chief he had a profound influence.
Field Work at Pinchot Estate

Ringland: This picture that I'm looking at was taken when we were at Milford, Pennsylvania. Every spring the class would go to Gifford Pinchot's country estate, Grey Towers, for field work.

Ingersoll: What sort of field work was it?

Ringland: It was demonstrations in the forests that surrounded the estate, in their management for sustained yield, and various silvicultural experiments that were being undertaken to determine the most profitable forms of working plans. Then there were the nursery practices. We were concerned too with the engineering techniques that related to forest working plans, surveying improvements, and the like; you see, as in the picture, there were the transit, the plane tables, and the stadia rods. So it was a practical field demonstration to complement the academic studies of the winter months in the school.

Ingersoll: Were these techniques, that were probably largely applicable to eastern forests, very applicable to your later work in the West?

Ringland: Well, forestry is based on the natural sciences, so the underlying principles apply to any forest area, East or West, whether the practice is directed to research or to the execution of working plans of forest management for sustained yield.

Gifford Pinchot and Yale University Forest School

Ingersoll: You see very strong links then between the personality and thinking of Gifford Pinchot and the Yale Forest School, don't you?

Ringland: Gifford Pinchot and his associate, Henry Graves, with James A. Touney were founders of the school.
Ringland: and may be recognized as pioneers of applied conservation in this country. They were among the first to obtain professional forestry instruction abroad and by 1900 were directing the old Division of Forestry in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

They were of the conviction that if professional forestry was to develop in this country professional education comparable to that offered in Europe was essential. The influence of Yale's original faculty on forestry in America and overseas has become a cherished legend. Approximately half of its graduates served on the staff of the U.S. Forest Service during its formative period. Indeed, when I was District (Regional) Forester for the Southwest Region, the staff at the headquarters in Albuquerque was composed almost exclusively of Yale graduates.

The school was started almost as an emergency device to train professional foresters for the rapidly expanding public forestry service. The graduates of my class and the three preceding ones generally entered the Federal service, for at that time industrial and private forestry was yet to find its place in the forest economy. It should be borne in mind that at that time in the first decade Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot were focusing national attention on the need to curb the exploitation of the natural resources of the public domain.

At the first reunion of the alumni of the school held in Memorial Hall at New Haven on December 21, 1911, I was listed to respond to the toast, "Unwritten History of the Early Days." I cannot recall now what I said, although I do remember remarking on how to behave west of the 100th meridian. My thinking now is how I had the temerity to undertake to say anything immediately following the toast of President Arthur Twining Hadley.

Not too long ago several of us Washington alumni of the school felt that there was not

1 Bulletin of Yale University School of Forestry, Series 62, No. 15, August 1, 1966.
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Ringland: sufficient visible recognition of the part played by the Pinchot family in the establishment and endowment of the school. We suggested to Dean Garratt that the name of the school should be the Pinchot School of Forestry of Yale University. We pointed out as a precedent there were a number of graduate schools named after or in honor of the founders, i.e., the Woodrow Wilson School of International Relations at Princeton.

Dean Garratt pointed out that it was not the policy of the Yale Corporation to designate the schools of the university by a personal name. He added, too, that he was Pinchot Professor of Forestry and there was well in mind the plan to name a much needed new building after Gifford Pinchot. The Dean's reaction to our suggestion was well received, and we told him that we were looking forward to being present at the laying of the cornerstone.

Dedication of Pinchot Institute of Conservation, Milford, Pennsylvania (1963)

Ringland: Thinking of Milford and our class experience there brings sharply to mind the dedication of the Pinchot home as a conservation institute. In September of 1963 I received an invitation from Chief Forester Edward Cliff, of the U.S. Forest Service, to attend on September 24 the dedication of the Pinchot Institute of Conservation Studies by President Kennedy.¹

"This institute will be housed," Mr. Cliff said, "in Grey Towers, G.P.'s ancestral home. This historic building was recently deeded to the Forest Service by the families of Gifford Pinchot, Jr. and Mrs. Amos Pinchot, sister-in-law of Amos, the brother of G.P." Mr. Cliff said that the Forest Service had entered into a cooperative

¹Original on file with Ringland Papers.
agreement with the Conservation Foundation to operate the Pinchot Institute as a national center for conservation education. It was his hope that the dedication would focus new attention on the continuing need for protection and wise use of our natural resources.

I was very glad to accept the invitation, and in company with Bay Marsh and his attractive daughter-in-law, Mrs. James Marsh, we motored to Milford, to the Pinchot home. The three of us stood in the brilliant sunshine on the broad terrace that flanks the mansion and overlooks the rolling countryside to the Delaware. We had come to the dedication and were awaiting the arrival of President Kennedy.

Some weeks previously, Ed Cliff had told me of the plans to establish the institute at Grey Towers. I was so impressed that I suggested it would be an appropriate occasion for some of the Yale alumni of the early classes to make a sentimental journey to Milford, where once they carried on their field work. Bay was interested, though the pilgrimage did not develop at that time. Even so, it was a disappointment not to see some old associates. But I did meet Nelson Brown and his wife at the luncheon given by the Conservation Foundation. Governor Scranton was the honor guest at the luncheon given by the Foundation after the dedication, and I was interested because of my friendship with his cousin, Philip Scranton Platt, the one who persuaded me in Paris to go to Prague with the American Relief Administration.

While we stood on the terrace, we heard the helicopter. It landed on the lawn near the terrace, and out stepped President Kennedy, who bounded up the steps to the terrace and immediately shook hands and chatted with those near him. He left a lasting impression with me because of his ebulliency and the charm that he radiated. The photograph that I have was given me by a Forest Service photographer and shows the President in the crowd. After a few minutes there of walking around with the group, we all followed him down to a long pitch of one of the lawns, where some five thousand people were seated, elbow to elbow, to hear the dedication. At the foot was the speaker's stand.
Ringland: I did not care to go down, though I had a VIP ticket to sit right under the speaker's stand. But I stood at the very back of the whole pitch of the lawn and listened to the public address system, which worked perfectly. I preferred the freedom that gave me.

At the dedication Secretary Freeman of the Department of Agriculture introduced the President. The President spoke later of the first conservationist, meaning Gifford Pinchot. But, it's interesting to note that Secretary Freeman, in the course of his remarks, read, as he put it, a short excerpt from a historic letter. That was the letter from the then Secretary of Agriculture, "Tama Jim" Wilson, dated February 1, 1905 (the date when the forest reserve was transferred from the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture) to the first Chief of the Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot. He read that letter, which today is the Mosaic law of the Forest Service. What he said then stands today as the guideline of the administration.

He then proceeded to introduce President Kennedy as the number one conservationist in the United States at the time. And President Kennedy gave a perceptive address, which I think was an inspiration because he saw not only what had been or had been tried, but the grave problems ahead. This address, and of course the letter of former Secretary Wilson, I assume are very well known.¹

Of additional historic significance are the remarks of President Kennedy:

I begin today a journey to save America's natural heritage, a journey to preserve the past and protect the future.

¹Copies of the introduction given by Orville L. Freeman (containing the letter from Wilson to Pinchot) and the address of John F. Kennedy are on file with the Ringland Papers. See Appendix. The picture referred to in the text and a program for the dedication are also with the Ringland Papers.
Ringland: President Kennedy said in his dedication remarks:

Pinchot's contribution will be lost if we honor him only in memory. It is far more fitting and proper that we dedicate this institute as a living memorial. By its very nature, it looks to the future instead of the past. It is committed to meeting the changing needs of a changing era.

Gifford Pinchot and his Conservation Policy for World Peace

Ringland: While the President addressed his remarks to our domestic conservation needs, it is pertinent to refer to his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, presumably 1960:

The United Nations must play a larger role in helping to bring to all men the fruits of modern science and industry. For example, a world-wide program of conservation could protect the forest and wild game preserves now in danger of extinction, improve the marine harvest of food from our oceans, and prevent the contamination of our air and our waters by industrial as well as nuclear pollution.

These remarks bring sharply to mind Pinchot's philosophy of conservation. On November 19, 1941, I received the following note: "Dear Ringland, Here's my screed. I hope you'll find it worth reading. Yours, as always, G.P." It was a paper entitled "Conservation as the Foundation of Permanent Peace."¹ It was prepared, I understand,

¹The original of Gifford Pinchot's covering note to Arthur Ringland and a copy of this paper are on file with the Ringland Papers. See also appendix for note and text.
for delivery before the eighth American Scientific Congress, held in Washington in May of 1940.

Mr. Pinchot quoted President Theodore Roosevelt's remarks made at the opening of the North American Conservation Conference, February 1909:

In international relations, the great feature of the growth of the last century has been the gradual recognition of the fact that instead of its being normally to the interest of one nation to see another depressed, it is normally to the interest of each nation to see the others elevated....I believe that the movement that you this day initiate is one of the utmost importance to this hemisphere and may become of the utmost importance to the world at large."

The North American Conservation Conference, Mr. Pinchot pointed out, declared that its activities should be projected on a world-wide scope. It was suggested that the President should invite nations to join in a conference on the subject of world resources and conservation and wise utilization. It seems, however, that President Roosevelt had foreseen this, and Secretary Root reported that the principal governments had already been informally sounded to ascertain whether they'd look with favor on such a conference. He said that the responses were uniformly favorable. The President therefore felt it was timely to initiate it through a formal invitation. Secretary Root added that the people of the whole world were interested in natural resources and would benefit by their conservation and be injured by their destruction. He emphasized that people of every country were interested in the supply of food and of material for manufacture and that intelligent treatment should be undertaken to provide each nation's share of the supply.

Invitations were sent to fifty-eight nations to meet at The Hague in September of 1909. Thirty of the nations, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and Mexico, had already accepted when President Taft, as stated by Pinchot in his
Ringland: paper, killed the plan when he succeeded President Roosevelt on March 4, 1909. It seems that two attempts were made to revive it. Colonel House suggested obtaining world-wide cooperation to President Wilson. But Mr. Pinchot said that, although Wilson "took steps," nothing came of it, unfortunately. I suppose it was because of the World War conditions at that time. It seems reasonable to think that.

Ingersoll: You think that there was nothing against this, but other conditions were more important?

Ringland: I doubt it, I wouldn't think so. Mr. Wilson's scholarly character suggests support, and note he "took steps." I think it was the pressure of the war. And this might have made it awkward for some of the countries. However, during President Hoover's administration, a group of nearly two hundred leading citizens, from all parts of the country, urged him in a public petition to take action. But again, nothing came of it.

I would like to quote here from the "screed" he gave me that, notwithstanding the checks to the development of a world-wide conference, Mr. Pinchot emphasized:

The demand for new territory, made by one nation against another, is a demand for additional natural resources. And I need not point out to you how many times this demand has plunged the nations into war....When the terms which will end the present war are considered, nations should be in a position to assist in finding the way to such a peace.

Mr. Pinchot projected his philosophy of the relation of conservation to world peace by proposing that a commission be established to formulate and plan recommendations to the American nations for a general policy and a specific program of action, including the presentation of the plan, when prepared, to neutral and belligerent nations. He felt that such a commission would open the road toward a workable basis of permanent peace, that the situation in Europe and in Asia suggests that action was never more necessary than at present.
Ingersoll: When G.P. sent you this proposal as his "screed," what was your reply to it?

Ringland: I wrote him, and in my letter I referred to Harold Nicolson, who at that time was a member of Parliament and a supporter of Chamberlain's government, as quoted by Louis Fisher in his book Men and Politics. Nicolson said, "We must convince the masses in our own country that we are determined at any cost to the present social structure to carry through the campaign against poverty and to give to each individual in this island a fair prospect of food, habitation, maintenance, and opportunity."

Let me interrupt here. I can't refrain from remarking how pertinent these remarks are in respect to our present anti-poverty campaign. But to continue Nicolson: "We must convince people abroad," he said, "that we are prepared to give them a free share in the resources of our Empire." Of course, since Mr. Nicolson said that, the empire is something else today.

Mr. Pinchot replied to my letter and said "Harold Nicolson was certainly dead right in the quotation your letter contains. I am for it one hundred per cent."

Ingersoll: Was this international conference on conservation that Gifford Pinchot suggested should follow World War II ever held?

Ringland: I'm not aware that it was, but there have been many international meetings on the various phases of the conservation of natural resources, although the objectives have been technical rather than political, shall we say, and not directed to world peace as such. But most importantly has been the

---
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Ringland: establishment of the UN Food and Agricultural Organization.

Ingersoll: Well, we've travelled a long, interesting road in this conversation from student years at Yale to field study at the Pinchot estate, to the dedication of the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, to Pinchot's "screed" on the relationship between conservation and world peace.
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First Initial Professional Grade in the New Service

Ingersoll: At the time your class graduated, what was the procedure students at Yale Forest School followed to get into government forestry work?

Ringland: The United States Forest Service was established in February of 1905. In June of that year my class, the class of 1905, was graduated from Yale University Forest School. In the spring my classmates and I took the Civil Service examination for the position of forest assistant in the new Service. We were the first candidates for this initial professional grade.

Despite many a night of the lit lamp and the girded loin, to paraphrase Browning, some of us were fearful that we could not pass the examination. I asked a doctor popular with Yale students for a stimulant to buoy me up on the day of the ordeal. He was most sympathetic and at once gave me some white pills, assuring me that I would have no trouble at all if I took them exactly as directed. I did as he said, and, feeling much invigorated, attacked the examination with invincible elan. When told that I had passed, I had no doubt that it was the pills that had done the trick. And so they had—even though, as I later found out, they were nothing but placebos made of sugar. The doctor was a wise man, and this was his standard prescription for cases like mine.

On July 1, having received notice of my appointment, I reported for duty in Washington and was immediately assigned as a forest assistant at $1000 a year to the Lincoln Forest Reserve in New Mexico established by Presidential Proclamation July 26,
1902. On April 24 of 1907 it was proclaimed as a National Forest. As a student assistant, I had served in the East in the old Division and later Bureau of Forestry; service in the West was to be a new experience.

First Impressions, Capitan, New Mexico

The railhead for the Lincoln was on the Rock Island Line at Carrizozo, some three hours distant by a daily horse mail stage from Capitan, our nearest post office. At that time Capitan was a classic example of false-front architecture. Notable structures on its wide single, dusty street were: Aunt Hattie's Southwestern Hotel, Titsworth's General Store, Sebe Gray's Livery Stable, editor Haley's sanctum, and a butcher-cum-barber shop where law and order were administered by the Justice of the Peace while he held a cleaver in his hand as a symbol of dignity and authority.

Change-over from Land Office of Interior to Forest Service

Before 1905 the Lincoln Forest Reserve had been administered by political appointees under the Land Office of the Interior Department. The headquarters, when I reported, were at the home- stead of the supervisor, Clement Hightower, (a political appointee) some six miles from Capitan. The adobe ranchhouse was a simple structure, but I lived there in reasonable comfort with the supervisor and his hospitable family.

The first evidence of change was the delivery of an Oliver typewriter which the supervisor, and sometimes the forest assistants, pecked away on
Yale Forest School,
Field Work at Milford, Pa.,
Pinchot Estate, 1905

The Mesa-Roosevelt Stage Lines, Arizona 1909
(one form of transportation still in those days)
Shortly after I reported I accompanied the forest supervisor on a lengthy horseback trip to see something of the forest, the people, and the problems. As a tenderfoot for the first time west of the 100th meridian, I said to the supervisor as we jogged along, "How is the best way to get along with the people here?" He pulled up his horse, turned in the saddle, thoughtfully stroked his goatee, and paraphrased the parable of the Good Samaritan in these words: "My son, if you meet a sheep-herding so-and-so on the trail with a broken leg, break the other leg and go on."

Well, I did find a way to make friends with stockmen, sheepmen, and nesters. Thanks to the officers of Fort Stanton, an old cavalry post then administered by the Public Health Service, I early acquired a certain notoriety. I had a bull terrier, Patsy, who often rode with me. Carelessly one day I boasted of his prowess in fighting a badger. As a result, I was challenged and asked to bring Patsy to Fort Stanton for a fight. At the mess that night the waiter asked solicitously if he should feed Patsy before the fight, and I told him to wait until afterwards.

And so the fight was arranged just behind the row of the officers' quarters. Quite a crowd gathered. I heard afterwards that even the ladies of the post peeked from behind drawn curtains. I brought Patsy out and held him on a leash while a rope perhaps thirty feet long was attached to a box holding the badger, as I thought. In the meantime, numerous bets were being made and carried away by the prevailing spirit of sportsmanship, I bet a month's pay--$83.33--that my dog would run the badger off the post.

When all was ready, I was given the rope, and at the drop of the referee's hat, I unleashed Patsy with one hand and pulled the rope to spill the box with the other. Whether the game is still played in the West, I do not know; but old-timers will

1A "nester" was a homesteader who took up land on the range wherever there was water, often running into conflict with stockmen.
know what happened: with my pull of the rope—and it was a good one—out rolled a utensil that still competes in some parts of the country with the products of the Crane Company!

For a month or more as I rode over the country, someone would be sure to pull up and say, "Well, how about that badger fight?" That was all right on the range; but in town it meant setting up drinks for everyone present, and I was broke after paying off my bets. I was a soft touch for a ne'er-do-well cowpuncher, I remember only as Bill. I decided some final action was necessary. The next time he asked the question, I set up the drinks as usual, including a number for those who always shared the hospitality of the badger fighter.

I said to Bill, "I hear you're looking for a job. Have you seen those hobby horses that're hanging from the rafters of Titsworth's store?" "Sure," he said, "I've seen them; they've been there since Christ was a yearling. What about it?" "Well," I replied, "those broncs haven't been broken, and old man Titsworth wants you to curry them below the knees, so that he can sell them." That ended the drinks for Bill, but he was a good sport and joined in the "ha, ha." Actually I made friends by taking my tenderfoot innocence in good part, for all poked their fun in a pleasant way.

One evening after supper at Aunt Hattie's, I listened to Pat Garrett and Emerson Hough, the author, regret the passing of the old West—their West that was no more. It will be recalled that Lincoln County was the scene of the exploits of Billy the Kid, and too, it was known for the Lincoln County War. Pat Garrett was the sheriff who killed the Kid, and he was still the sheriff of Lincoln County when I listened to him that evening in Capitan in 1905. And yet within a year, he too was killed with his boots on.

Following an inspection and a shake-up of personnel—various charges including rustling had been made against some rangers—the forest supervisor, Hightower, was succeeded in February of 1906 by an outstanding ranger, John Kerr, who was transferred from the Gila National Forest. Kerr was later promoted to the District Office in Albuquerque in
I completed a year's service on the Lincoln in June of 1906. At the close of the month I was being sheared by the butcher-cum-barber, when a telegram arrived ordering me to Washington. When I looked in the mirror, I wondered if I could get by! As I prepared to leave, it was heart-warming to say goodbye to the little group of residents I had known so well in Capitan. Aunt Hattie, and Hiley her brother, Sebe Gray, editor Haley, George

---

1 Inspection Report of March 1906. Original in National Archives, Washington D.C.
Chamberlain, Forest Supervisor John Kerr and Ranger Kinney stand out in my memory, and too Wilson and the Johnson brothers, English ranchers, and I should add Arthur du Bois. We met by chance on a trail and over the years became intimate friends meeting in Washington, Paris, and Vienna, including a trip we made together in Ruthenia. Arthur was a linguist and served brilliantly as an intelligence officer in World War I and II. But officially I felt happy, for I had a letter—a good letter—from my chief, Gifford Pinchot.¹

The West of Pat Garrett and Emerson Hough was no more. Even so, in my day there was much to engage the interest of a tenderfoot in a country that still had some large cow outfits but no dude ranches; Studebaker wagons but not Studebaker motors; English remittance men, but not tourists; corrals instead of parking lots; hitching rails instead of parking meters; spurs instead of stiletto heels; and the warm glow of kerosene lamps instead of the chill of neon lights.

For me, these memories of sixty-three years ago are even now charged with wonder and with appreciation that I shared in some measure, however limited, a life when the West was my West.

BOUNDARY SURVEYS (1906-8)

Ringland: When I was ordered to Washington in June of 1906 after completing a year as a forest assistant in Lincoln National Forest in New Mexico, I was assigned to Boundaries, the most romantic unit in the newly-organized United States Forest Service. There we compiled the results of our field surveys of what areas of the public domain should be reserved as national forests.

In each case the final action was an Executive order by the President proclaiming a new national forest or an addition to an existing one. The exercise of this authority by President Roosevelt was bitterly contested in Congress, particularly by senators from the Northwest. Eventually Congress in March of 1907 prohibited further withdrawals from the public domain for national forest purposes by Executive order in the states of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Ingersoll: You say that Boundaries was the most romantic unit in the Service. Can you elaborate that a bit, Mr. Ringland?

Ringland: The men of Boundaries were members of an elite corps, the envy of the tree planters and nurserymen, who were meanly referred to as "the boulevard seed droppers." Often when a Boundary man was ordered to the field, and so relieved of paper work in the Washington office, he was the "honor man," so to speak, at a farewell dinner in the old Century Club.

This small club occupied a town house, long since torn down on Vermont Avenue, opposite where the Veterans Administration now stands, bordering Lafayette Square. It was composed of a rebel group from the old University Club, which was at K Street. I think it was the former mansion of President Taft when he was in the cabinet. These rebels wanted better food, drink, and conversation, and they attained all three objectives. They were field men
not only of the Forest Service, but of the
Geological Survey, the Reclamation Service, the
Biological Survey, and other agencies particularly
engaged in the West. Although, as far as I know,
his name had nothing to do with the invention, the
bartender then bore the name of a potent cocktail,
the Hughes. This, I believe, was a precursor of
the famed Gibson.

Parenthetically, I might note that I knew
Hugh Gibson, for whom the cocktail was later
named, when he was in our diplomatic service as a
brilliant ambassador. He was a close associate of
Herbert Hoover in Belgian Relief days, and we all
knew him in the American Relief Administration.
Talking with me one day, I remember, he said that
he had been appointed to the State Department when
he was a young man through Senator Thomas Bard
of California. I said this was interesting, because
Senator Bard was my wife's uncle. Hugh Gibson was
famous in the diplomatic corps for his wit. I
wonder now if he and Adlai Stevenson are matching
bone mots somewhere in the wild blue yonder.

Medicine Bow National Forest, Wyoming

Ingersoll: What were the feelings of the men doing boundary
work in those days?

Ringland: My first field assignment was an examination of
public land with the view to an addition to the
Medicine Bow National Forest in Wyoming. One of
the best of the old time rangers--Bill Mulligan--
was my good guide, and more than that, counselor.
Once, as we rode off Centennial Peak in the midst
of a snowstorm, he turned in his saddle and said,
"By God we are making history!" And indeed this
was so, whenever the men of Boundaries, acting in
the national interest, took steps to protect and
preserve the public domain at a time when valuable
timbered areas and ranges were being alienated
through the application of unwise land laws, such
as the Timber and Stone Act, which fortunately was
later repealed.
When we reached the flats that time with Mulligan, we were bucking a near blizzard and found it necessary to cut a barbed wire range fence. Now this is done, if honestly, only in emergencies. Our consciences were salved in this case by an added justification: the fence was illegally enclosing range controlled by a U.S. senator.

An interview of a classmate of mine, Stanton Smith, records the colorful experiences of Boundary men in Arizona and New Mexico.¹

**Forest Homestead Act, 1906**

**Ingersoll:** After your work in Wyoming, you did boundary work related to the Forest Homestead Act of 1906, didn't you?

**Ringland:** Yes, I went from Wyoming to the Puget Sound country in the state of Washington. During the winter of 1906-1907 I assisted in the examination of homestead entries in Oregon and Washington under what was called the Forest Homestead Act of June 11, 1906. This act, which had been recommended to the Congress by the Chief Forester, under the Secretary of Agriculture, provided a means by which bona fide homesteaders could settle on (and obtain title to) agricultural land within national forests.

I always remembered one homestead-entry examination. This was in the valley of the Skagit River near the Canadian border, or the British Columbia border more specifically. The land in question was potential farm land. The settler was a bachelor, and as I had worked until darkness, he invited me to supper.

Ringland: For dessert there were some prunes, but in the uncertain light of a guttering candle stuck on a tin, I put salt on the prunes instead of sugar. His eyesight was better, and he roared, "I'm going to write that man Pinchot (he pronounced it Pinshot), and tell him that if a man can't tell salt from sugar, how the hell can he tell what's farm land?"

Often in the heavily timbered Puget Sound country homestead claims were filed by persons whose sole intention, in fact, was to sell their rights at a profit to the lumber companies. However, there were a number of legitimate squatters on agriculture land, and this act permitted them to proceed to acquire title after we examined it and recommended it for approval.

Ingersoll: But your job was to see what was the good agricultural land in the area?

Ringland: There were, of course, attempts to apply under the guise of this act for timber land with no thought of bona fide settlement. We had to make an inspection of all applications to find out what was legitimate and what was not.

Ingersoll: So your job was to look at both the land and the settler who was to use this land?

Ringland: A good many acres were already occupied by homesteaders, but this act afforded a means to acquire title. Where they were homesteading on agricultural land, we were only too glad to help them gain title to it.

Ingersoll: Did it happen often that they were homesteading on land that could better be used as forest land?

Ringland: Well, I think that there were attempts under the old Homestead Law to prove up; and there were many fraudulent entries. The Forest Homestead Act was a constructive piece of legislation which, as I said, had the warm support of the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture.

Ingersoll: Did it for the most part have the support of the people who were living on these areas too?
Ringland: I should say so, at least as far as those who were seeking a legitimate title to a homestead were concerned.

Ingersoll: Do you feel that those who were seeking a legitimate title were the majority in the Puget Sound area where you were working?

Ringland: Some of those valleys, of course, had good fertile soil which properly fell under the terms of the Forest Homestead Act.

Controversy Over Addition to the Washington Forest Reserve now Mt. Baker National Forest, Washington

Ingersoll: Will you tell us a little about the Seattle story—the kind of resistance you met from people in that part of the country during the days when you were working there?

Ringland: That was quite an experience. Upon the completion of the boundary work in the Medicine Bow country of Wyoming late in the fall of 1906, I was directed to report to Tacoma, Washington, for further field examinations in Oregon and Washington.

Late in December and into January of 1907 I made an examination embracing approximately 20,000 acres in Whatcom County, Washington, some 15 miles east of Bellingham. This acreage included an extraordinarily fine and heavy stand of virgin Douglas fir and cedar. An examination was undertaken with a view to an addition to the adjacent west boundary of the Washington Forest Reserve as it was then called and later as Mount Baker. Immediate action was dictated, for an announcement had been made that this area would be opened on February 6 to homestead and timber claimants.

Ingersoll: Who made those announcements in those days?

Ringland: They were made by the General Land Office in Washington with the approval of the Secretary of
In the Seattle Land Office. This particular one was filed in the Seattle Land Office. In consequence of the urgency, I telegraphed the Forest Service in Washington the legal descriptions of the townships 38 and 39 north and ranges 5 and 6 east and the sections within that should be withdrawn from entry and added to the Reserve and followed this by mail with a plat.

My recommendation was approved January 7, 1907, by the Forest Service, and formal withdrawal action was taken by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior on January 25, 1907. The Seattle Land Office was advised by a letter dated January 29 and received February 5, 1907, just a day before the land was to be open for entry on February 6, 1907.

Then the storm broke! Within my experience and, I believe within the history of the Forest Service, there has not been a political uproar quite comparable to the one that exploded in February of 1907. It was an uproar that resounded in the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce, the Bellingham papers, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, and the Seattle Daily Times, and within the state legislature. Governor Mead at Olympia was involved as were the two U.S. Senators---Piles and Arkenny, and the Washington state delegation in the Congress, the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, the General Land Office, and the Secretary of the Interior. Finally the row reached the White House and the ears of T.R. himself.1

Ingersoll: How did some of these people whom you mentioned respond to this action?

Ringland: The general charge was made that the government had acted in bad faith, since the settlers had been invited to apply for land and then it was withdrawn. The feeling expressed was that the act of withdrawal was infamous and practically fraudulent after hundreds of citizens had endured hardship

---

1See Appendix. Clippings from Seattle papers of February 1907.
Arthur Ringland, special agent of the Department of Agriculture who is one of the "experts" of the Forestry Bureau is the man who is responsible for the withdrawal of 20,000 acres of land in Whatcom County from entry by homesteaders and timberland entry men. Ringland is a young man who came from Washington D.C. several months ago fresh from school with instructions to report on the forest reserves in the state of Washington. Never having seen such big trees before, young Ringland immediately believed them to be a good thing to keep and so he drew up a pretty little map of the 30 odd sections in Whatcom County and sent it to Washington with a recommendation that the lands be withdrawn from entry and later added to the Mount Baker Forest Reserve. Ringland left Seattle Friday for the purpose, it was said today by one acquainted with his instructions, to go into the Peninsula country and pick out more timberland which may be brought into the forest reserves. It is said that Ringland is energetic as well as useful and it is therefore possible that he will continue his work of marking black spots on the map of the state of Washington unless drastic measures are taken to bring him approximately near a realization of the needs of the growing state of Washington and the futility of trying to prevent all development and growth here.
Ringland: Senator Piles held a conference with Mr. Pinchot and according to the press report, Mr. Pinchot said he "would act at once and prepare an order for the restoration of the land to the settlers." And the Senator informed the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce that "Whatcom County will be able to expand industrially with hundreds of millions of feet of timber and other resources available."

Ingersoll: So Piles was really more interested in the timber industry expansion than he was in the individual settler.

Ringland: Well, he wanted to have it open and then let the filings take their course. Now the press also reported, this was in the Seattle Daily Times of February 11, "The strange act of government is still a mystery and an official explanation is eagerly awaited, otherwise the people will be inclined to believe that corporate influence had something to do with it."

Ingersoll: What did they mean by "corporate influence" in that case?

Ringland: That's a mystery to me. The lands were again open to entry and the press reported that the obnoxious order of Commissioner Richards was withdrawn, and the local land office received notice from Washington.

The Seattle Daily Times of February 12 stated:

Heeding the protests from Bellingham and from the legislature against the order of Land Commissioner Richards to withdrawing from settlement approximately 20,000 acres of the finest timber and agricultural land in Whatcom County, the President at Washington D.C. yesterday directed the land office to restore the lands to entry.

The prompt response of the President to the voluminous and indignant protests of the people of Western Washington against

---

1Seattle Daily Times, February 11, 1907.
what was condemned as an unfair and utterly unjust order on the part of the General Land Office at Washington D.C. is held to be evidence that before more land now settled on will be taken from the homebuilders and placed in forest reserves, there will be more careful and thorough investigation of all the facts.

Arthur C. Ringland, an alleged expert of the Forestry Bureau of the Agriculture Department, was the man whose recommendation that the Whatoom County lands be withdrawn from entry carried the day and cost the settlers untold worry to say nothing of the terrible loss of the money they had spent in obtaining their rights. Ringland, it is said, figured that the Mount Baker Forest Reserve already including the greater part of Whatoom County should be extended to the West toward the city of Bellingham. There happened to be no sensible reason or excuse for this and when the facts were known to the President the wrong was quickly undone.

T. R.'s Explanation of Withdrawal of Lands

It's desirable to comment on President Roosevelt's telegram to Governor Mead in response to his wire protesting against the further extension of forest reserves as contemplated. The Governor said, "Withdrawal of these lands from entry after inviting settlers to file is a real injustice."

President Roosevelt responded on February 11, 1907 and stated, "The withdrawal of lands in townships 38 and 39 was a clerical error made in the absence of Pinohot from Washington. When attention was called to it by yourself and Senator
Piles, it was corrected by wire. I regret that mistake occurred and glad it was promptly remedied. It is not to be charged to our forest policy."

I have never understood what was meant by charging the withdrawal to a "clerical error." The matter was not one of crossing t's and dotting i's, but one of judgment to be exercised by responsible officials, not clerks. These officials were respectively the commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior who based their decisions on the recommendations of the officials of the Forest Service.

In this respect the Seattle Daily Times of February 14 commented:

The records of the local land office and of the General Land Office in Washington show conclusively that there was no blunder by a clerk. The Secretary of the Interior and the Land Commissioner, W.A. Richards, had approved the placing of the 20,000 acres of land into the forest reserve. Of course, this may be one of the President's pleasing ways of slipping out of a tight place by placating the people of the state of Washington who gave him in 1904 an unprecedented vote for President. As a matter of fact, the records tell a different story. On file at the local land office is a letter of the General Land Office dated last January 29 directing the withdrawal from the public entry of the land described, and attached to this letter is a plat made by Arthur Ringland of the United States Forestry Bureau now in this state in which Ringland recommends the withdrawal of the 20,000 acres over which the controversy existed. The plat bears the legend "proposed addition to Washington Forest Reserve," Ringland's recommendation of January 5, 1907. The shaded area indicates the lands and townships 38 and 39 north and ranges 5 and 6 east adjoining the reserve and which had been settled and filed on by hundreds of innocent people in the belief
that the Government would treat them fairly and honestly. The plat made by Ringland was attached to the letter to the local land office officials by General Land Commissioner Richards who said in his instructions to officials here, "On January 25, 1907 the Secretary of the Interior withdrew the vacant unappropriated public lands in the area described below from all forms of disposal under the public land laws except the mineral lands as a proposed addition to the Washington Forest Reserve. (Here follows a description of the identical lands withdrawn following Ringland's plat.) The foregoing shows conclusively that the President indulged in his own peculiar style of diplomacy in trying to assuage the feelings of the state officials of this state, the Congressional delegation, and the people of Whatcom County when he laid the blunder of the Secretary of the Interior and Forest Service onto a clerk. The facts, however, are a public record and can be attested by anyone."

Now I will go back to what I said. It is fair to assume that this controversy was one of those very rare cases in the Service's history when it was found advisable to yield to overwhelming political pressure, and as T.R. perceptively stated, "It is not to be charged to our forest policy." That was the saving grace.

Ingersoll: At what point do you think that pressure was brought to Pinchot in this controversy? You said that Senator Piles spoke with him at one point.1 Was that the main pressure on him or do you think that it came from T.R.?

Ringland: I suppose, but of course this is speculation on my part; there must have been a number of conferences, more than the one with Senator Piles. The case was

1Seattle Daily Times, February 11, 1907. Appendix.
blown up, I think, because of the growing attempts to attack the whole forest system. I believe that is very much what was in Mr. Pinchot's mind. That is what I meant when I said that it was advisable to yield to overwhelming political pressure in this particular case for the sake of the greater good. There was no question at all about the validity of my recommendation; it was a thoroughly sound one because I knew what I was talking about and what I had seen and examined. That was not in question.

Cupidity Aroused by Timber and Stone Act

In 1908 James Garfield, the able Secretary of the Interior in T.R.'s cabinet, and a fellow conservationist of Gifford Pinchot's concluded that the language in the Timber and Stone Act of 1878 providing for sales at the minimum price of $2.50 per acre meant what it said. Timber land thereafter was sold for the appraised value instead of for the flat minimum that had previously been charged. The Senate Committee on Public Lands, in 1907, had proposed appraisals by the Secretary of Agriculture and allocation of 24 percent of the proceeds to the counties where the timber was located. There appeared to be no follow-up.

It is curious this common sense interpretation of the language by Garfield was not invoked years before when exploitation of the public lands was flourishing particularly in the Northwest. In this respect the Secretary of Agriculture reported to the Senate Committee on Public Lands in 1909 the disposal to June 1908 of approximately 12 million acres of timber land had been sold for something more than 29 million dollars. These lands, he said, were worth at a conservative estimate 300 million dollars. The Act lends itself to concentration of vast tracts of timber land in the hands of a few owners. He concluded that the conservation of all the forest lands now in the public's ownership is of urgent importance.
And doubtless the Assistant Secretary of the Interior had this in mind in his report of January 17, 1955 to Congress requesting the repeal of the Timber and Stone Act. Past disposal has resulted not only in waste of timber but also of the soil and other resources. Frequently the lands have been stripped of their timber, abandoned and taken over by the counties because of delinquent taxes. Removal of the protective cover has caused erosion, and loss of revenue and other benefits to dependent communities.

Seventy-seven years after its enactment in 1878 the Timber and Stone Act was repealed August 1, 1955. In fact, it had been administratively repealed by the Garfield dictum of 1908. This was fortified some years later by statutes such as the Public Sales Act, which permit the sale of the timber alone without including the land, and thus sustained yield management of the public timbered lands was facilitated.

When T.R.'s order of revocation became effective February 11, 1907, I sat in the Seattle Land Office and made note of the character of the applications for entry for homesteads, and as well, under the Timber and Stone Act of 1878. I distinctly recall that the greater number of applications for entry were for the timber rather than for agriculture. That was so, for that was the general character of the land. There were some bona fide applications for homesteads by squatters, but these were very few. The Seattle Daily Times of February 6, 1907 reported:

The land on which filings were made today is among the richest in the state. It is heavily timbered with fir and cedar. Some of the 160 acre claims are said to be worth easily $20,000. In a few years they probably will be worth twice that amount. As farming land it is worth little; it is rugged and steep.

The Timber and Stone Act of June 3, 1878 was obviously the magnet that excited the cupidity of the greater number of the 400 applicants who stormed the doors of the Seattle Land Office. Some had been
The Timber and Stone Act required an oath from the entryman that the land was valuable for timber or stone as the case might be, and was for his sole use, and was to be paid for at not less than $2.50 an acre. In those days there was the so-called "public land conscience" which made it possible for otherwise respectable people, school teachers, merchants, doctors, lawyers, and ministers to feel no sense of guilt in conveying the lands immediately after proof to lumber companies.

The act lent itself to fraud despite the attempts to enact its repeal so long ago as 1897, I think, and in 1904 by the Public Land Commission and the American Forest Congress, sponsored by the American Forestry Association in 1905, and again by the report of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Senate Committee on Public Lands in 1909. The Secretary emphasized, "very grave injuries to the public interests [were committed] by the disposal to June of 1908 of approximately 12,000,000 acres of land for something more than $29,000,000. These lands were worth at a conservative estimate $300,000,000—a net loss to the Government of $170,000,000. In view of the rapid exhaustion of our timber supply, the conservation of all the forest lands now in the public's ownership is of urgent importance. The act lends itself to concentration of huge tracts of timber land in the hands of a few owners." It seems incredible but it was 77 years later when the Timber and Stone Act was repealed. This was August 1, 1955. Timber lands under the terms of the repeal were to be sold at appraised value rather than for $2.50 an acre.

1Photograph, Seattle Daily Times, February 6, 1907. See Appendix.
Influence on the Six State Exclusion Act, 1907

Ringland: When one considers the millions of acres involved in other withdrawals and their inclusions in national forests, the area involved in the Whatcom County case in Washington state of 20,000 acres was insignificant, though the volume value of the timber was exceptionally great. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the withdrawal of this Whatcom County acreage, despite the subsequent revocation by T.R., was the hair trigger that activated the Six States Exclusion Act of March 4, 1907, an action that was taken less than a month later when the Agricultural Appropriations Bill was under discussion. This opinion is fortified by the protracted discussion in the Senate on February 22, 1907, relating to amendments to the Agricultural Appropriations Bill providing for an increase for the support of the Forest Service.

Ingersoll: Do you have some background on the Six States Exclusion Act of 1907?

Ringland: In the Senate, on February 22, 1907, when the Agricultural Appropriation Bill was under debate, Senator Beveridge of Indiana discussed the character of examinations for the creation of reserves, "I hold in my hand, and I shall ask to have entirely inserted in the Record in my remarks, the instructions to the field men who make the examinations. I will not read them all; they are too voluminous. I want to read two or three of these instructions, but from the two or three I do read, the Senate can see the minute care taken in ascertaining knowledge upon which to make the reserves." 2

Senator Fulton of Oregon proposed an amendment to the Agricultural Appropriations Bill which would prohibit the addition to or creation of forest reserves in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana,

1 *Seattle Post Intelligencer*, February 23, 1907. See Appendix.
2 *Congressional Record*, February 22, 1907, p. 3630.

Senator Carter of Montana, however, proposed to add this language, "Nor shall the exterior boundaries of any forest reservation be hereafter maintained more than one mile beyond the timber line of the forest embraced therein."

Senator Fulton remarked, "The timber line as a rule is way up."

Senator Carter said, "I mean the lower line."

Whereupon Senator Heyburn of Idaho said, "Line of timber not timberline."

Senator Spooner of Wisconsin added, "It is a subtle purpose (referring to the Carter language) to destroy the forest reservations, in my opinion."

Finally it was agreed on February 25 to accept Senator Fulton's amendment and terminate the language at the word, "Congress" so that the final reading was: "That hereafter no forest reserves shall be created, nor shall any additions be made to one heretofore created, within the limits of the state of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, or Colorado, except by act of Congress."

Just to give you an idea of some of the discussion that went into this: The Post Intelligencer of Seattle reported February 23, 1907, that, "Forceful speeches were made by Senators Burkett, Du Pew, and Beveridge in defense of the work of Chief Forester Pinchot, and opposed to the extension of the Forest Service by Senator Heyburn who went into the entire subject."

The Seattle Daily Times (February 22, 1907) reported that, "It was conceded by the senators in charge of the agriculture bill that the grazing lease provisions will be eliminated from the bill on a point of order." (That refers to the authority of the Forest Service to make allotments for grazing and to charge fees.) "Senator Warren said that he was aware the provision would go out on a point of order; nevertheless he advocated it."1

---

1 Seattle Daily Times, February 22, 1907.
See Appendix.
Ingersoll: What was it that Senator Warren advocated?

Ringland: The elimination of the grazing lease. Mr. Warren resented the charge that certain senators had fenced in the public domain. Personally, he said, he did not have an acre of illegally fenced land. This brings to mind the reference I made to cutting a fence in the course of the Medicine Bow boundary examination where it was understood that this fence was illegally enclosing Senator Warren's range.

Senator Clark of Wyoming added, "I say the Forest Reserve is being made the damnation of the country. The time has come when a halt must be called."

Senator Spooner defended the necessity for forest reserves and believed the future would demonstrate their wisdom. He declared that the big lumber companies had cut enough timber on government land to pay the national debt many times over. Also that through carelessness of cutting and unnecessary fires much more had been destroyed.¹

Ingersoll: So it was the debate beginning with a discussion of the character of the examinations for the creation of forest reserves (like your examination in Whatcom County) that led through all this bitter discussion by the opposition Senators Fulton, Heyburn, Carter, Warren and Clark and support from Senators Beveridge, Du Pew, Spooner, Burkett, and others.

Ringland: Yes, and the final action was the passage of the Six State Exclusion Act of March 4, 1909 prohibiting any further additions to or creation of natural forests in those six western states: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado. But before this prohibition became effective on March 4 the President by proclamation of March 1 and 2 added land in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana and Colorado, and added new reserves

¹Seattle Daily Times, February 22, 1907. See Appendix.
In the spring of 1907 upon completion of field work in the Puget Sound area, I reported back for duty in Washington. On May 7 I was appointed Chief of Boundaries.

What were some of the important things that you were responsible for as Chief of Boundaries at that time?

That, of course, was the final preparation of the documents to permit the proclamation by the President of forests in those areas in the states that were not affected by the Exclusion Act of 1907.

Do you think that there was any fear at that time that there would be other acts passed which would exclude other areas from the public domain?

Well, I don't recall that there was anything like the opposition that we encountered in the Northwest. In fact, if anything, there was support, because, among other factors there was the general desire to conserve the water resources in the Southwest through protection of the forest cover. Thus, we were supported by the great irrigation interests of the Salt River Valley in Arizona.

At the end of May I proceeded to Lansing, Michigan, to meet Mr. Pinchot who was there to receive an honorary degree from Michigan State. We wanted his approval of a number of proposed proclamations that were pending, and to obtain his acceptance before he left for an extended absence.

Ringland: I remember how I carried these papers, maps, and descriptions in a golf bag that I kept with me even in my pullman berth during the trip. Upon arrival at the Hotel Downey, Mr. Pinchot's sitting room was cleared of furniture and the maps were spread on the floor. We took off our shoes, rolled up our trousers, and in stocking feet crawled all over the maps with Mr. Pinchot carrying a heavy blue pencil in his hand. With this pencil he indicated the areas to be included in the proclamation.

When Mr. Pinchot had made his final determinations, I immediately carried the papers back to Washington where the Boundaries staff prepared them for signature and proclamation by President Roosevelt. As I recall it, some 17 proclamations ensued, affecting national forests in Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Utah.

Ingersoll: When papers and maps like this were presented to Pinchot, did he have full confidence in the men doing the boundary work in the field and the people in Washington, or was there a great deal of discussion and questioning of the things that had been done from a distance?

Ringland: He had great confidence in the reports by the field men and the soundness of their recommendations. Senator Beveridge—I spoke of him before—pointed out in the Senate the care that was exercised by the field men in proposing the creation or addition of national forests from the public domain. There of course would be a discussion. The Boundary man, if he were present in Washington, would brief the Forester, or in his absence the chief of Boundaries with the reports available would make the appropriate recommendations.

Ingersoll: Was it a common thing that these men who had been working on Boundaries in the far West would come back to Washington before going on to another assignment?

Ringland: Not necessarily. One reason was the considerable urgency of the boundary work especially in the Northwest before the Exclusion Act. The urgency was to forestall the illegal attempts to take over valuable forest lands that were still within the
Ringland: unappropriated public domain. There was constant pressure to withdraw these valuable areas before they could be exploited.

In his book *Breaking New Ground*, G.P. wrote: "Sometimes it was a question of locating boundaries in hot haste and beating the grabbers with a wire to Washington recommending withdrawal from the public land laws by a presidential order." The Boundary men as Mr. Pinchot expressly put it were "working against as competent a body of land thieves as e'er the sun shone on."¹

Gifford Pinchot's foresight and timely action, and Theodore Roosevelt's authority, salvaged from exploitation millions of acres of the public domain. This made possible the development of the great national forest system. Moreover, the administration of these lands under the Forest Service made possible, where scenic values were exceptionally predominant, the establishment or extension of a number of national parks, the Tetons in Wyoming for example. In these respects, notable action was taken in 1925 and 1926 by the Coordinating Committee on National Parks and Forests appointed by President Hoover at the request of his Cabinet Committee on Outdoor Recreation.²

²*Proceedings and Reports of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation 1924-1928*. Archives.
Decentralization Policy: Background and Significance

Ingersoll: As soon as Gifford Pinchot put his decentralization policy into effect, you were made the first District Forester for the newly established Southwestern District 3, I understand. As you look back on it now, what was the significance of that decentralization policy?

Ringland: In September of 1908, Chief Forester Pinchot took an action believed to be without precedent in federal-civil administration. The national forests which were transferred from the Interior Department in 1905 were greatly expanded in numbers and area in the course of the following three years. The greater part of the public domain reserved for such purposes was west of the 100th meridian, in the Rockies, the Cascades, and the Sierras—all remote from the headquarters in Washington.

It was Gifford Pinchot's temperament that accepted and applied the dictum that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points. He felt that administration of field problems should be brought as close as possible physically to the source of these problems. Not only would this mean economy of time and funds, but more importantly development of an intimate knowledge of the people by the forest officers and the ways in which they could best be served.

The Secretary of Agriculture wrote in the Yearbook of Agriculture for 1909: "A notable change in organization was put into effect on December 1,

1 Districts are now Regions.
Ringland: 1908. Previous to that time all work on the Forests had been directed from Washington. Only the larger questions of administrative policy are now handled in Washington. In consequence, business is transacted with far greater dispatch; close touch between office and field is easily maintained, and efficiency along all lines of work has been vastly stimulated. It is already clear that this was the most important step ever taken by the Forest Service in taking the Department to the people."

The first step was the division of the national forests of the country into six geographic districts with headquarters at Missoula, Montana; Denver, Colorado; Albuquerque, New Mexico; Ogden, Utah; San Francisco, California; and Portland, Oregon; each with a professional staff given wide responsibility for definitely settling problems. Decentralization strengthened the forest supervisors' hands and in turn the rangers'. Good Lord, before the decentralization the supervisors would have to send reports to Washington that assumed the size of a cowpuncher's bedsheet. Clean cut channels of direct action and administration were set-up from field to office. I would say, Mrs. Ingersoll, if you were speaking in modern times that it was Parkinson's Law in reverse.

Ingersoll: Can you say anything more about what the decentralization meant to you men in the field in terms of the kind of authority or the kind of feeling you had?

Ringland: We were very conscious of the responsibility that we had because it was put up to us. We could not shift the load to Washington. We had to carry it with the exception of basic policies affecting the whole Service which only the Forester himself could effect.

Ingersoll: What were the backgrounds of the six men who went out as district foresters in the very beginning. Did they have very much previous experience with the Forest Service?

Ringland: Oh yes, they all did and with background as professional foresters. They all had been at one time or another student and forest assistants and then in higher grades before the transfer was made--they
Ringland: were inspectors, men with a great deal of field background and experience.

Did I tell you about the campaign speech the Governor of Colorado made in 1916? I dug this up in the Archives. The Governor made his speech in his campaign for the United States Senate and was elected. It was a blistering attack upon the Forest Service and all its works. He was Governor of Colorado, you understand. In the course of his speech, I had reason to raise an eyebrow, as is said in the New Yorker. He said, "There is A.C. Ringland," and now he is speaking of the District (Regional) Forester. "There is A.C. Ringland in Albuquerque who comes from New York." (I came from New Jersey and I was the first one he mentioned.) Then he went on: "There was F.E. Olmsted at San Francisco from Connecticut. There was Smith Riley at Ogden, Utah, from Michigan." I don't recall whether he mentioned E.T. Allen who was stationed at Portland. "Well" he said, "not a single one from the West." He made that statement in 1916. These men had not only been engaged in the field administration of the national forests since 1908, but before 1908, and some went back to 1900! They had been all over the West in various field activities related to the public domain in one capacity or another. With all those years of experience behind them, you can see that the Governor's charges had absolutely no validity whatsoever.

Description and Organization of District 3

Ingersoll: How did you feel about becoming District Forester?

Ringland: My appointment as District Forester on December 1, 1908 to District 3 came as a great surprise. I had understood that I was to be assigned as Associate District Forester at Portland, Oregon, which was the headquarters of District 6 for Oregon and Washington, the richest in timber resources. I
Ringland: was elated with the prospect of serving with E.T. Allen, the District Forester and a man of extraordinary personality and ability. But Overton Price, Associate Chief Forester, sent for me and said that I was not to go to Portland. My face fell; he then said that I was to go to District 3 as District Forester. This time I was so taken aback that Mr. Price said, "Are you afraid of it?" After a second or so I replied, "No--no--sir." So with Earle Clapp as associate we journeyed to Albuquerque, the headquarters. Clapp later became Assistant Chief Forester and developed research pure and applied, through measures of wide compass, including the organization of experiment stations in the major forest types of the country. Subsequently he served for several years as Acting Chief Forester at a critical time. In this capacity he carried the responsibility of chief but was denied formal recognition by high authority.

Ingersoll: What was the area of District 3?

Ringland: It embraced the national forests in the states of Florida, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. In New Mexico and Arizona the national forests blanketed the mountain ranges and comprised some twenty million acres. There were 9 national forests in Arizona of approximately 12 million acres, 8 in New Mexico of approximately 10 million acres, 2 in Arkansas of approximately 3.5 million acres, 2 in Florida of approximately 1 million acres, and 1 in Oklahoma of some 50,000 acres. In all, the district embraced 22 national forests with an acreage of more than 26 million.

Personnel

Ingersoll: You mentioned Earl Clapp. Who were some of the others out there in District 3?

Ringland: We had, I think in the beginning, about fifteen staff officers.
Ingersoll: Could you tell me a little bit about them as personalities...what they stood for?

Ringland: What was the motto of the three musketeers? That's about it—"all for one;" these men all concentrated intensely on carrying out the Pinchot philosophy of service in the public interest. Here is a list of the initial personnel, though changes occurred later.

**Personnel of District 3 (From report for December 1908)**

A.C. Ringland, District Forester  
E.H. Clapp, Associate District Forester  
H.B. Jamison, District Law Officer

**Operations**

- A.O. Waha, chief  
- R.G. Wilson, assistant chief  
- Engineering — Orman Powell  
- Occupancy — H.H. Harris  
- Accounts — J.J. Duffy, fiscal agent and Albert Morris, assistant  
- Maintenance — W.B. Bunton  
- Silviculture — T.S. Woolsey, Jr., chief  
- A.B. Recknagel, assistant chief  
- Planting — A.S. Peck  
- Grazing — J.K. Campbell, chief  
- John Kerr, assistant chief  
- Products — O.T. Swan, chief

**Forest Supervisors**

**Arizona**

- Apache — John D. Guthrie (Springsville)  
- Chiricahua — A.H. Zachau (Douglas)  
- Coconino — F.C.W. Pooler (Flagstaff)  
  W.H. Kobbe, W.M. Drake and Clifford McKibbin, assistants  
- Coronado — Robert J. Selkirk (Tucson)  
- Crook — T.T. Swift (Safford)  
- Gavies — W.H.B. Kent (Nogales)  
- Prescott — C.H. Hinderer (Prescott)  
- Sitgreavers — Alex J. Mackay (Snowflake)  
- Tonto — W.H. Reed (Roosevelt)
Arkansas

Arkansas - S.J. Record (Mena) Francis Kiefer, assistant
Ozark - David E. Fulton (Harrison)

New Mexico

Alamo - Arthur M. Neal (Alamogordo)
Carson - Ross McMillan (Santa Fe), Thomas R. Stewart, assistant
Datil - W.H. Goddard (Magdalena)
Gila - Douglas Rodman (Silver City)
Jemez - Ross McMillan (Santa Fe), Thomas R. Stewart, assistant
Lincoln - J.H. Kinney (Cáptian)
Manzano - A.D. Head (Albuquerque)
Recoa - Ross McMillan (Santa Fe), Thomas R. Stewart, assistant

Oklahoma

Wichita - Frank Rush (Cache)

Florida

Ocala - Inman Eldredge
Choctawhatchee - Inman Eldredge (Pensacola)

District Headquarters Changes

O.M. Butler, Assistant District Forester
J.C. Kircher, R.L. Rogers, Hugh Calkins, Forest Examiners
J.O. Seth, S.F. McGowan, Solicitors
G. Fagan, Albert Morris, District Fiscal Agent
F.C.W. Pooler, Don P. Johnson, and M. Cheney, Office of Lands

District Area Changes

Effective July 1, 1914, District 7 (Southeastern) was established including the Ozark, Arkansas, Ocala, Choctawhatchee, Wichita and Luquillo National Forests with W.L. Hall, District Forester and headquarters in Washington. This reduced the administration of District 3 to the National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico with personnel as follows: Headquarters 23, National Forest Headquarters 34, Year-long rangers 141, Short-term guards 188, Total 389.
Ingersoll: Did you have anything to do with choosing your staff for District 3?

Ringland: No, all were assigned by Washington but they were happy choices, I can assure you.

Ingersoll: I understand that the group that gathered to organize District 3 was very young.

Ringland: Yes, so young that I think only two were married; the rest were bachelors and we had a mess of our own. Albuquerque was a small town. Quite a number of us were recent graduates of Yale the College, the Forest School, or the Law School. It may be doubted that any had reached the age of thirty; I had just attained the vintage age of twenty-six. When a stockman called upon one of our staff, he stood in the doorway and exclaimed, "Why I thought you were a grey-bearded old so-and-so!"

Ingersoll: Had any of these men been student assistants like yourself?

Ringland: I think that every one of the foresters had been at one time or another and had gone on up to higher levels as inspectors in the field.

Ingersoll: I'm trying to understand how certain individuals moved in the profession. Now you began as a student assistant, then you went to the Yale School of Forestry, then you came back to the Forest Service. But were there some of the people who began as student assistants with you who did not go away to the university but just stayed right on?

Ringland: No, I think they all at some period went to school. Every one of those men in the Albuquerque office was technically trained.

Yale graduated the first class in forestry in 1902; my class was the fourth. In the Albuquerque office the group was from Yale. There was one exception which was outstanding. That was the Associate District Forester, Earle Clapp. He was from the University of Michigan, and Earle later became, as I said, Acting Chief of the whole Forest Service.
Ingersoll: Can you give us any idea of the other men? Waha, for instance, what type of man was he?

Ringland: He and I were together as student assistants in Washington in 1901. In the boarding house where we were spending our $25 a month in riotous living, we were called "The Hall Room Boys" after a popular cartoon of that day. Waha came to the Yale University Forest School after I had graduated so I had no contact with him while he was a student. Our association was resumed when we organized the district staff in December, 1908. He was made chief of operations, and proved an able one having had behind him ripe experience as the forest assistant on the Gila National Forest in New Mexico and later as an inspector. Wu, as he was known in the Service, was throughout our years of association an intimate friend.

Ingersoll: Aldo Leopold was on the staff later, wasn't he?

Ringland: Aldo joined us after he graduated from Yale Forest School. He was in the field mostly. Leopold became one of the historic national figures in game and wildlife and in conservation generally.

Aldo Leopold in those early days should be credited for vitalizing the conservation of wildlife in New Mexico. He even published a little leaflet called The Pine Cone, and a game handbook was issued to Forest Offices. He brought together local game federations and state officials, particularly through the cooperation of the Game Departments. These associations state and local gave strong support to the Hormaday Plan - the Chamberlain-Hayden Bill in Congress. He laid the groundwork and met with success.

Ingersoll: Was wildlife his main concern while he worked with you in District 3?

Ringland: Well, it was, of course, but he had other interests and duties. He was one of the early men to see the danger of soil erosion, for example. It was ironic and tragic that this great naturalist should die in a brush fire. He has been memorialized by the Leopold Medal awarded from time to time by the Wildlife Federation and now considered one of the highest in the field of conservation.
Ingersoll: Was it during this time when he was in District 3?

Ringland: No, it was after he had been attached to the University of Wisconsin, it was then that his reputation became national. As our association ripened, I counted him one of my most esteemed friends and for whom I had a lasting admiration. His book *A Sand County Almanac*, a classic, reveals Aldo Leopold as one who understood and practiced "the art of living happily with nature" as John Stewart Collis defined ecology.¹

Ingersoll: You've mentioned the professional staff at Albuquerque; can you give us any picture of the rangers in those days?

Ringland: I'll tell more about them in connection with the ranger school we started. I received a letter from an old friend of mine, Harold Greene, who was land examiner in District 3.² It gives a good picture of the rangers.

As I look back now, I am impressed with how little money we were allotted to cover a vast amount of work, especially the physical improvements that had to be done in the way of building ranger stations, barns, lookout stations, trails, telephone lines, etc. You remember the rough board two room shacks that a ranger had for himself and family. I think $500 was considered standard and later $650 for building the ranger his house. My salary was $75 a month and expenses while in the field. But I got along fine on this. I went from Santa Fe by narrow gauge D & RG to Espanola, N.M., and had difficulty keeping the engine cinders out of my eyes. Travelled by buckboard to the little Mexican town of Coyote. Roads sandy and rough and slow. Met bowlegged ranger Frank Blake who was to work with me for a while. Like most of the old rangers, he was a former cowboy. Having

¹The Triumph of the Tree, The Viking Press, New York.
H lngland recently been on a field trip with Bill Hodge—I think it was—he had learned to use a toothbrush because Bill did, and he admired him very much so he followed Bill's example. Frank was really quite a guy. He did not drink or smoke but in the use of profanity he was unexcelled. Practically all the permittees on his district were Mexicans and very few of them could speak English. In fact everywhere I rode I found it difficult to meet anyone who could talk anything but Spanish. As a result I learned to talk their language fairly well.

Frank Blake rented me a blue saddle horse that was only "half broke" and he did his best to scrape me off under every low hanging branch along the trail. Luckily I was used to riding. One day we met a Mexican rancher who stopped Frank and they got into an angry argument apparently about my horse. Frank always carried an old time Colt's six gun and I was afraid he would use it. In fact, I had to get between them finally to stop the scrap. They finally worked out a deal and both seemed satisfied. I found out afterward that Frank did not own the horse he had rented me, or at least he had claimed ownership, but it appeared it was really this Mexican's horse, which Frank had picked up on the range. So I continued to ride this animal. Most of Frank's horses were pretty wild. I saw one start to buck Frank off in the middle of a boulder strewn wash and he "stayed with it" to the finish.

Greene came West for his health shortly after graduation from Princeton. Before his resignation from the Service to take up ranching, he became forest supervisor of the Tusayan National Forest in Arizona. The Forest included the Grand Canyon National Monument and Greene had an active part in contesting mining claims filed to exploit scenic values.
Problems of Forest and Range Management

Ingersoll: What were some of the early problems you faced in District 3?

Ringland: In the formative years immediately following 1908, the administration of the national forests of necessity passed through a process of trial-and-error in dealing with primary problems related to sales of timber, range allotments, special uses, forest homesteads, and mining claims. This was to be expected, for the regulation of the public’s natural resources was a new concept in a region still influenced by the pioneer spirit of free exploitation. So there was trespass, sometimes innocent and sometimes by design. On balance, however, there was effective cooperation.

Notably this was so in the great lumbering operations in the ponderosa pine belt in northern Arizona and with the livestock associations.

Silvicultural practice and research were advanced by the setting up of a Marking Board to determine in the field the character of the logging operations to permit the maintenance of sustained yield. The initial meetings were stimulating for experience at that time was academic. Yet out of this experience came the effective contribution to the silviculture of the ponderosa pine and its management—the green gold of the Colorado plateau. This was the major work of Gustave Pearson, for years director of the Port Valley Experiment Station near Flagstaff, Arizona.

Ingersoll: What were the problems in range management you came up against at that time?

Ringland: While technically trained foresters were available, there was hardly a counterpart of men trained in range management: a form of conservation yet to reach adequate control throughout the district. So it will be understood that the introduction of range management was difficult. But the District was fortunate in having the sage advice of such experienced stockmen as Albert Potter and Will Barnes of the Washington office, each personally
Ringland: familiar with the range in Arizona and New Mexico, and of John Kerr and Jose Campbell of our District office.

The fundamentals of the grazing policies for control, including the provision for regulation through range allotments to permittees and the payment of fees, were developed by Albert Potter, who became Chief of Grazing of the Forest Service in Washington and later Associate Chief Forester. Later there came provision for range experiment stations in New Mexico and Arizona. These afforded a striking picture of range management as compared with open adjoining range.

Ingersoll: At this time was the fee policy which Potter had worked out pretty much accepted by the cattlemen, and the sheepmen in the area?

Ringland: Potter had been an experienced Arizona rancher and was highly respected and well-known. So I would say, generally speaking, that payment was accepted in our area. The control, of course, presented problems for some of the grazing districts bordered on the public domain permitting stock to drift where there was no control. Harold Greene, who served from 1912-1917 as forest supervisor of the Tusayan National Forest in Arizona wrote me:

Grazing was our most active work. What made administration particularly difficult was the fact that the Forest boundary was not fenced, and there were many direct instances of outfits grazing both on the Forests and on the adjoining public domain. There being no regulation then of grazing on the public domain, we had difficulty in preventing trespassing when it became over-grazed. Too many cattle would drift onto the Forest range. Also sometimes cattle regularly using the public domain would be drifted illegally onto the Forest range. It was hard to pin facts down which would stand up as acceptable evidence in court in a trespass case. Anyway, we did the best we could under the circumstances and were always hoping to get boundary fencing authorized.
Ingersoll: There was a note in Robert's book *Hoofbeats on Forest Trails* saying that you on one occasion had had to explain to the sheepmen just exactly what government policy was, that this was the sort of thing that you did on numerous occasions. Do you remember times like that?

Ringland: Yes, I attended a number of meetings of cattle and sheepmen's associations, but I never felt I was encountering opposition. It was rather the development of cooperation and acceptance of the necessity of regulation in their own interest.

Ingersoll: Do you think that these sheepmen had enough foresight to see that their range would be depleted if they grazed it indiscriminately?

Ringland: That had been quite well established, I think, by some of the investigation of previous years. For example, Gifford Pinchot and Albert Potter made quite a study of range conditions in Arizona and the effect of over grazing by sheep. Of course, we have to remember that historically grazing had been a free enterprise in all respects. I think, as I said, there was a growing acceptance that it was not only in the interest of public welfare but in their own interest as well.

Ingersoll: Who were some of the prominent sheepmen?

Ringland: Solomon Luna was one of the largest holders of sheep, so was Frank Hubbard. Luna was more than that; he was an influential politician. New Mexico was then a territory; it did not become a state until 1912. I saw quite a bit of him and so did the staff responsible for grazing allotments, Campbell first and then Kerr who followed him. Mr. Luna, when I had occasion to write to him, would never answer a letter but he would come and talk to me.

A field trip on the Coconino National Forest in 1915 with Congressman Carl Hayden gave an unusual opportunity to talk over a wide range of our problems. Throughout his career as congressman and senator he has always given constructive support in the promotion of the objectives of the Forest Service.
Practical Solutions

Ingersoll: It seems that there must have been a great many forest and range management problems needing solution. Then there must have been the added problem of getting knowledge of these solutions over to the rangers.

Ringland: The Fort Valley Experiment Station was set up to find some of the solutions as were the range experiment stations such as the Jornado in New Mexico.

Fort Valley Experiment Station

Ingersoll: Do you have any memories of the early days of the Fort Valley Experiment Station?

Ringland: It was established in the spring of 1908. During the early years it was part of the District organization. So I entered into a conspiracy with Gus Pearson, the Director. An immediate problem was decent housing because of the $500 unit limitation. The difficulty was met by building two units so close together, yet legally apart, that Gus was able to make do.

Ingersoll: Who was responsible for establishing the center while it was still in the planning stages?

Ringland: I would say Raphael Zon, a distinguished pioneer forester in the field of research. It was the first station established in the Forest Service.

Ingersoll: What was it set up to do?

Ringland: In broad terms to develop knowledge of the silviculture of the primary tree species of the Southwest; forest management; forest genetics; the economic benefits of forest products; and the effect of forest influences. The station's activities were
Ringland: directed with particular reference to the great ponderosa pine forests of the Colorado Plateau largely embraced in the Gila, Apache Sitgreaves, Coconino, Tusayan and Kaibab National Forests.¹

Ingersoll: Were there any problems you saw in those early days that have been solved in more recent years?

Ringland: In 1955 I visited the Fort Valley Station in company with the director, Givens, and with him visited a pilot plant at Flagstaff for the production of wood pulp for paper. During the day in the field where the extraordinary reproduction of the ponderosa pine was everywhere evident the problem of the utilization of the small growth was an imperative one. So the visit to the Flagstaff Pilot Plant was significant. Later I visited the Sitgreaves National Forest in company with forest supervisor Spaulding.

Extensive lumbering operations were underway as they had been for some time centered around McNary. But a pulp wood project was yet to be developed: today it is well established and for the first time the profitable use of thinnings is possible to complement the utilization of saw-logs. The astonishing growth of the economy of Arizona is now making possible ideal silvicultural practices.

In this respect I would like to quote from my report made to the Forester September 13, 1915:

The Sitgreaves National Forest is one of great potential resources. At present though activities must rest dormant and this condition will continue for some years. Sometime though it will be a Forest as highly developed economically as the Coconino National Forest.

¹G.A. Pearson, "A Forest Research Program for the Southwest" (by Director of Southwestern Forest Experiment Station, Fort Valley, Arizona) 1915. Filed with Ringland Papers.
Ingersoll: Harold Greene's description of the rangers with whom he worked in those days makes me wonder how they learned the things they needed to do their job.

Ringland: The rangers as far as possible were recruited from men who knew their local country and who were experienced in the livestock, lumber or mining industries, and accustomed to the West. Those of us who came into the Service like myself were the young forest technicians. The rangers and supervisors though, practical men that they were, had had no occasion to study and develop, for example, range management. In those days the livestock industry was a matter of exploitation rather than of conservation. Our policy was to develop the necessary research and practical studies in the field through the set up of experiment stations. That, you may remember, was brought out by Paul Roberts in his book.

Ingersoll: Were you responsible for getting the Fort Valley Ranger School in District 3 set up?

Ringland: It developed as a consensus of the staff to meet the need for field training. We were all enthusiastic at the prospect. We launched it, and our district staff personnel served as lecturers. I considered the ranger school as an essential phase of the district administration. The Fort Valley Ranger School was established in the Coconino National Forest in Arizona in September of 1909. It was the first established in the Forest Service. It was a field school held in camp during September and October of 1909. The new decentralized administration of the Forest Service had begun in District 3 in December, 1908, you remember.

Ingersoll: Before then what was the link between the ranger and supervisor in the field and the men in the Washington office?

Ringland: Previously, ranger and supervisor meetings had been held in the spring of 1908 by the inspecting officers stationed in Albuquerque: Daniel D. Bronson, (chief) W.K. Matoon, T.S. Woolsey, and
Ringland: A.O. Waha. George Cecil and myself came from Washington. These meetings served an indispensable purpose—they formed the only liaison between the ranger and supervisor in the field with the administrative officers in Washington.

The Forest Service administration then was less than three years old. Valuable as these meetings were, and indispensable as they were, they were exercises in paper work and not demonstrations in the field where, perforce, all problems of national resources have their origin.

Without displacing the ranger and the supervisor meetings in the district, the staff of the district concluded that these meetings should be complemented by a field school. Thus, the Fort Valley Ranger School was set up.

Ingersoll: How many rangers came to the school?

Ringland: Two were nominated I think from each national forest, and as many as forty in all, I guess. We canvassed the whole personnel on the national forests through the supervisors, and asked them to nominate and select the rangers that should attend the school. The first student body was recruited in that manner. This school was a camp school; the men lived in tents.

Ingersoll: How did you choose the location for the school?

Ringland: We wanted to try to work things out on the ground itself and that is why the school was established on the Coconino National Forest in Arizona. For these reasons it was selected: The Coconino National Forest was one, if not the most important
Ringland: In the district area because of its timber sales, cattle and sheep grazing allotments, and special uses. It is part of one of the great pine forests of the world extending from southwest New Mexico through the Mogollon Range in Arizona and north beyond the Grand Canyon into Utah.

Ingersoll: What do you feel were the accomplishments of the ranger school?

Ringland: Considering the circumstances of its establishment as a pioneer effort with limited facilities, it was a signal success. It engendered a splendid "esprit de corps," an indispensible attribute for any organization. On the practical side, there were the great timber operations under Forest Service contract. For example, there were the operations of the Arizona Lumber and Timber Company at Flagstaff, and those of the Saginaw and Manistee Lumber Company at Williams as demonstrations of sustained yield forest management of the stands of ponderosa pines.

An agreement between the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad and the Secretary of the Interior, approved April 2, 1902, provided for reconveyance to the United States of certain timber lands within the Coconino National Forest in Arizona subject to the right of the Arizona Lumber and Timber Company of Flagstaff to cut the timber under prescribed rules and regulations.

In these demonstrations, as part of the school instruction, the Marking Board initiated and headed by Woolsey, chief of silviculture of the district office, took an active part. Pearson, director of the Fort Valley Experiment Station nearby, discussed measures of applied research to assure reproduction of the ponderosa pine.

As I've said, while there were trained foresters to lead in forest management demonstrations, there was hardly a counterpart of men trained in range management, and this whole problem was yet to be worked out.

Ingersoll: Were the rangers, whom you said were all seasoned Westerners, aware of the nature of the grazing problems even if they weren't familiar with the
Ingersoll: sorts of plans Albert Potter was working out for solving them?

Ringland: Very much so. They were receptive to studying and developing this new use of the forage resource. I think it has been brought out pretty well in Paul Robert's book; he touches on that in a revealing manner.

Directors and Instructors

Ingersoll: Who did the planning and instructing for the School?

Ringland: Of course we all worked on the planning. It fell to me as District Forester to make the formal opening address. The first month's school was under the direction of A.O. Waha who was chief of operations of the District staff. He was the director of the school and did all of the initial spade work to get it underway, and then continued for that month. He was very successful and popular with the rangers. We always knew him in the Service as Wu. The rangers gave Wu a very fine Navajo blanket which he told me he kept all of his life. The second session in October was turned over to Allan S. Peck from the District office. Peck, after World War I, became District Forester of District 2 with headquarters in Denver.

There were several resident forest instructors at this school—Bernard Becknagel and J.H. Allison, for example. It is interesting to observe that these two became respectively part of the faculty of the Forest School at Syracuse and the University of Minnesota. Other instructors rotated from the district staff at Albuquerque, headed by Earl H. Clapp, Associate District Forester.

There were also temporary instructors including John Kerr, chief of grazing of District 3. John Kerr had been an outstanding ranger on the Gila National Forest, and came to the Lincoln National
Ringland: Forest while I was a forest assistant to take over after the discharge of the politically appointed forest supervisor. He was an outstanding forest officer and so, because of his broad experience, was made chief of grazing for District 3 at the Albuquerque headquarters.

Joseph Kircher was another one who later took charge as District Forester (later known as Regional Forester) of the newly created Region 7 in the South. After World War II, he was responsible for forest policy during the American occupancy of Germany. And I should speak of S.J. Record, Forest Supervisor of the Arkansas National Forest who later became Dean of the Yale Forest School.

Ingersoll: You had very high calibre men then who were carrying out the planning for the ranger school in those days.

Ringland: Yes, you can see that all of these men continued in responsible positions. Others from the district office were James Mullen, engineer, and Harrison B. Burrall, silviculturist, I think he was.

Ingersoll: Do you remember what Kircher was responsible for in the ranger school, what part of the instruction?

Ringland: Yes, that was in forest management. The rangers were selected from the following 21 forests: Jemez, Lincoln, Gila, Alamo, Pecos, Datil, Carson, Manzano, and Zuni in New Mexico. Chiricahua, Coconino, Crook, Sitgreaves, Prescott, Tonto, Apache, Coronado, and Garces in Arizona. The Wichita in Oklahoma. The Ozark and Arkansas in Arkansas. These men were picked as outstanding: so it was that Director Waha was happy to report the visit of Civil Service Commissioner McIlhenny. He was a close friend of President Roosevelt. Waha pointed out that McIlhenny visited the training camp for the purpose of securing first hand information about the work of the forest rangers and to see the type of men we were getting for that position. McIlhenny had been in command of one of Teddy’s Rough Rider regiments. Recreation had its place at the camp. Mr. Pinchot took a keen interest in the school and donated as a trophy a rifle to be given in competition for the best shot. Baseball was popular—Arizona vs. New Mexico. But the wearing of spurs while running bases was not permitted.
The End of an Experiment

Ingersoll: What happened after the session in October 1909?

Ringland: Our plan was to set up the same thing in 1910, but unhappily, the legal officer of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. McCabe, concluded that there was not authority to carry on the school.

Ingersoll: What kind of "authority" did he mean?

Ringland: I suppose that there was no specific language in our Forest Service appropriation.

Tight Funds

Ingersoll: Were expenditures very tight in those days?

Ringland: My word, tight! Let me give you an example of it from the Datil National Forest. I think it was more than two million acres—anyway it was very large, and it included some of the most important range for sheep and cattle outfits that we had in the Southwest, big outfits. Magdalena, which was the headquarters, was the shipping point. Well, Bert Goddard was the supervisor and an experienced Westerner. Goddard wrote us and asked for authority to buy a team of horses and wagon. You must consider what distances were in those days, no motors of course. He wanted a team to expedite his necessary supervision of the Forest. I don't remember what a team of horses cost in those days, but certainly not much. The ultimate answer was "while recognizing its value, it is necessary to wait until the next fiscal year." He wrote for this in the fall and the next fiscal year began in July of the next year. That will give you an idea of how tight money was.

This recalls a supervisors' meeting. It was attended by Captain Adams who was the Chief of Operations of the whole Service in Washington.
Ringland: Someone was bold enough to say, "Would it be possible to consider the purchase of an automobile?" Why, Good Lord, I remember the first one to cross from Los Angeles; it was a great event. Well, I don't know how serious the question was when he brought it up. "It will save a great deal of time." Captain Adams replied, "Yes, no doubt. Now tell me what you will do with the time you save?" That was the last we heard of it; we continued to depend on saddle horses, pack outfits and Studebaker wagons.1

Ingersoll: You mentioned before how difficult it was to get money to build the first building of the Fort Valley Experiment Station. Did anything else like that ever happen?

Ringland: The forest supervisor's office in Santa Fe, the capital of New Mexico, left something to be desired. It occupied the second story of a shabby building and was reached by an outside stairway. When Don Johnston was transferred to Santa Fe as supervisor of the Pecos and Jemez National Forests, I asked him to seek quarters with some dignity in recognition of the importance of this post. As a result a local banker, Levi Hughes, constructed an attractive one-story building opposite the State Capitol and a lease was effected for $40 a month! Even so I was criticized by Washington for authorizing this seeming extravagance, and the building was sometimes referred to as the Ringland National Monument.

Ingersoll: Was this tightness of funds because the congressional appropriation was generally so small for the Department of Agriculture and then under that for the Forest Service?

Ringland: The Service's support was part of the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture and its requirements necessarily had to be weighed against other demands of the Department. There were restrictions of necessity so it astounds me today how much can be

1A few cars in private ownership ventured to make field trips but often were stuck for there were no graded roads.
Ringland: done and is being done that we couldn't even dream of in my time. It is a reflection of the acceptance of the public of conservation as a national institution; and consider what it means to have statesmen like Senator Hayden and Senator Anderson. Compare them with Senators Fall and Cameron of my day.

Ingersoll: And something like the ranger school would not take a great deal of money to run, would it?

Ringland: No I don't think that the termination of the school was a matter of money; it was a matter of authority. It has always seemed to me that there was resort to legalism in denying authority for the continuance of the school.

Ingersoll: What do you mean by a resort to legalism?

Ringland: I think it was rather odd that meetings of rangers and supervisors at convenient points from time to time were not challenged. In effect what is the difference between a meeting under a roof in town or under a tent in the field? I don't know why there was not a specific earmark in the next Forest Service appropriation, or perhaps, recognition of the philosophy of T.R. to get the effect that if something were clearly in the public interest and not expressly forbidden, it should be carried out.

Effect of the Firing of Gifford Pinchot

It is my thought that the atmosphere was so changed by the firing of Gifford Pinchot by President Taft in January of 1910 that the Taft administration engendered none of the stimulus and the enthusiasm that had radiated from the White House during T.R.'s tenure.

Ingersoll: What about Graves? How do you think he felt about a thing like the ranger school?
Ringland: I am completely confident that Henry Graves, as an educator and Dean of the Yale University Forest School and a professional forester, who succeeded Gifford Pinchot, was wholly sympathetic to the continuance of the ranger school. But at that time, as I have just pointed out, he had perhaps too much on his plate of greater consequence to use an English expression. Despite the fact that we did not have the school, Henry Graves had our complete support. We were happy that the tradition was established that the Service should be headed by a professional forester. Over the years this tradition has been sustained.

Ingersoll: Was the firing of Pinchot a stunning shock to you then?

Ringland: No doubt about that because it was the loss of a leader who had recruited us.

Ingersoll: Were you able to follow the controversy very well when you were so far from Washington?

Ringland: No, not as much as we'd like. I can tell you what Mrs. Price, wife of Overton Price, the Associate Chief Forester, said to me. When I had occasion to be in Washington during the Ballinger-Pinchot controversy, I had dinner at the Price's home. Mrs. Price said to me, "Don't talk to Overton about it." And I of course knew what she meant—that he was right in the midst of all of this row. Then two or three years after all of this happened when he and Pinchot were dismissed, he did away with himself. He was a brilliant man, an ideal type of public servant. G.P. gives him the greatest praise in his book Breaking New Ground. And, of course, I had a great admiration for him as did my associates.

Ingersoll: What about the period when Albert Potter, who wasn't a professional forester, was in charge before Graves was appointed? Were there politics involved in Potter's appointment?

Ringland: Albert Potter had the complete confidence of Pinchot and Price. He was a competent and able man, and he carried on as the associate when Graves was appointed. One thing the Forest Service has kept clean on is political appointees. Not that
Rlingland: there was not pressure; I had it too as District Forester, of course, to a minor extent. Albert Potter, who was the Chief of Grazing, and had done so much to inaugurate the whole grazing policy and control, was prominently mentioned to succeed Pinchot and was taken by Secretary Wilson to see the President, but I understand, it was Anson Phelps Stokes, secretary of Yale, who suggested to President Taft that he consider Henry Graves who was then dean of the university forest school. Graves did see Taft and it resulted in his being appointed to succeed Pinchot. Potter recognized that this was best so he requested that his name be withdrawn; he then in turn was made the Associate Forester to Graves. They made a very good team because Graves was a professionally trained forester and educator and Potter an outstanding authority on grazing problems.

Ingersoll: How do you feel about the ranger school now as you look back on it?

Rlingland: Even now as I speak 60 years later, I feel a sense of sorrow and even anger that we were compelled to abandon plans for a school in 1910 because we had established a tradition which we thought would carry on.

I always wondered why we didn't carry it through until the next year and get the authority because I was still there in the district and everybody was for it. Why it did not happen I can't answer. I think the reason was the aftermath of the Ballinger-Pinchot row. Of course, that left a "dark brown taste" everywhere—certainly among foresters and conservationists. I think it had a depressing effect upon the "esprit de corps," and the imagination of doing things.
Political Pressures

Ingersoll: You mentioned that you had to contend with political pressure at times. Did any of this come from Senator Fall of New Mexico? His ranch was in your domain, wasn't it?

Ringland: Yes, there was a controversy over limiting the range allotment to Fall in relation to his Three Rivers Ranch adjacent to the old Alamo National Forest.

Ingersoll: What did Fall do?

Ringland: He was so incensed that he told a friend of mine in Santa Fe following his election to a Senate seat, "Now we shall see."

Fall was elected to the Senate in 1912. During the sessions of May 14-16 there was under consideration the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1913. There ensued a drum-fire of criticism against the Forest Service led primarily by Fall and supported by Senator Borah of Idaho and Senator Clark of Wyoming. The major points of attack were the application of the Act of June 11, 1906 providing homesteads in the forest reserves, the sales of timber, and grazing permits. Senator Chamberlin of Oregon and Senator Burnham of New Hampshire actively participated in developing the policies of the Forest Service.1

A remarkable amendment was introduced by Fall in the course of his attack. In substance the State of New Mexico would administer the forest reserves but under the laws of the United States and the rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture; the State would appoint the personnel; it would pay the cost of administration but all revenues would accrue to the State. Under these terms Fall asserted the cost of the administration of the forest reserves in New Mexico would not cost the Federal Government a cent.

1Congressional Record, Vol. 48, Part 7, 1912.
Ringland: At the close of the discussion Fall's amendment was lost on a point of order raised by Senator Burnham of New Hampshire and it was sustained by the Presiding Officer on the ground that the language involved general legislation in an appropriation bill.

In 1921 Fall became Secretary of the Interior in Harding's Cabinet, and during this time his Three Rivers Ranch and the Tea-Pot Dome oil field became the center of a scandal resulting in his conviction for bribery. Oddly enough Fall said during the discussion in May of 1912, "I believe before many years or before many months have rolled around the Congress of the United States will abolish the Department of the Interior of the United States government and with it the Indian Office."

Grand Canyon Mining Claims

Ingersoll: The Grand Canyon area was part of your domain out in District 3, wasn't it?

Ringland: Yes, the Grand Canyon National Monument was established by T.R. in 1905, and remained in this status until the Grand Canyon National Park was established in 1919.

In 1916 I asked forest supervisor Don Johnston of the Coronado National Forest to represent the Department of Agriculture on a committee with the Department of Interior to work out boundaries of the proposed Grand Canyon National Park by adjustment from three adjoining national forests; these were the Tusayan, the Coconino (south of the Canyon Rim) and the Kaibab on the north side. The recommended adjustments, as I recall them, became the basis of the boundaries of the national park when it was established in 1919, although some minor adjustments followed as a result of the examination in 1925 by the
Ringland:  Coordinating Committee on National Parks and Forests of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation on which I served.¹

Ingersoll:  You were there during those days when Cameron's claims were considered, weren't you?

Ringland:  Yes, I should point out that before the Grand Canyon National Monument was established, the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve had been established in 1893 under the administration of the Interior Department and remained open to mining claims until the monument was established in 1905. While no new claims could now be made or filed under the restrictive provisions of the Antiquities Act, claims filed under the old reserve could, if valid, proceed to patent. A number of such mining claims had been filed at strategic scenic points along the south rim and on the famous Bright Angel Trail. They were obviously staked out to capitalize their value for development as tourist attractions. The Forest Service able expert mineral examiners, H. Norton Johnson and T.T. Swift, reported that the claims apparently were not filed in good faith for mineral development. There was no reasonable showing of valuable ores and the land claimed was needed for public use in the logical development of the Canyon area visited as it was by thousands and thousands of tourists.

Ingersoll:  Was the report made by Johnson and Swift while you were District Forester?

Ringland:  Yes, I think that particular year was 1915. Many of the claims had been filed by Ralph Cameron before the creation of the national monument. He had been a delegate to Congress and later became U.S. Senator when Arizona was admitted to statehood in 1912. I want to quote here what Swift wrote in his recollections:

> On account of my mining experience
> I was assigned, in addition to Supervisor duties, mineral examiner of all mineral claims for patent on the forests of Arizona,

Ringland: New Mexico and buffalo range in Oklahoma. In addition was assigned to examine the Cameron claims in the Grand Canyon.

Mr. Cameron was quite a politician during the territory days of Arizona. In fact was elected Delegate in Congress to represent the territory of Arizona.

The start, of what is now known as the Bright Angel trail, was made by the Havasupai Indians from the south rim to Indian Garden. The Havasupai Indians lived, and still do, down in the canyon. Cameron took over this trail and improved it, extending the trail on down to the Colorado River by way of Pike Creek. He plastered mining claims the full length of the trail as well as along the south rim both east and west of the Harvey occupied area. Thru his political influence, I was told, he got the territorial legislature to pass a law declaring the Bright Angel Trail a toll trail. Whether this is true or not I never checked because I felt it had nothing to do with validity of his claims. I also was told Cameron called at the Harvey office every night and collected $1.00 per head for every tourist who rode over the trail. I did not confirm this either. Cameron refused to allow any improvements on his claims such as hard surface roads along the rim drives for convenience of tourists, or any other improvements of any kind.

To assist me in examination of the Cameron claims was a mineral examiner from the Interior Dept. by the name of Gilliland, also a mining man of wide experience from Seattle by the name of Kennedy, the latter of which also had experience in Alaska. We three met at the Grand Canyon and made plans for work. Before examination started I had a conference with Mr. Cameron explaining why and reason for the examination. I asked him if he had a map of his claims and if so could I have a copy. His answer was all the claims were recorded in Coconino County and I could
help myself. Thus we had to hunt for each claim. Each location work, we found no other workings, was carefully sampled and plainly marked. During the day I kept all samples under lock and key and at night under my pillow. This was done so I could swear, if necessary, all samples were always in my possession, and also allowing no one to tamper with the samples or salt them as is a mining expression.

When the work was finished we were packed out from our camp at Indian Garden to the Harvey Hotel on the south rim. I secured a Pullman reservation for Los Angeles taking all samples for assay by a reliable assayer I knew. When I was ready to board the sleeper with the sack of samples the porter refused to allow me to take the sack into the car, said I could check it or send by Express. I explained the situation but of no avail. I told my story to the Pullman Conductor who let me on the car with samples. Upon arrival in Los Angeles I got a cab and drove to the assayer's office, turned the samples over to him taking his receipt and waited results. With the exception of possibly 4 or 5 samples all showed not even a trace of value. The 4 or 5 samples showed a trace of either gold or silver but not enough to figure a value. On the finding of the assay returns and my personal investigation of the Cameron claims I prepared an adverse report which was sent to the District Forester, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Harold Greene, then the forest supervisor on the Tusayan National Forest, was also in immediate charge of the Grand Canyon National Monument. Within his recollection of that time he informed me that dates would be set by the Federal General Land Office in Washington for public hearings on the validity of these claims by Cameron, but many times the hearings managed to drag along. They would be postponed just as the critical time approached.

Ingersoll: Did Cameron cause the postponement?
Ringland: I would assume that. He was in powerful office. It seems reasonable to suppose that. Greene further recalls that the claims had been filed by Cameron just before the creation of the National Monument with shrewd foresight. These adjoined the Santa Fe Railroad’s 20 acre station sites, which were selected in connection with the company’s right-of-way. So the position of these claims was a commanding one if allowed to go to patent.

Ingersoll: Can you spell this out a little more, how they would be in a commanding position?

Meeting with Chief Forester Graves

Ringland: In October of 1914 I met Chief Forester Graves at the Grand Canyon. The purpose of our conference was to formulate a broad plan of action, looking to the proper development of the Monument as a national asset, and eventually its creation as a national park, a higher and needed status than that of a national monument.

Ingersoll: What was the outcome of this meeting with Graves?

Ringland: Our primary objective was to conclude the validity of the mining claims and prevent the acquisition of title where claims commanded the scenic points and access to the rim. The Forest Service accomplished in the main its objective based upon the competency of its mineral examiners Norton and Swift before the park took over, though the Park Service still had some of these claims to contend with. Had title been obtained, there would have been a honky-tonk development overlooking one of the world’s greatest natural wonders.
Cameron's Threat

Ingersoll: Did you ever meet Cameron yourself?

Ringland: Yes, I have met him; he was an amiable and affable person that one could like personally. Officially, however, he was something else in my opinion. He at one time said that I was trying to ruin him.

Ingersoll: What was this occasion?

Ringland: Oh, I was having dinner with one of my associates in the service, Don Johnston, in the Grill Room of the old Adams Hotel in Phoenix when Ralph Cameron came to our table and, referring to his mining claims, said that I was trying to ruin him. He said, with a smile, "I have a notion to shoot you with a double-barreled shot gun."

Ingersoll: Was he the type of man who might seriously have considered something like that?

Ringland: Oh, no! None of us took that remark seriously--he was joking--but he was serious about our opposition.

Ingersoll: Did you have any other encounters with Cameron during those long years when he held his claims?

Ringland: No, that was the only time I talked to him directly. What precipitated that was the difficulty the Fred Harvey Company was having in driving across one of Cameron's claims which at times was like a mud hole. When Fred Harvey, the head of the company, brought this to our attention, we suggested since the hole was not due to any mining work but due to surface conditions that the company repair it. This they did and Cameron was outraged.

---

1 Recorded in personal diary of A. Ringland.
Solution in a "Monopoly of Excellence": The Fred Harvey Concession

Ringland: You see, I should say here that the Fred Harvey Company had a concession. They managed the famous El Tovar Hotel which was located at the railhead right at the rim of the Canyon. They had, under our special use permit, the tourist facilities there—the carriage drives along the rim, and mule trains down the Bright Angel Trail, and other amenities.

Ingersoll: Do you have any idea how they acquired this concession?

Ringland: I think it was obvious that with the hotel and the great flow of visitors pouring in there something had to be done to regulate the use of the facilities. That we recognized. Of course, from time to time there were complaints that we were supporting a monopoly. Our stock answer to that was that it was a monopoly of excellence. On that point of monopoly let me quote here something that is current in a way and that is the statement that Joseph Krutch made in his book The Grand Canyon written in 1958. It is so pertinent to our old policy of maintaining the monopoly of excellence that I want to inject it in here.

Occasionally one hears some theoretical objection to the monopoly of the whole hotel-autocourt-restaurant system which on the south rim is held by the Fred Harvey Company and on the north rim by the Union Pacific Utah Park Company. But whatever unfortunate aspects monopoly management can develop, those who compare the situation within the parks with that prevailing in much-visited areas outside them are likely to conclude that a properly controlled monopolistic concession is easier to manage than free competition which seems everywhere to encourage blatant advertising, confusion, noise, and the whole ugly paraphernalia involved when the vulgarist whims of the tourists are catered to. Monopoly has no
Ringland: need of neon signs and loud speakers.... Like the Park Administration, the Harvey Company, especially, seems to have reached a very acceptable compromise between what floods of visitors must have and what would destroy the uniqueness of the region they have come to enjoy..... Regularly a certain number of visitors look sourly at the mule trains setting out for the Canyon bottom. "Why don't you build a funicular railway or a series of ski lifts?"  

Ingersoll: And you would agree with Krutch's view of what happens there?  

Ringland: Not only agree, but we put that principle into effect more than 40 years before Krutch, but I am happy that a man of his stature and national standing has brought it out today so well because the pressure is greater now than it ever was in our day by the increase, of course, of population. Greene wrote me once too about this question of monopoly in his day, the maintenance of it. He said:

A difficulty arose around 1915, when the use of autos was fast becoming popular. We had quite a number of fly-by-nights appear with all kinds of doubtful automobiles and an attempt to solicit passengers for pay in competition with the legalized Fred Harvey carriages and later buses. Our greatest problem seemed to be getting an opinion from our solicitors as to just how far we could go in regulating this business under our authority. Anyway we did make a number of arrests and I recall several trips to Flagstaff to attend hearings before the U.S. Commissioner there.

We managed finally to more or less straighten things out by giving permits to some responsible operators. We were

---

Ringland: not entirely happy with the settlement.¹

News of the Sinking of the Lusitania Received While in Conference with Secretary of Agriculture Houston

On May 4, 1915 I met Secretary of Agriculture Houston at the railway station in Albuquerque and accompanied him to Los Angeles by way of the Grand Canyon. The area was then a national monument under our administration as a division of the Tusayan National Forest.

It was a beautiful spring day. Since no field trip was scheduled, I wore light clothes and a straw hat. But when we woke up at the Canyon the next morning, it was snowing. The Secretary with a broad smile looked at my straw hat and said, "Ringland, you are the sort of optimist who would attempt to drive a banana through a hardwood floor."

On the afternoon of May 7th while in conference with other forest officers of District 5 in a Pasadena hotel, a bell boy handed the Secretary a telegram. As we watched him read it, it was evident that the message was one of unusual importance. It was, and he passed it around the circle. It was from President Wilson informing him of the sinking of the Lusitania by a German submarine. We wondered then how long President Wilson would keep us out of war. Two years later, less a month, Congress declared war against Germany, April 6, 1917. Several of us who sat with Secretary Houston on that momentous day in Pasadena were soon in uniform and soon overseas.

¹Harold Greene to Arthur Ringland, August 9, 1965. Filed with Ringland Papers.
Introduction of First Bison to Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma

Ingersoll: There were a number of rather historic moments while you were in the District Administration, Mr. Ringland. One of them, I understand, was when the bison were introduced to the Wichita Wildlife Reservation. Could you tell us a little bit about that?

Ringland: Yes, that was historic. In a sense it initiated the preservation of a type of wildlife which had practically disappeared from the country. The Wichita National Forest, where the herd was established, was a unit in the southwestern region of District 3 of the U.S. Forest Service when I was district forester. This forest in Oklahoma, of approximately 60,000 acres, was established by Theodore Roosevelt under the act of June 24, 1905. It was later transferred to the Biological Survey, now the Fish and Wildlife Service, in 1936 as the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. In the interim years, the national forest was under the general administration from Albuquerque, until the new District 7, or the Southeastern District, with headquarters in Atlanta, took over. The forest was stocked in 1907 with fifteen buffalo, a gift of the New York Zoological Society through Dr. Hornaday, the Director. Shortly afterward, in the course of inspection, I met Frank Rush, the first supervisor. Frank was a fine type of the old West. It was he who developed the basis for the present herd of about one thousand, occupying a fenced enclosure of some eight thousand acres. One day Frank proudly pointed out the leader of the herd, which he had named Ring after me. On my next visit I wanted to see Ring, but he was no more. He was too old and had been horned out by a younger one.

The headquarters building at this time was no credit to the Forest Service. Yet the budgeting limitation of $500, which applied throughout the Service, was inadequate. Frank solved the problem by establishing the roof of a new building as a lookout station and using the services of the guards, whenever possible, for necessary labor.
Ringland: The roof, indeed, was a good lookout, for the terrain, mostly range, permitted one to see for miles. The completed structure was now a credit to the Service, and since there was always a stream of visitors from the city of Lawton and throughout the state, Rush's action, which I warmly supported, was in the interest of public relations. As I took a last look at the attractive headquarters and wondered what the legal lads in Washington would think, I thought of the philosophy attributed to Catherine the Great: that you cannot court-martial a victory.

It is to no credit that the Army attempted recently to eliminate a large acreage of the refuge as an addition to the nearby Fort Sill Artillery Range. This attempt was made long after the Forest Service had relinquished its administration. The Refuge was then under the administration of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with its inclusion of herds of buffalo, elk, antelope, and longhorned steers, and a sanctuary for a wide variety of bird life. Its accessibility to thousands of visitors now constitutes a unique and outstanding example of conservation in the public interest.

Bandelier National Monument, New Mexico

Ingersoll: I understand that in northern New Mexico, in some of the great national forests, there were a good many of the remains of the ancient cliff dwellers. Did the Forest Service have any part in recognizing or perserving these, perhaps?

Ringland: Indeed we did. And I'd like to refer in particular to the Bandelier National Monument, included in the Jemez Division of the Santa Fe National Forest. In July of 1915, I joined Will Barnes, Chief of Grazing of the U.S. Forest Service, and Don Johnston, supervisor of the Santa Fe National Forest, in an inspection of the Jemez Division in the Upper Rio Grande Valley. In particular, we
made a careful reconnaissance of the Canyon of the Rito de los Frijoles because of its extraordinary exhibition of ruins and cliff dwellings of the pre-historic pueblo era, including the pueblo of Tyuonyi and Cochiti, probably not abandoned until the middle of the sixteenth century. The area included the stone lions of Cochiti and the Painted Caves. The purpose of our inspection was to determine the form and necessities of administration as a responsibility of the U.S. Forest Service.

At the time of our visit Judge Abbott of Santa Fe, and Mrs. Abbott, were occupying the only cabin, under a special-use permit. Miss Anna Bourke of Washington was a guest, and we camped nearby with our pack outfit. In the course of our talk, it developed that Miss Bourke's father was the late Captain John G. Bourke, aide to General Crook in the Apache Indian War in Arizona, and a distinguished scholar, author, and authority on the Indians of the Southwest. And, moreover, Will Barnes who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, our highest military distinction, had served in Captain Bourke's cavalry troop. So much for a small world.

At this point, I would like to refer to my field diary, on the date of July 22, 1915, when we remained all day in camp in the Frijoles Canyon. We had been discussing the proposal to create a Cliff Cities National Park. (In 1925, the Coordinating Committee on National Parks and Forests of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, recommended disapproval and there was no further action.) [from the diary:]

Judge Abbott feels that the boundaries should be much restricted as compared to the boundaries as given in the Catron (U.S. Senator) Bill and map of the Chamber of Commerce at Santa Fe. He thinks including the Rito de los Frijoles, the Stone Lions, and the Painted Caves will be sufficient. Dr. Hewitt in one of his monographs refers to this immediate region as including all of immediate interest. The intervening
ruins are of no particular interest. Ashley Pond, a rancher of the Ramon Vigil Grant, is keen for the park, but I think for advertising purposes. Judge Abbott thinks a line running north and south, connecting the Cochiti Grant and the Ramon Vigil Grant would be right. It runs just east of St. Peters Dome.

July 23: Left in the morning and rode to Canyon Capulin and camped. July 24: Rode down Canyon Capulin three miles to La Cueva Pintada (the painted cave). This cave is high up in the cliffs on the north side of the Canyon, about sixty feet wide and thirty feet high, entirely open in front. The walls are covered with paintings in red, although a few are in black and white, some in green. Painting, relatively modern, because of mineral composition; pictures mostly of deer, lion, horses, eagles, many crosses and some figures of men. From La Cueva Pintada we rode back up Canyon Capulin to camp, and there, out of the Canyon, about one mile north. Here there is a ridge between the Canyon Capulin and a fork of the Canyon. About one quarter of a mile to the east, we found the stone lions of Cochiti. These lions are carved out of tufa rock, in place. The lions are exactly alike, are about thirty-eight inches long from head to base of tail. The tails are thirty-six inches long. The figures are fairly intact, but the lines are somewhat obliterated by the weather. The heads are not at all distinct. The lions rest within a stone enclosure about twenty feet in diameter, with a wall entrance from the south about five feet wide. These lions are considered by such authorities as Bandelier, Starr, and Prince as the most important specimens of aboriginal sculpture in the United States.

We were in agreement following our field trip and inspection of the Tyuonyi Ruin, which is a large, circular community, that cliff dwellings, the stone lions, the painted caves, and the Pueblo Quemado--the Burnt Pueblo--with tufa walls, some
Ringland: standing and covering six or more acres, all within the Canyon of the Los Frijoles, should be declared a national monument, embracing some twenty-seven thousand acres under authority of the American Antiquities Act of June 3, 1906.

Will Barnes made the appropriate suggestion, with Judge Abbott's warm concurrence, that the monument be named after Bandelier. "He, Adolph F. Bandelier (I'm quoting from my diary) was born in Berne, Switzerland August 6, 1840, son of a distinguished Swiss Army officer. He came to New Mexico as first fellow of the Archaeological Institute of America. For five years he explored on foot nearly all of New Mexico and Arizona, and his publications by the Institute are now the foundation for archaeological and ethnological studies in these regions. He died in Spain on March 18, 1914." The honoring of Bandelier was in accord with our policy to recognize significant names in local history, or place names—so the Carson, Apache, Sitgreaves, Crook, Coonino, Tusayan, Kaibab, and Tonto National Forests, for example, in District 3. Washington approved our recommendations and the Bandelier National Monument was established by presidential proclamation on February 11, 1916. The National Park Service, created in that year, now administers this as well as all other national monuments and parks.

Watershed Protection and Irrigation Interests

Ingersoll: How do you feel about the proposal of the irrigation interests around Phoenix a few years ago? The Tonto watershed, which would have been effected, must have been in District 3 while you were there.

Ringland: The value of forests for watershed protection, of course, has always been recognized and its application was sought by the Reclamation Service for the protection of the headwaters of the Salt River and the Roosevelt Dam. I believe this was in 1908 when the Roosevelt Dam was completed, or possibly 1909. It would provide irrigation and power for
the Salt River Valley lands then adjacent to Phoenix. These headwaters have long since been included in the Tonto National Forest.

It is ironic, however, to speak of the fantastic proposal of some irrigation interests in and about Phoenix a few years ago or less: to denude the forest cover of the Tonto watershed in order to promote a flow of rainfall which it was contended, was unduly absorbed by the vegetation, trees and the like. As I remember, it was even proposed to denude the forest cover by chemical spray. A formal report was made by the irrigation interests in cooperation with the University of Arizona. There was here a clear case of the denial of the influence of natural environment, an attempt to segregate for private benefit a property that was not private, in fact, it was not even in the state's hands, but a national property. I don't know the exact status today, but I believe that it is as dead as "Dicken's doornail."

**Developments in Administration**

Ingersoll: I understand that during the time you were District Forester of District 3, there were several new ideas for ways the Forest Service might function. In the light of the years since the initial organization of the District in 1908, were there any significant plans for changes in administration?

**Consolidation of National Forests**

Ringland: For some time I had a feeling, if not a conviction, that some of the national forest units could be consolidated to advantage. I pictured in my mind
Ringland: a national forest embracing natural resources of sufficient and potential importance to warrant a strong technical supervisory staff at a central headquarters; there were none too many technicians available in the varying fields of forest and range management, engineering, and the like, to man every national forest unit.

In 1915 I felt the time had come to make recommendations to the Forester. An exhaustive study was undertaken by the district staff and in consultation with forest supervisors and other field officers. A voluminous report replete with tables and maps was submitted to the Forester, September 13, 1915. It went into great detail setting forth the principles governing the consolidation of the seventeen national forests in Arizona and New Mexico into ten and based upon 1) geography, 2) topography, 3) transportation and communication and 4) economic and social conditions.

For example: the unbroken mass of national forest land of the Colorado Plateau in northern Arizona where geography is not a factor, compared to the massive mountainous uplifts in southern Arizona with great stretches of intervening desert. There geography is a factor. The whole plan was not accomplished by the time I was transferred in 1916; the number of national forests in these two states is now thirteen.

Ingersoll: You were also a strong believer in decentralization. Were the ideas for consolidation of the national forests and the principles of decentralization compatible?

Ringland: Yes. Decentralization means action at the grass roots when carried to its ultimate extent. The fact that in consolidation there would be technicians available to know all about the grass roots, shall we say, would make terminal action possible, where this could not be accomplished on a national forest which could not support an adequate technical staff.
The Forest Service and the Army

Ingersoll: I understand that you also had an idea for the use of Forest Service rangers in time of crises. Did this have any relevance to the danger from Mexico while you were District Forester in the Southwest?

Ringland: Yes, it did. The Villa raid on Columbus, New Mexico, March 9, 1916 stirred up a great deal of excitement. It was followed, it will be remembered, by General Pershing and the cavalry driving the Villa forces back into Mexico. When the Mexican crises was at its height, the Secretary of Agriculture after a conference with the Secretary of War, authorized the Forest Service to obtain a list of volunteers presumably for scout service. Within a few days enough to form a squadron was readily obtained. The subsequent events fortunately put an end to the need for further activity.

At that time I thought of the advisability of some form of permanent organization with a measure at least of military training in the event of future needs. In the winter of 1914-15 with the war in Europe spreading, the countrywide agitation for the strengthening of national defense spurred these thoughts. I had in mind obtaining the informal advice of Captain Frank McCoy then in command of the cavalry at Fort Wingate, New Mexico. I had met him a number of times and had been his guest in Washington too where he served as aide to T.R. He became the secretary of the General Staff as Colonel at Chaumont in France at the time of World War I, and later as Major-General commanded the Forty-second Division, A.E.F. In the years since, he became prominent in the public service.

I was quite surprised to find in a census that was made of the members of the Forest Service in District 3 to learn of the number who had had some form of military training, elementary as it might have been. All moreover had broad experience in the out-of-doors: camping, cooking, packing, riding, topographic sketching, road, trail and bridge building, telephone construction, use of
Ringland: the heliograph, use of arms, and knowledge of first aid and some of Spanish. These men, forest rangers, short-term guards, and supervisors, numbering some 350 and stationed in the National Forests of Arizona and New Mexico, offered ideal material for military service. All had the individual capability and needed but training in military bodies to make themselves an efficient organization.

Ingersoll: Was there any precedent anywhere in the world for foresters being used in military ways?

Ringland: Quite so, because it was reported that some 40,000 foresters in organized bodies were fighting in the armies of Russia, Germany, Austria, and France in World War I. In France they were known as the Forest Light Infantry, Chausseur Forestier. In Germany they were organized into the Feld Jager Corps.

Ingersoll: Did your plan have support from people higher in the Forest Service?

Ringland: Quite so. No organized action developed, but the question remained a live one. Chief Forester Graves asked me to get in touch with Major General Leonard Wood.

Ingersoll: Was it late in 1915 that he asked you to do that?

Ringland: Yes, that was late in 1915. Now this request arose because General Wood had made an inspection of cavalry posts in New Mexico and Arizona, and we in District 3 had extended courtesies to him. We knew that he was familiar with the type of men the Forest Service employed and their potential for military service.

I have found among my papers, copy of a letter from General Wood to Gifford Pinchot of December 26, 1911. It reads as follows:

---

1Original in National Archives.
Hingland: Dear Mr. Pinchot,

I have been hoping, ever since my return from the Western trip, for an opportunity to tell you how very favorably impressed I was by the personnel and the efficiency of the Forest Service as I saw it in Arizona and New Mexico. All the representatives whom I met seem to be young men of intelligence and energy, and their work for the conservation of the forests is unquestionably of the greatest value.

Very sincerely yours,

Leonard Wood

Mr. Gifford Pinchot
1615 Rhode Island Avenue
Washington, D.C.

Ingersoll: What was the reason for General Wood's visit to the New Mexico region in 1911?

Ringland: He went there to inspect the cavalry posts which were still active in New Mexico and Arizona, such as Fort Wingate in New Mexico, and Fort Apache in Arizona.

Ingersoll: Was the Forest Service in any way connected with these cavalry posts?

Ringland: Not directly. I would say rather that there was a friendly cooperation, perhaps in case of need in fighting forest fires and in other respects. Principally, as we have now brought out, was the potential cooperation of the Forest Service with the War Department in possible phases of national defense, more specifically a possibility of war with Mexico.

Ingersoll: Then did Gifford Pinchot send this letter from General Wood on to you back in 1911?
Hingland: Yes, in a letter of December 28, 1911, Mr. Pinohot addressed the following letter to me at my station in Albuquerque, New Mexico:

Dear Hingland,

Enclosed is a copy of a letter from General Wood, which I have just received. Make whatever use of it that you think best. I should exceedingly like to have the men in the field know about it. It has made me prouder than ever of the men and their work, if that were possible.

Sincerely yours,

Gifford Pinohot

Ingersoll: Was that the sort of thing that Pinohot was accustomed to do—to let his men in the field, as he says, know of any particular commendations that were given to them by other people?

Ringland: I should say, and most emphatically, that this was a part of his lasting contribution to the development of the "esprit de corps" of the Forest Service. It was simply one example of any number that evoked his commendation. It was typical of the character of the man.

Ingersoll: And in busy days when there were so many things to be done in Washington, it was really splendid that he passed on a letter like this to the men in the field.

Ringland: Yes, I know that I cherished the letter from him when I was on my first assignment in the West as a forest assistant on the Lincoln National Forest.

Ingersoll: He made his men feel a part of the larger effort, didn't he?

Ringland: Yes, and more than that he would back them, and the men knew it.

\(^1\)Original in National Archives.
Ingersoll: Can we go on now to develop the points in your 1915 contact with General Wood concerning your proposal that foresters have military training?

Ringland: While in New York, I received a cordial note from Major General Leonard Wood asking me to go over the matter with him at Governor's Island. At that time the General was in command of the Eastern Corps Area of the Army.

As a result of Mr. Graves' suggestion, I was able to make a report to him on November 9, 1915 of my talk with General Wood. I said:

I am very glad to tell you that everything is working out in the right way in the consideration of what part in the Forest Service may take in the plans for national defense. The conference that I had with General Wood was so satisfactory and he appreciated to the full the points brought out by you [Graves] in your talk with me. He felt the best way to present the matter for final action was to leave it with him to take up with the General Staff in Washington. And to this end, he asked me to supplement my talk with a memorandum. This I have promised. My talk with General Wood was of exceeding interest as he gave me many sidelights on the situation, as he now sees it.

I had had the pleasure of meeting General Wood some time ago, about the time of his inspection of the cavalry posts in this district. In the course of this inspection, he gained a measure of familiarity with our organization, and so I was able to present our ideas in a way that he could fully appreciate. I shall of course, keep you in touch with further developments although he said he would request the War Department to take the situation up with you.1

1 In National Archives.
Ingersoll: What did you mean in your letter to Graves when you said that General Wood had given you many sidelights on the situation?

Ringland: The General was disturbed because his plan to develop a reserve corps was meeting with obstacles in Washington, as I understood it.

Ingersoll: What sort of obstacles were those?

Ringland: I don't know, but I do know he appreciated the value and necessity for a reserve corps and our defense history sustains his judgment.

Ingersoll: So this was just the type of thing that he was looking for at the moment then, wasn't it?

Ringland: Yes.

Ingersoll: It could act as a substitute in part for what he was not able to get.

Ringland: He was a man of vision.

Ingersoll: Can you say any more about General Wood as you remember him from those inspection tours or other meetings with him?

Ringland: Well, the only times that I ever met him were once very briefly when he became out to the Southwest and then at Governor's Island. This time at Governor's Island was quite a talk, you know. It impressed me, as naturally it would.

General Wood was then becoming a national figure; he became controversial later in the political arena. Of course, you know about the fight for the nomination of the presidency at the Republican convention that ended in the smoke filled room that nominated Harding. Well, General Wood and Governor Lowden were the two leading candidates. What a pity!—that General Wood and not Senator Harding... Well, we might name some other "pities" if that is the right word. Yes, he had all of the philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt—liberal, and rich experience as an administrator in the military occupancy of Cuba, and as chief of staff of the army.
Ringland: On November 19, 1915, Chief Forester Graves wrote to me at Albuquerque:

D Supervision
Military Training
District Forester
Albuquerque, N.M.

My dear Ringland,

I have your (D, supervision) letter of November 9 telling of your talks with General Wood. I think that this is splendid. A better way could not have been found to get the matter before the War Department, and the next move is now up to them. I am very glad indeed that you had this talk with him.

Very sincerely yours,
H.F. Graves, Forester

Ingersoll: Was there anyone else who was working with you on the idea of using the Forest Service men for national defense?

Ringland: Yes, at about this time I carried on a personal correspondence with Coert du Bois, the District Forester for California.

Ingersoll: Were your ideas pretty much the same?

Ringland: We were in accord about the essential service that might be rendered, and it was simply a matter of developing the details of the plan of possible action. He had been in touch with some of the local army officers in San Francisco and their reports were made available to Washington, as I recall it.

Ingersoll: Did all this go very high in the War Department? Did the Secretary of War ever hear about it?

Ringland: On that point I should recall that General Wood said to me at Governor's Island that he would take up the question of the use of Forest Service personnel with the General Staff in Washington.
Hlngland: Shortly afterwards, on December 7, in follow up Secretary of War Garrison wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture enclosing a memorandum from the General Staff on the subject of the utilization of the Forest Service personnel for military purposes. "It is shown therein that the personnel of the Forest Service could be of great use to the Government in time of war or threatening war by cooperating with the Army."

Ingersoll: But between the time that all of these thoughts were being formed and talked through between yourself and people in the Agriculture Department and the War Department, and the time you were involved in the organization of the Tenth Engineer's for World War I, there had to be quite a bit of change in plans, didn't there?

Hlngland: Well yes, history was moving rather fast.

Ingersoll: Do you feel that these ideas for using the Forest Service personnel for national defense had an influence on the heavy use that was made of Forest Service personnel during World War I?

Hlngland: I would say that there was an acceptance of the policy that the Forest Service personnel had a potential value in a contribution to national defense, whatever form that might take. The position, following Secretary of War Garrison's statement, established the latent value of this form of service. Events did not make any demand on the use of the Service personnel as contemplated in case of war across the border, but forestry personnel were always there for possible use as outlined in the discussions between the Forest Service and the War Department.

Ingersoll: Did you take any further steps after that memo from the Secretary of War in late 1915?

Hlngland: I find that in my monthly report for January 1916 as District Forester to the Washington office, I said, in reference to military preparedness that as a result of the conference with General Wood a

---

1In Archives, Washington, D.C.
Ringland: draft of a bill had been submitted to the Forester making available for national defense the services of civil officers and employees of the various departments.¹

Ingersoll: Who does "the Forester" refer to?

Ringland: The Chief, his title was simply "Forester" for a long time.

Ingersoll: So a draft of a bill had been submitted to Graves then with your proposal to use Forest Service personnel?

Ringland: Yes.

Ingersoll: Was there a bill submitted to Congress?

Ringland: I am sure not. While I cannot state here the follow-up action, I can say there was none looking to legislation.

Ingersoll: As you said, probably at this point events were just moving too fast in Europe to make this more than a latent piece of thinking for later use in another way.

Ringland: Yes. In 1917 the whole question of the use of Forest Service personnel for national defense was brought to an issue. The problem here was the use of Forest Service personnel in an entirely different field from that contemplated in the talks with the War Department in 1915 when war with Mexico was a possibility. The declaration of war which brought the United States into the European conflict on April 6, 1917, precipitated a demand for the use of Forest Service technical personnel and lumbermen in the provision of supplies from French forests for the use of the Allied forces.

¹In Archives, Washington, D.C.
Public Relations

Ingersoll: Did the concept of what a national forest should be or do change significantly while you were in charge of District 3?

Ringland: It was not until 1915, and more directly in 1916, that serious thought was given to the need in the organization of the U.S. Forest Service for an active unit to be known as Public Relations to promote the use and understanding of the national forests. While in Washington for consultation in November of 1915 opportunity was afforded to discuss this question with Chief Forester Graves. There was need, I felt, for specialized attention to establish personal relations with the officials of the chambers of commerce, the industrial aspects of the railroads, with all public and quasi-public organizations, Federal, state and local, not only to promote business (such as sales of timber) but to bring about understanding of (grazing allotments, special uses, etc.) Although the Forest Service had been established ten years ago, in some quarters, particularly political, the national forests were not looked upon as permanent national institutions in our economic development; there were persistent proposals to transfer them to the states, or others to eliminate them through the operation of the public land laws. Mr. Graves was much interested in the idea and asked me to outline the activities of such an organization.

Upon my return to Albuquerque I wrote my colleague, Coert du Bois, District Forester at San Francisco, a personal letter of November 10, 1915 seeking his thoughts on the problem. He wrote me on November 20 under personal cover in full accord, making the interesting suggestion that the activity should be concentrated at Madison, Wisconsin, at the Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory, working through the respective district offices of products—"which now spend their time in microscopic examination of shavings."² du Bois developed his thinking

²See Appendix VI.
further in an article he prepared for the University of California Journal of Agriculture, probably published in October or November of 1916.3

On May 10, 1916, I sent Mr. Graves the first rough draft of an outline in detail on public relations directed to community development based upon the social and economic anatomy of each national forest, as well as provisions for personal relations and understanding with public and quasi-public organization, federal bureaus, chambers of commerce, county supervisors, county and state school and health boards, road associations, stockmen's association, game commissions, fire protection associations, and the like.4

I felt that a national forest was a public estate to be administered to contribute multiple public services to make life more productive and fruitful within the sphere of its influence. I went to Alaska shortly, and when I returned to Washington in the fall it was evident that our participation in World War I seemed assured and I had no further part in the development of public relations as a unit of organization.

It may be, however, that the missionary efforts which du Bois and I shared in 1915 and 1916 pointed initially to today's units of Information and Education which now form an indispensible part of the far flung organization of the U.S. Forest Service.

3Copy of article and covering letter from Coert du Bois to Arthur Ringland filed with Ringland Papers.

On the Coconino National Forest, near Flagstaff, Arizona, May 1909 (A. Ringland)

Rangers on pack trip, Apache National Forest, Arizona 1910
Farewell

Ringland: I think it might be interesting to wind this section up by putting in the final piece I wrote for the Daily Bulletin, which incidentally we began while I was in District 3. It was written on April 15, 1916.

It is with no small show of sentiment that I leave the work of this District and my association with you of eight years to engage in official duties elsewhere. Nevertheless I do leave with a very large measure of pride in what has been accomplished—not by any individual alone but by the teamwork of all of you. This District has always prided itself, and justly too, on its esprit de corps. And so while each of us doubtless has had a share in disappointment official and personal the District as a whole measures abreast in its high ideals and productive results with any unit in the Service. This is not mere assertion but based on knowledge—knowledge gained by close and often intimate association with many of you, in back-to-a-log talks, around a campfire, in stick-whittling chats with nesters, and with business dealings with permittees of large and small affairs. You have realized that the whole Service is greater than any part, the personnel greater than the individual. That is why D-3 has made good.

Material, equipment, methods, money and man make up the essentials of any great work. So the work of the Service is great. In the National Forests we have the material of an empire; our equipment is good and becoming better; methods are a constant subject of study; the appropriations—on the whole—are adequate. But what of the men? Well I am proud of the personnel of this District!

Mr. Paul Redington is District Forester, effective April 16. I have known him for years—in the forest school and in the Service.
Ringland: I know most of you. And so I can leave the work knowing that D-3 will continue to progress toward the ideals on which the Service was founded.

(Signed) Arthur C. Ringland
District Forester

Ingersoll: And I think it would also be very interesting to conclude with the editorial from the Albuquerque Evening Herald of April 28, 1916 entitled "Mr. Ringland's Success":

Albuquerque bids farewell to A.C. Ringland, the retiring District Forester, with sincere regret. Mr. Ringland has made good in a difficult position. His administration of the forests in the Third District has been successful. He has made the forest service of great value to New Mexico, and while he leaves the District with forest service and forest users working in full cooperation, he and the men who have worked with him during the past few years created the spirit behind the present cooperation by hard work, wise diplomacy and fairness at every stage of the game.

When the Third District headquarters were established here the present friendliness toward the forest service did not exist. In some parts of the state there was positive unfriendliness, not to say bitterness, toward the service. Many forest users felt that their rights were being infringed upon. Others saw special privileges of great value in process of slipping away. For a time nothing was heard but criticism of the forestry policy and the service.

All of that attitude on the part of forest users has disappeared. The forest service has come to be regarded as an institution working solely and disinterestedly for the welfare of the forest users of the protected areas and of the country tributary. Wherever possible development has been aided.
Ingersoll: and uses broadened and within a surprisingly brief period an attitude of positive hostility on the part of a very considerable number of people has changed into one of the heartiest cooperation and friendliness.

The part Mr. Ringland has played in this important readjustment of sentiment is well known to those who are familiar with the affairs of the district headquarters. His advancement to the very important constructive position he goes to fill has been earned. Mr. Ringland takes with him not only the best wishes of Albuquerque people, but of the people and the forest users of the whole district.
Early in the summer of 1916 I was instructed by Chief Forester Graves to report on forest conditions in Alaska including the Tongass National Forest in the Southeast and the Chugach National Forest in the Kenai Peninsula area.

I traveled via the Canadian Pacific from Montreal to Vancouver B.C. During a stop-over in Montreal I listened to the impassioned talk of a recruiting sergeant to a crowd in Windsor Park. He made me feel uncomfortable though his talk was directed to French Canadians apparently reluctant to enlist.

In Vancouver I was joined by Hugh Bennet of the Bureau of Soils of the Department of Agriculture, and Lage von Wernsterd of the Forest Service, a classmate of mine at the Yale Forest School.

Bennent became chief of the Soil Erosion Service of the Interior Department in 1934, and as chief of its successor body the broadened Soil Conservation Service in 1935. He soon established a reputation at home and abroad as an authority. It was his initiative and leadership that literally put erosion control of farm lands on the map as one can see from an airplane in many parts of the country. The novelist and conservationist Bromfield in a vignette said: "Hugh Bennent deserves the greatest honor of the American people as one of its great benefactors." In 1936 I was appointed by Bennent to report on soil conservation overseas, so I saw much of him and developed a keen appreciation of his great public service. One might say that he was to soils what Gifford Pinchot was to forests.

Our voyage through the famed Inland Passage was spectacular though we were aware of occasional wrecks for at that time there were, we understood, uncharted pinnacle rocks.
At Seward we engaged Louie Bell as guide and two packers Walter Lodge and Bill Kaiser. Inevitably there were quips about the activities of a namesake in Europe. All three proved themselves and we were fortunate to have such a team.

Our main course of travel was by boat a French "bat" down the Kenai River from the head of Kenai Lake to Cook's Inlet some 100 miles. At times rapids were encountered where we left the navigation to Bell and his assistants while we hiked reminding me of the portages on the Penobscot River in Maine in 1902. But for Mt. Katadin we had the inspiring sight of the Spencer and Kanikof glaciers. We made many side trips from the Kenai River as a base into the interior, to Shilak and Tustamena Lakes and up the Moose and Russian Rivers. A Siwash lean-to sheltered us at night, and though it was August a fire was necessary. We were plagued in the day by mosquitoes so vicious that frequently we wore head nets in camp or when making slow progress across muskkeg.

The Kenai Peninsula was a wilderness in all respects, some parts unmapped and traveled by a few trappers, Indians and occasional big game hunters. At one time or another we saw the Kenai moose, the largest of its species, the Kodiak or brown bear, the largest of the carnivors, and bands of mountain sheep and goats difficult to approach because of the whistle of the sentinel ptarmigans, and in every stream, fish!

One day I lay on a log across the very head waters of the Russian River and witnessed the spawning of the sock-eyed salmon. These had fought their way from salt water despite fallen timbers. They had returned to the very waters where as fingerlings they had been spawned and then sought the sea, to return in full growth after a cycle of four years. Once the biological function was completed I saw the salmon change to mottled colors and die to float ashore for feasting bears.

Once with the wind and the ground in favor, and well covered by several guns, I ventured to photograph a huge Brownie while he was browsing. And at another time I took a picture of a female...
with her cubs. She was fishing as we quietly approached in our boat through deadwater. When she saw us she stood up and the cubs crouched at her feet. The composition was perfect but a soft rain was falling and I was doubtful of results. Weeks later when the film was developed in Washington all proved duds; the first showed a rock for I had buck fever in my excitement, and rain spoiled the other. Kodiak bear pictures were not common and Dr. C. Hart Merriam, an outstanding biologist expressed great interest and then disappointment. Unhappily I boasted before the development!

All told we were conscious that the Kenai Peninsula must rate as one of the great wild-life regions of the world. But as I write I am also conscious some fifty years later that oil is being developed.

We concluded our cross-country of the Peninsula at Kenai on Cook's Inlet and there took a launch 67 miles to Anchorage on September 5, 1916.1 Anchorage then was but a raw-boarded village and now the largest city in Alaska.

The nearby Matanuska Valley was attracting a few pioneer homesteaders because of its agricultural potential. With the completion of the railroad from Seward and the subsequent growth of Anchorage a market was afforded and the Valley was settled.

We returned to Seward by way of Turnagain Arm (so named because Captain Cook found he must return to the Inlet to get to sea). At Seward we were given a dinner by the Commercial Club and an opportunity was afforded to do some missionary work, and offset some resolutions critical of the Forest Service.

At Ft. Liscom, a forlorn garrison on Prince William Sound at Valdez, we met Colonel Richardson of the Army Engineers in charge of Alaskan road construction. Like the Forest Service he was

---

1Voucher for the Launch "Chase." Appendix.
having some friction with the Interior Department. In discussing this with him at the Tillicum Club he said "Give 'em hell my boy, a lot of damned politicians." In World War I as General Richardson he served with distinction in command of troops collaborating with the Allies in the Arkangel area of Russia.

Upon completion of our investigations in the Prince William Sound region we returned to Juneau and thence through the Inland Passage to Vancouver and the luxury of the Canadian Pacific Hotel. As a result of our reports Alaska National Forests were eliminated from the administration of the Portland Office and established as an independent district. Frank Heintzelman was appointed District Forester and made such a brilliant record that he was appointed Governor of the Territory by President Eisenhower. At a dinner in Washington just before Frank went to Juneau for his inaugural I offered him a formal black coat and striped trousers tailored for me in London's famed Saville Row some years ago, and a top hat. Of course I had my tongue in my cheek. Frank replied that if he appeared in that costume he would never reach the platform for the ceremony.

Frank completed his term as Governor when the Territory became our 49th or was it the 50th state? Following his public service his intimate knowledge of Alaska and its resources made it possible for him to promote its economy successfully, particularly the utilization of the timber (especially the Sitka spruce) of the Tongass National Forest in the Southeast for lumber and pulp under sustained yield management. His death a few years ago was the occasion of universal mourning in Alaska, the country he loved and served so well.
THE FOREST SERVICE AND WORLD WAR I (1917-8)

**Early Days**

Ringland's "Creep-Mouse" Letters

**Ingersoll:** What was the origin of the actual use of American foresters in World War I?

**Ringland:** When it became apparent in the early months of 1917 that war was seemingly inevitable, the Department of Agriculture became concerned in common with other Federal departments with the protection of its interests and the disposition of its personnel. Under instructions of Acting Chief Forester Potter, I attended a meeting of bureau representatives in the offices of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Forest Service was requested to inform quietly the district foresters to take precautionary steps, and plan the part the national forest personnel should play in safeguarding from sabotage key mountain passes and railroads, bridges, tunnels, etc. within or adjacent to their areas.

Since I was serving in the Washington office as a sort of adjutant to the Chief at this time, Mr. Potter asked me to send the request under my personal cover. This I did, and one of my colleagues, District Forester Coert du Bois, amusingly wrote and asked what I meant by my "creep-mouse" letter. I kidded him that he himself had envisioned the desirability of action of this character some time before at the time of the prospect of a war with Mexico.

**Ingersoll:** Was there some fear on the part of Forester Graves that the Forest Service personnel might become subservient to the Army?

**Ringland:** I think that expresses the situation with too much emphasis.
Ingersoll: How would you temper it then?

Ringland: Events were moving fast in 1917 because the British and French missions were in Washington and part of their representations were the urgent need for a forestry regiment.

At that time—I am speaking of March—Mr. Graves was in the field and Mr. Potter, the associate, was acting. In the proposals that were shaping up, Mr. Potter on March 28, 1917, in a memorandum to the Secretary of Agriculture on the use of the Forest Service for national defense, referred to the previous discussions in 1915 by district foresters du Bois and Ringland, and Ringland with General Wood. In exchange of correspondence between Potter and Forester Graves, then in the field, Mr. Graves made it clear that the Forest Service personnel as such would not become an integral part of the Army.

Ingersoll: What was he trying to avoid by saying that they would not become an "integral part of the Army"?

Ringland: There is a possible misinterpretation. I referred to "the Forest Service personnel as such." What he meant, as I recall it, was the use of the Forest Service as an organization rather than the use of its personnel. Does that make it clearer? The Forest Service would continue operating for civilian needs. It had great responsibilities which had to be continued despite the war and which had to be carried out as a service organization. Graves wanted to preclude any possibility which would impair the functions of the Forest Service as such.

Ingersoll: Graves himself left Washington later to go to Europe, didn't he?

Ringland: Yes, he went over with Barrington Moore at the urgent request of the War Department to organize an acquisition force of foresters to acquire French forests for utilization by an American forest regiment.
Ingersoll: After alerting the district foresters in your "creep-mouse" letter, were you involved in further plans for national defense from the Forest Service Washington office?

Ringland: When war was declared against Germany on April 6, 1917, my request for a furlough from the Forest Service was approved, and I enlisted as a candidate for a commission, when the first reserve officer's training camp was established at nearby Fort Myer. But before that I joined a number of enthusiasts and in the evening we would solemnly march in squads east and west through the streets of Georgetown.

A highlight in the course of our training at Fort Myer was participation in a march of a large contingent of troops down Pennsylvania Avenue headed by President Wilson in a blue suit, wearing a straw hat and carrying a cane.

After retreat one afternoon Arthur du Bois, an old friend from New Mexico days, and a graduate of the Yale Forest School, met me to my astonishment. He had been standing on the side-lines of the parade ground watching the ceremony of retreat. Arthur said he had been out of the country and had hurried home but too late for the first training camp yet he was eager to serve in some capacity. I told him that he should consult Navy Intelligence in view of his knowledge of languages and wide travel experience. This he did and served brilliantly in South America and again in Europe in World War II as an intelligence officer. When I next saw Arthur it was in Paris where he was a member of Secretary of State Lansing's staff at the Peace Commission.

While at Fort Myer I was informed by Acting Forester Potter of the Forest Service in a letter of May 28, 1917, that I had been recommended for a commission on the regimental staff of the 10th Reserve Engineers (Forest). Soon I received orders to report and I was then commissioned as a captain. Shortly I left the R.O.T.C. company before completing the course.

* See page 138 a
Urgent Wartime Need for Foresters

Ringland: The reason for this action was the urgent need for personnel to make up a regiment of foresters to go overseas to provide necessary forest products for the Allies. These ranged from piles at seaports to duckboards in the trenches. Such recruitment had already been undertaken in Canada and these Canadian units had begun lumbering operations in the forests of England. As a result of experience in World War I, the British undertook extensive plantations of trees to provide mine pits and other necessities which no doubt were useful in World War II. I saw a number of those plantations in the course of the tours that I made in Europe a few years before World War II.

About a month after the declaration of war by the United States, the War Department was notified by the British and French missions which had come to Washington in May of 1917, that the British government in particular wanted to decrease the transport of lumber and forest products across the channel to France, presumably because of a shortage of shipping. Then the French government to make this possible authorized the cutting in various forests in France.

Ingersoll: Do you know whether the Canadians worked in France at all?

Ringland: Oh yes, they were moved over to France; but they weren't enough. Before the war was over there must have been, just counting the Americans alone, over 20,000 in these forest regiments, though we started out with a regiment of about 1,200.

Forest Acquisitions and Operations in France

An American acquisition group working with the French acquired the forests so that the operating group could move in with their sawmills
Ringland: and cut to meet requisitions. Acquisition was an essential preparatory phase of the whole American participation. I mentioned that Lt. Col. Graves was in charge and R.C. Hall, who now lives in Alexandria, was one of the acquisition officers.

Ingersoll: But you were in regimental headquarters--more concerned with organization for operations than for acquisition. Is that right?

Ringland: Yes, I was with a regiment. The acquisitions group acted almost as individuals in a way. They formed a group in Paris who would appraise the forests and determine where operations should be undertaken.

Ingersoll: Were the acquisitions men commissioned?

Ringland: They were all commissioned; they had to be as technical foresters so they could work with their French opposite numbers of the Service des Eaux et Forets. But they were not in the regiment so they had none of the traditions of that group.

Quick Response of Forest Service

Ingersoll: How did recruitment of American foresters for service in France begin?

Ringland: I'm indebted for the following to Captain Arno Kolb. These were notes that he compiled in January 1919, and which are on file at the Archives in Washington. Information was transmitted to the Chief of Engineers from the Secretary of War on May 11, 1917. It stated that the War Department desired to organize companies of foresters to conduct logging and milling operations in France. The Secretary of War requested that the Chief of Engineers take up the organization of such companies with the Secretary of Agriculture as soon as possible. On May 14--one can see how quickly action was taken--Chief Forester Graves informed the Chief of Engineers of the types of
Ringland: personnel required for a six company organization, and outlined the portable sawmill and logging equipment. And he offered to aid in recruiting. The War Department designated this organization the 10th Engineers (Forestry).

Ingersoll: What was your part at this time?

Ringland: My first duty was in company with Captain Eldredge, a Forest Service colleague, to lay out the campsite on the campus of American University in Washington for training the recruits.

Esprit de Corps of Personnel

Ingersoll: What kinds of men were recruited?

Ringland: The 10th Engineers was recruited largely from personnel stationed in the West. There were included men competent to carry out any of the tasks involved in a logging and sawmill operation—trained foresters, expert lumbermen, axmen, sawyers, saw-filers, teamsters, blacksmiths, carpenters, mill-wrights, motor cycle and truck operators, and all-around lumberjacks, particularly from the Northwest.

Quite a number of the officers were from the Forest Service so I knew all of them intimately, others from executives of the lumber industry. It should be said that an extraordinary number of the enlisted personnel were college graduates, professional men—professional foresters, executives from the lumber industry, and engineers. They offered their services as a patriotic duty. Patriotism was a meaningful word in those days in the preparation of our armed forces.

It might be said that the regiment had unmatched esprit de corps for many of the men were recruited from an organization famous in this respect so they simply were moving into another job with the same high spirit. They were
Ringland: Imbued with a responsibility and I think adventure had its part in it. Most of these men came into the old Forest Service with a spirit of adventure in the very beginning.

Ingersoll: After working with Captain Eldredge to lay out the campsite for these men, what were your responsibilities?

Ringland: When the preparation for the campsite was finished (Captain Eldredge and I made the initial survey), and the carpenters had put up the barracks and all that at the American University, I was perched on a high stool in a shanty with Colonel James Woodruff and a few others. My job was as regimental adjutant, sort of a glorified chief clerk. Colonel Woodruff was in command of the regiment—a regular army officer.

Ingersoll: Had he had any forest experience at all?

Ringland: No, but he did not need it. He came into the picture because as an army officer, he knew how to organize a regiment for whatever purpose it was recruited and shape it into a disciplined body.

We had two battalions and each was in command of a forester. R.E. Benedict had one; C.S. Chapman another. These men were senior officers in the Forest Service, and so they, as well as others, particularly executives from the lumber industry, were able to give advice. Our supply officer was Captain Bryant, familiar with the necessary kinds of equipment which were new to Army Engineer organizations.

Ingersoll: Had Captain Bryant been a man from the Forest Service?

Ringland: I can't remember that but he was a technical forester, a Harvard man.

Ingersoll: Was he able to get this rather odd kind of equipment?

Ringland: Yes, and he was supplemented by Captain Barlow who came from the lumber industry in the Northwest.
Ringland: He was familiar with the type of portable sawmill that would be needed in France. In fact, as I recall it, he had a great deal to do with the designing of the type that was necessary under war conditions. I remember how precious those designs were because when we marched to the point of embarkation in the Georgetown yards of the B. & O. R.R. when we left American University, Captain Barlow had these rolled in a long leather bag which he carried under his arm; it was not quite military but it was important. Barlow never would leave those designs; he carried them right into the bunk with him aboard ship and during the boat drills. He was a conscientious officer. He was sent while in France to some point to buy a derrick that was necessary. He came back and told Colonel Woodruff that the French wanted too much for it; he felt the owner was a bit rapacious, as doubtless he was. I happened to be there at the time since I was the colonel's adjutant. The colonel said, "What the hell do you think we are doing here? You go and get that goddamn derrick!" and that was it. Barlow, so conscientious, could not quite adjust himself to the fact that Mars the fiddler was calling the tune. I always remember that.

And I recall when I was in Belgium and our outfit was marching back from the front after the Armistice, my company was billeted in a farm house one night. As we moved off in the morning the farmer, irate, handed me a bill for alleged damages. It was paid later without question as a matter of good will.

Ingersoll: Was Lieutenant Colonel Greeley associated with the 10th Engineers?

Ringland: No, he came in later after the 10th became part of a greatly expanded force—the 20th Engineers. Then he finally was given command of all these forestry forces. Colonel Woodruff had to go on into the more military aspects; but that was after I had left the regiment, and before retirement Woodruff became a major-general of engineers.

Ingersoll: What were you doing perched on that high stool beside Colonel Woodruff in the shanty at American University?
Ringland: Well, the immediate job there was to schedule the arrival of the troops who were coming from the West, by companies from the different points of recruitment, to see that they were properly met and provided for, and sheltered. All those actions that go to quickly taking care of a mass of men had to be taken. It was in work of that kind that Colonel Woodruff played a very necessary and essential part. As a green, green one, I had to consider army regulations too, though my R.O.T.C. experience helped. There was a certain conformity despite the war. I remember telling Colonel Woodruff one time when I was trying to figure out something according to the regulations, of a story that I heard about the, I think it was the Assistant Secretary of War, but it was when the Spanish-American War broke out, I heard that he rung his hands and asked, "What will happen to my files?"

Colonel Woodruff was no red tape man; he was very incisive.

Ingersoll: Were there any difficulties between men of professional backgrounds and knowledge and a man whose main background was military? Was it hard to get an understanding between these two?

Ringland: No, I don't think so; it went with remarkable smoothness.

A Nightmare of Exclusion

By September we were ready to go. I had to take part in a very unhappy job, one that has haunted me ever since. I had to go through the list of all the personnel and strike out the names of those who suggested that they might have some German origin.

Ingersoll: There must have been a good many from the forests of Minnesota and places like that.
Ringland: As I look back at it, it was the act of some damned fool, that is all I can say, but we had to do it.

McCarthyism was terrible and the worst exhibition in my time, but even before McCarthy we had these extraordinary exhibitions. I remember in my home town of Montclair, New Jersey, which was made up of intelligent people where a tennis court belonging to a family of German origin was said to be a gun implanation because it overlooked New York.

Ingersoll: Were there many people of German ancestry who had to be stricken from the list?

Ringland: I don't remember that; all I remember is how unhappy I was about it all. I was very unhappy.

Ingersoll: Who had to explain to these men? Was this done after they came to the training camp or before?

Ringland: No, it was before we were ready to go. It was within a day or two even. Orders were very confidential. Very few people knew when they would come. I still feel unhappy about it even after all of these years.

Ingersoll: Did you have to tell the men?

Ringland: I personally? No, that was another thing that made me unhappy. The orders were transmitted through the battalion commanders and they in turn through the captains.

Ingersoll: Did you have any way of knowing how this was explained to the men who would have to be dropped?

Ringland: Well, I think if I did that I buried my head somewhere.
Embarkation and Crossing

Ringland: We left camp at the American University on September 9, 1917. We took trains from Hoboken, the point of embarkation. We boarded the R.M.S. Carpathian and on that same day in the evening we sailed with all personnel below decks. During the voyage we had schools of instruction on military and technical forestry subjects. We remained in the city of Halifax for some five days waiting for a convoy to be organized.

This gave an opportunity for boat drills, rowing instructions, fire drill, provision against submarine attack. That was something to be remembered. Part of my job was to schedule for the entire personnel who would go into lifeboat and who would hang to this liferaft. I found in the course of working this out that the lifeboats were in poor condition and some without proper provision of water.

Lifeboat Responsibility

In the course of the voyage, I happened to be standing on the bridge early one evening along side the captain, when he told me to give the call to quarters. The reason was not a submarine attack, but a convoy warship known to us as the "Painted Lady" because of the camouflage, was bearing down on us in the fog. Nothing happened, but the spectacle of all those men scrambling from the lower decks to get up topside was a forerunner of what would happen if the real thing developed, although it should be said that the discipline was good.
Meeting With Colonel Mitchell - 2nd Engineers A.E.F.

Ringland: There was another regiment on board, the 2nd Engineers under Colonel Mitchell known as "God Almighty" Mitchell who was a fine officer whom we all admired.

When we got to France, the 2nd Engineers became quite a famous combat outfit. I just missed joining when I finally did get transferred. I had a note from Colonel Mitchell that came too late since I was already in Belgium with another combat division. I heard afterwards one of the stories about Mitchell; it was a true one too because it was told to me by his adjutant whom I knew well. Anyway two soldiers were outside a hut and Goodwin happened to be walking by. These two were talking about Mitchell, and one said, "He's a mean old 'S.O.B.'!" The other said, "Yes, he is but he is a square bastard." That got to Mitchell's ears and he loved it.

Ingersoll: Was there anything that you could do at that time about life boats that were not in good conditions?

Ringland: Let me pick up where I was at that point. As we approached the Irish coast, we were met by an escort of British destroyers. It was the most dangerous part of the whole voyage, I suppose. Everyone was ordered to sleep on deck with their lifebelts. Finally we entered the river Clyde and moved on up to Glasgow. I had the unhappy task of reporting to the captain of the Carpathian. Incidentally that was the ship that rescued the Titanic passengers. I felt very reluctant because the ship had made voyage after voyage from Canada under the most dangerous conditions before we entered the war. But I had to do it--to tell him what I had found. I reported to him after we had landed in Glasgow (concerning the bad lifeboats) and he was furious. I tried to tell him that I knew full well and appreciated the circumstances. He went on to say that he had brought thousands over here and this report was the first. I felt unhappy about it, but it was factual; the condition was due to the pressure to get men and supplies over.
"Are Ye Downhearted"

Ringland: In Glasgow our ship went up the river which was lined with factories. The women factory hands hung out sheets from the windows and waved and shouted. That I well remember. They shouted, "Are ye downhearted?" We had two regiments on board—the Tenth and the Second, well over two thousand I suppose, lining the rail, and they shouted back, "Hell no!" It really echoed and they waved and waved!

I had another unhappy experience. No one was allowed outside of the railroad yard in Glasgow except the Colonel and myself. He sent me on an errand. I remember coming out of a tobacco shop. Some women had seen me go in apparently, and when I came out, I looked for the proverbial hole to sink into. These women old and young either had someone over in France or had lost someone in France, so they put out a hand and touched me and said "God bless you" and all that. I felt abashed for I had not heard anything much louder than a firecracker on the Fourth of July!

When we had entrained at Glasgow, we went to Southhampton for a few days before crossing the Channel.

"Did They Get Our Goat?"

Ingersoll: Wasn't it Southhampton that there was a barroom fight involving the lumberjacks and the marines?

Ringland: Quite so, and it was all over a goat. I'll have to go back to a review of our regiment before we left American University. We were reviewed by the Secretary of War, Newton Baker. We marched from the University campus and passed in review down the 17th Street side of the old State, War, and Navy Building and that is where Secretary Newton stood and reviewed us. Because I was
Ringland: regimental adjutant, I rode with the colonel and we had behind us a number of dogs and a band and what not. Others were mounted too; we borrowed these horses from Fort Myer. All of us were used to riding in the Forest Service, but riding on asphalt was something else. My horse was a bit skittish with all the noise. I remember the regulation to salute twelve paces before and then hold it twelve paces afterwards. My vision of Newton Baker— I doubt that he was as tall as I was even— was rather sketchy.

Ingersoll: Were the dogs with you as mascots or did they have some other function?

Ringland: No, dogs are like small boys; they followed the troops. We had dogs and cats and a goat. They were with us when we were reviewed and some of them came on the train with us even, and on the ship. Their presence brought a touch of home, perhaps poignantly to some of us. But we had to turn the dogs over to the Scots at Glasgow. We could keep the goat though. Then we went to Southampton. At Southampton one night a marine detachment was camped nearby and they stole the goat from Captain Eldredge's Company C. The next day I knew that something was up over in Eli's company. (We called him Eli.) That night a number from Company C went over and pried the marines apart and brought back the goat. I say pried them apart—you can't beat lumberjacks in a fight, and these were lumberjacks.

Then we had orders to cross the Channel and as we marched down to the docks through the narrow streets of Southampton, a full regiment snaking through the narrow streets, there again were all sorts of people—mostly women—so glad to see us. Every now and then there was a dull roar towards the rear. Colonel Woodruff turned to me and said, "What is that noise?" I said, "I don't know, sir." He said, "Go back and stop it!" So I went back and there was an orderly leading the goat behind Captain Eldredge. Every time they saw a marine on the sidewalk, they would yell, "Did they get our goat?" "Hell no!" The last I saw of that goat was in France. The goat was drunk and so was the cook who had him in his arms.
Early View of Allied Regiments

Ringland: I want to add that we disembarked at Calais. A number of regiments of the Allies were going through to the front. I remember the Australians especially. They were a husky looking outfit. Of course we too--were all outdoor men. The British though showed the effects of malnutrition or something. They did not have the stature at all. Of course, that was no reflection on their ability; they more than amply proved themselves. But the difference was obvious and marked, I think, the drain on man-power and resources after three years of war. Now I understand that the British are providing a free school lunch for half the children in the United Kingdom. It has had a marked effect on their well-being according to Maurice Pate, Director of UNICEF, and an old Hoover associate of mine.

Movement of Regimental Headquarters

Ingersoll: Where did you go from Calais?

Ringland: We left Calais almost immediately and went to Nevers in central France for organization purposes. From there a battalion was sent to the Jura Mountains near the Swiss Border and another one to southeast France, south of Bordeaux to the maritime pine forests.

Ingersoll: Were these the battalions that were under Benedict and Chapman?

Ringland: Yes. Our headquarters for a short time were at Besancon. We moved to Paris, I am speaking now of the regimental headquarters. From there we went to Tours.

Ingersoll: Why did headquarters move that way?
Ringland: Well, I suppose the whole American Expeditionary Force was getting organized in such a manner that it was necessary not to have too much decentralization and the 10th Engineers became a part of the Service of Supply A.E.F.

Ingersoll: Can you think of any problems that came up for the Tenth Regiment headquarters while you were with it?

Ringland: The problems that we had were procedural relating to personnel and requisitions for forest products to be passed on to the various battalions.

Ingersoll: As regimental adjutant, did you have any relationship with French forestry men?

Ringland: We had a French liaison officer with us at headquarters.

Ingersoll: Was he a man who had been in forestry?

Ringland: No, he was a French reserve army officer.

Applications for Combat

When we became well organized, I began to receive personally applications for transfer to combat outfits from some of the regimental officers and men. One application in particular so got under my skin that I was determined to do something about it if it was at all possible. That application was from Hubert Williams. He had been a stroke oar on a victorious Yale crew. He had been a supervisor of a national forest in Idaho or Montana, I have forgotten which, and was a lieutenant in the Tenth Engineers. He was stationed for awhile in Benedict's battalion, but for reasons that I do not recall, he was transferred, believe it or not, to the so-called "Garden Service" where vegetables were raised. I took that letter to Colonel Woodruff. I thought it was an opportune time to tell the Colonel that I too would like to
Ringland: have a transfer. What spurred me was not only the fact that the Tenth was then fully organized, and headquarters work was mostly routine, but also an experience that I had. We were among the early troops in France and at that time a general's car did not sport a flag. I was sent on an inspection, and while motoring down a long French road lined with Lombardy Poplars—a familiar scene—I saw a regiment taking a short rest from its march to the front. As my car approached, some zealous lieutenant called his platoon to attention. I shrunk down in the car so that the captain's bars were not visible and returned the salute. That was one of the things that prompted me to think I ought to join Bert Williams. The Colonel was kind and said he would approve the transfer.

Ingersoll: For both Hubert Williams and you?

Ringland: Yes, and we were sent to Saumur. There was a famous French cavalry school there, where American engineers in training were occupying the barracks under Colonel Black. Colonel Black was a savvy officer and maintained a high morale. I even now can hear reveille because it was done so well, the march around the barracks square with bugles and drums. He believed in dog and the value of a dog. One day Bert and I noticed on the bulletin board a call for volunteers for the first gas regiment, second or first lieutenants. Bert said, "Here is my chance. I am putting in for it." Bert qualified as a first lieutenant. He was sent to the front and he was killed very shortly after he was assigned to the First Gas regiment. He was a fine type and I felt grieved.

Ingersoll: How long was it then that you were in France with the Tenth Engineers?

Ringland: I think it was about eight months. Following a tour in Saumur I was assigned to Gondricourt for further instruction and then to Chaumont, the headquarters of the A.E.F. And on September 30, 1918, I received orders to report to the C.O. of the 112th Engineers, 37th Division, for duty.¹

¹Appendix, Special Orders American Expeditionary Forces, September 30, 1918.
Ringland: The division had just been relieved from the Meuse-Argonne sector and was ordered to the Belgian front. I was assigned as C.O. of Company E of the 112th and took over (the former captain had been wounded) as we entrained for the Ypres area in Flanders.

Ypres-Lys Offensive (October 25 - November 11, 1918)

By the middle of October the great converging offensives of the Allies had made considerable progress. The progress of the Allied offensive east of Ypres, however, had not been so rapid. The Allied commander-in-chief requested that two American divisions be sent to Belgium to give new impetus to the attack. The 37th and 91st Divisions were hurriedly sent from the American front.¹

The British and the French had broken through the trenches in the Ypres area and warfare now was one of movement, a situation that was best adapted to American training and experience. The Germans had started a general withdrawal and the 37th Division followed in pursuit. The terrain we crossed as we went forward to follow the Germans suggested that Dante had lived too soon--shell holes, stagnant pools, rats as big as cats. In the end word went down the line that there was a tree in sight with leaves!

Armistice

Ringland: On the morning of November 11, 1917, at about 7 a.m. a runner from Division Headquarters informed us that a cease-fire had been reached with the Germans. In the distance we heard the whine of the last shell but it was a dud. We were instructed to permit no civilians to pass through our lines. In the course of the morning groups of "chomeurs" (workers) who had been held by the Germans assembled at the river bank waving green boughs and singing in their happiness at the prospect of returning to their homes. We extended what hospitality we could from our rolling kitchen.

Our division participated in a triumphal review in Brussels. To make an impressive showing all men had to be not less than six feet tall. Our company was told to provide nine of this height. I had a board nailed at six feet to assure this, but nevertheless every man insisted on trying to qualify, one wit remarking that Napoleon was a short guy!

After Armistice Day the division slowly marched back to the American Embarkation Center at Le Mans. One day my quarters were in the home of the village priest. He greeted me warmly and invited me to have supper with him. This was a rate treat and change from the fare of the rolling kitchen, and as the evening wore on we were warmed by wine from bottles which the priest had dug up in the church yard and hidden from the Germans. Much to my delight he said "I speak a little English" and he took off his napkin and marched around the table singing, "Twinkle twinkle little star how I wonder what thou art!" I should add that I in turn spoke a little French so we got on beautifully with Burgundy serving as interpreter from time to time.

I asked the priest if the village suffered hardship during the German occupation. He said annoyances rather, such as the requirement for men to lift their caps when meeting an officer two and a half centimeters, as I recall it.
I was relieved from the company and ordered to join the forestry engineers staff attached to the American Peace Commission in Paris. Our part was to appraise the enemy damage to French forests as part of reparations. In the course of the field work in bitter December weather I developed pneumonia and was hospitalized. For convalescence I was sent to the Riviera.

Life was quite pleasant on the Riviera in those early spring months of 1919. It was a leave area for all of the Allies and so gay. At first I was quartered at the deluxe Carleton Hotel in Cannes but at the end of two weeks when I was given a physical check-up I was ordered to Hospital #99 at Hyeres, a small but favorite winter resort on the Riviera near Toulon. I was one of a hundred or more convalescents, wounded and sick, quartered in the great villa of the Empress Eugenie. There I remained until May when I was discharged and ordered home. By happy chance I met an old friend in Paris, Lt. Philip S. Platt. He was enroute to Prague to join Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration Mission to Czechoslovakia. As a result of our meeting my orders home were cancelled and I, too, joined the ARA and was sent to Prague. Save for a hurried trip in 1921 I did not really go home until 1923, and then I was accompanied by a wife, a small son, and a Sealyham terrier! But that is another story.
Ingersoll: How did you become interested in the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation?

Ringland: May I first say something of the origin of the Conference. It was due to President Coolidge's interest in outdoor recreation as a needful factor in American life. He asked members of his cabinet--Secretaries Weeks of War, Work of Interior, Wallace of Agriculture, Davis of Labor, Hoover of Commerce, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Franklin Roosevelt--to form a committee and suggest to him how a National policy could be formulated and put into action. The committee endorsed the President's view that Federal leadership was desirable and recommended that a conference of interested organizations be called. The President concurred and 128 organizations represented by 309 delegates met in Washington May 22, 23, and 24, 1924. The cabinet committee became an integral part of the organization of the conference.¹

I succeeded Leon Kneipp as Executive Secretary. He served the first and formative year of organization and then returned to the U.S. Forest Service where too I had served and knew him well as an outstanding official who later became Assistant Forester of the Service. I served the succeeding three years of the conference work from 1925 to its liquidation in 1928 and, as a member of the Yellowstone National Park Boundary Commission in 1929, as an extension of the conference.

I had completed my service in Europe under Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration and, in early 1924, was enjoying a loaf with my wife, Dorothy, at my old home in Montclair, New Jersey, and later in California where we visited Dorothy's

¹Memorandum, extract of Nov. 20, 1943, from the National Archives, President Coolidge's statement of April 14, 1924, and Organization of Conference.
people. They had not seen her since she went overseas in 1916, before our entry into the war to serve with the American Fund for French Wounded organized by Anne Morgan. We had just come back from Paris, where our son was born in the American hospital at Neuilly.

It brings to mind a little bit of family history. That was in December of 1923 when we had come from Constantinople to Paris. There was some question as to whether our son was to be delivered in Cairo in a good hospital there or at the American hospital in Paris; so we went to Paris.

Not quite 21 years later, Peter, our son, was in Paris. He was one of a combat intelligence unit of our army. His unit had driven into Paris soon after the retreat of the Germans from the city. Under our treaty with the French, the French could claim for service anyone born in France even though we had registered Peter in the American Consulate in Paris. As Peter told me, he saw notices that his French-age class was due to be called to the colors. He immediately went to the mairie in Neuilly, a suburb of Paris, in order to avoid any embarrassment. There was no difficulty. The officials looked up the register and said that he fell within the call, but the fact that he stood there in an American army uniform exempted him from French service. Everything passed off in an amicable manner and, as a token of good will, Peter left a carton of cigarettes.

To go back, while I was in California, I had a telegram from Lee Kneipp asking me if I was interested in succeeding him as executive secretary of the Conference, because he was on loan from the United States Forest Service and wished to return to his organization. I was interested. The upshot of it was that two officials of the conference interviewed me, Dr. Vernon Kellogg, Director of the National Research Council and Charles Sheldon of the Explorers Club. The result was I was appointed and took over the work at the beginning of the new year of 1925.1

1Appointment as Secretary, see Appendix.
It was a rewarding experience because I recognized that the type of men that I was associated with as officers of the conference were the most distinguished in their respective fields. There was Chauncey Hamlin, Chairman of the Conference and President of the American Association of Museums; Dr. John C. Merrian, Vice Chairman, President of the Carnegie Institute; Dr. Vernon Kellogg, Vice Chairman, head of the National Research Council; George Bird Grinnell, Honorary Vice Chairman; Franklin Roosevelt, Honorary Vice Chairman, Assistant Secretary of the Navy; George Shiras 3rd, Treasurer; and myself as Secretary.

On the executive committee as officers ex officio, there were John Barton Payne, the President of the American Red Cross, and Mrs. Herbert Hoover, President of the Girl Scouts. There should also be noted: Charles Sheldon of the Boone and Crockett Club; George Scott of the Isaac Walton League; Gustavus T. Kirby, National Amateur Athleticos Association; William A. Welch, Palisades Interstate Park; Tom Wallace, Louisville Times; Barrington Moore, Council on National Parks, Forests, and Wildlife; Henry S. Graves, Yale University; T. Gilbert Pearson, National Association of Audubon Societies; Mrs. John Dickinson Sherman, League of Women Voters; Dr. Henry Ward, University of Illinois; R. L. Glisan, Portland Oregon Bar; William F. Bade and Frank R. Oastler, M.D. I have already mentioned the names of the cabinet members; and I shall refer to others in the development of the work of the Conference.

Did these well-known figures, including the cabinet members, simply lend their names to support the effort or did they contribute ideas?

I think that was the remarkable thing about them. All of these men and women were very active as heads of various institutions, but of a character that lent their interest to the objectives of the Conference, which were set forth clearly by President Coolidge, who opened the Conference in May of 1924, on the value of outdoor recreation in our social and
Ringland: economic life, and the need to develop a national policy to motivate it. This was reflected in the many addresses, remarks, and minutes of the Conference proceedings.¹

Organization

I only spoke of the officers. There were behind them the leaders of the 128 national organizations, that ran the scale from the Playground Association of America, interested in city recreation, to the Boone and Crockett Club and the Explorers Club interested in wild life. You dealt with all kinds of municipal, state, county and national organizations from those on the city playground to big game hunters. The collective influence of the constituent members was directed toward the broad social conception of adequate recognition of outdoor recreation as needful for the bodily, mental and spiritual welfare of all the people.

Ingersoll: The organization was in terms of committees, wasn't it?

Ringland: Well, now, I think the great strength of the Conference—and I have not seen anything quite comparable to the way it was organized—was the part that the officers—Executive Committee—and Lee Kneipp worked out in the first year when he was the executive secretary. It was my job to carry forward something that had already been set up with a strong framework. We had the Cabinet Committee appointed by the President—Coolidge—in the first instance as I have already mentioned; and, as vacancies occurred, President Hoover carried it on. These members of the President's

Ringland: Committee were not, as so many committees are set up, simply happy to have the name of somebody in the Cabinet. These were active, working officials, as the published records clearly give evidence. The Cabinet committee was the mainspring of the Conference because it emphasized there had to be an organized and active body to carry forward the philosophy expressed by President Coolidge. So the Conference was initiated with the officers whom I spoke of, making up a strong executive committee.

Ingersoll: Were the "officers" and the "executive committee" the same or different?

Ringland: Structurally they were different groups, but actually they were the same people.

Behind the executive committee there was an auxiliary, departmental committee representative of the Federal agencies concerned with outdoor activities, a general council. The members were all leaders of the period.

The executive committee outlined a four-year program—a series of projects which seemed pertinent and necessary for development. The principal ones were surveys of the recreation resources of the city, county, state, as political units, and of the public domain, including the national parks and forests. These surveys were supported by grants from the foundations, such as the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation, and it should be noted, in very modest sums. I think the total of all those surveys—some ten in number—when completed, cost far less than $100,000 because of the voluntary assistance from the membership of the Conference.

This four-year program within the funds and the facilities made available was completed. Major projects included:

Surveys of municipal and county parks (published);
Park Recreation Areas in the United States (published);
Survey of State Parks and Recreation Uses in the United States (published);
Survey of Recreational Resources of Federal Lands (published);
Ringland: Survey of Contribution of Natural History Museums to Outdoor Recreation (published); Survey of Outdoor Recreation for Industrial Employees (published); Study of Training Courses for Recreation Leaders (Compiled); Study of Conservation of the Elk of Jackson Hole Wyoming (published); Survey of National Park and Forest Boundary Adjustments (published); Report of Grazing on the Public Domain (compiled); Report on the Relation of the State to Recreation (compiled);

Initiation of legislation for the acquisition by states, counties, and municipalities of public lands for recreation and park purposes. (Passed by Congress June 14, 1926) And subsequently the application of the Act to the Oregon and California Wagon Road Grant Lands in Oregon.

Other projects include support of numerous legislative measures before Congress of particular interest to various member organizations of the Conference--notably, the Migratory Bird Refuse Bill, the Woodruff-McNary Bill for forest acquisition, and the McSweeney Bill for forest and biological research. Several publications have been issued of educational value, particularly the proceedings of the First and Second Conferences, and a report epitomizing the results of major fact-finding surveys of the Conference. These have been published as Senate Documents Nos. 151, 229, 117, and 158.

The execution of each of those projects was in the hands of experts and select committees. Each committee was composed of representatives of organizations that had a direct relationship and a knowledgeable interest in that particular project. This pattern of project organization was the strength of the Conference. I should like to emphasize this by citing a typical example.

The survey on State Parks and Recreational Areas of State Forests in the United States was one of several parallel studies in the fields of conservation and outdoor recreation. It was committed to the National Conference on State Parks by one conference and financed by a grant from the Laura
Ringland: Spellman Rockefeller Memorial. The Project Committee charged with the survey was chaired by John Barton Payne, former Secretary of the Interior and head of the American Red Cross; and the members included: Stephen T. Mather, Director of the National Park Service; James T. Greenleaf, President, American Society of Landscape Architects; Ransom Kennicott, Forester, Forest Preserve of Cook County, Illinois; John Oliver La Groce, Vice-President, National Geographic Society; Wilbur A. Nelson, State Geologist, Virginia; Albert M. Turner, State Park and Forest Commission, Connecticut; Major W. A. Welch, General Manager, Palisades Interstate Park, New York; Theodore Wirth, American Institute of Park Executives, Minnesota; Beatrice M. Ward, Secretary; and Raymond H. Torrey, Field Secretary, National Conference on State Parks.

The survey was completed in 1926 and published. It constitutes the first collection of data, covering the entire country, including the extent, nature, recreational facilities, administration and present service of all state parks and forests, and the funds and lands available or in prospect for additional parks and forests.

I have emphasized that the strength of the Conference work was through its project committees. Sometimes a committee was proposed which did not meet with approval of the Executive Committee. Once Dr. Merriam expressed his disapproval of a proposal for another committee by citing the experience of a missionary who was trying to explain the Trinity to a heathen Chinese. Again and again the missionary counted on his fingers and repeated, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Finally, a broad smile spread across the face of his listener who exclaimed, "Ah, the American Committee!"
Projects: Forerunners of Today's Concerns

Ingersoll: Mr. Ringland, what issues that are being discussed today were taken up during those years when the National Conference on Recreation was functioning, both as a group meeting in 1924 and again in 1926 and as a continually working series of projects?

Ringland: Some of these projects were the forerunners in their field and projected as pioneer efforts.

Recreational Value of Waterways - (Aquatic Pollution)

For example, pollution is in the minds of everyone today; but more than forty years ago, there was a project with leaders, such as Dr. Henry Ward of the University of Illinois, trying to do something about it. As Lee Kneipp said in his report to the Conference, the pollution and drainage of our waterways has attained the proportions of a double-barreled menace not only to natural beauty, to wild life, and to wholesome recreation, but to public health and prosperity as well.

Herbert Hoover was interested in the problems of river and stream pollution. Incidentally, members of the old Hoover group were recently asked to write down their memories of Hoover for the American Relief Administration Review. I wrote what Mr. Hoover said before one of the meetings of the first National Conference on Outdoor Recreation when he proposed to classify the rivers of the country in terms of the degree of pollution and to determine the action necessary. I said, "We all know what an ardent fisherman Mr. Hoover was, but not too many people know that he was a conservationist. His philosophy, as he said one time was 'all men are equal before fishes'." This field of pollution which is now so important is reflected in current legislation such as the Water Quality Act of 1965.
Recreational Value of Highways

Ingersoll: Now people think of pollution as a new problem.

Ringland: Yes, for example, too, there was a conference project on the recreational value of highways undertaken by the United States Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Public Roads and the Highway Departments of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. The Project Committee was represented by the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, the American Automobile Association, the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety, and the American Forestry Association.

In its study, the Committee considered the increased amount of traffic due to the automobile, that rural areas were consequently suffering from lack of classification or regulation. Highway classification, like city zoning, it was pointed out, would stabilize rural property values and preserve or develop the aesthetic values of the roadside through tree planting, regulation of advertising, and the like. The observed results of its work were projected as a basis for a national policy in the development of the recreational use of highways, and for the attention of highway authorities in all states.

National Roadside Committee

I am speaking of this particular project because of its bearing, through later years, on the work of the National Roadside Committee 1957-1964 on which I was privileged to serve as a director with the able chairman, Mrs. Vance Hood and Richard Westwood, the extraordinarily effective secretary. The Committee’s work on the Hill was directed to the need for the control of advertising on the Federal highways.
Ringland: Not only that but one committee envisaged the highways as affording appreciation of natural beauty, an education in conservation--sites for demonstration of forestry, and wild life sanctuary--as well as the enjoyment of recreational facilities. Highways under this concept would serve to bring to travelers an understanding of the relation of conservation in its wider aspects and its place in the national economy. Perhaps building on the Highway Beautification Act of 1965 this understanding can be achieved.

Ingersoll: Is there anything else that you can think of that is a current, present-day problem which was already attacked by the committees?

Ringland: About two or three years ago, a commission was set up by the Interior Department with a panel of advisors, which led to legislation in Congress for the establishment of an outdoor recreation bureau. It is now functioning in the Department of the Interior--a most useful and forward step. One may reflect on the fact that, over forty years ago that whole field was canvassed, and projected as a national necessity, even then when the pressures of population and other factors were not so apparent as they are today. But the underlying principles as brought out by the proceedings of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation have not changed though they are harder to apply despite an informed public.

Ingersoll: Do you know whether the work that was done by the original Conference committees was ever used by later people tackling the problems?

Ringland: I would like to think so, because the principle surveys and projects were completed and published as Senate documents or otherwise. I want to refer to this in detail when action was taken on my recommendation to liquidate the Conference in 1929. It's conceivable that they might be of some interest to someone for further reference, since they were prepared by recognized authorities. They are, presumably, available in certain libraries, and are in the National Archives as part of the records of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation 1924-1929.
Coordination of Federal Land Policies in Relation to Recreation

Ingersoll: In the outline of projects, I notice that the project entitled Coordination of Federal Land Policies in Relation to Recreation was one with which you were closely associated. Was this the project that was carried through by the Coordinating Commission on National Parks and National Forests?

Ringland: Yes, it was.

Ingersoll: Donald Swain writes that President Coolidge was worried by the controversy between the Park Service and the Forest Service concerning the expansion of national parks and for this reason convened the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation in May of 1924.1 Do you think that this controversy was really the moving reason for the Conference?

Ringland: No, I do not, although I was not in Washington at the time. Since I had only recently returned from abroad and was on the West Coast, I was out of touch, but when I later became executive secretary of the Conference, succeeding Lee Kneipp, and became quite familiar with the members of the executive committee and officers of the various agencies we were cooperating with, I feel I can say the genesis of the Conference was the outgrowth of the interest in outdoor recreation of the members of the Explorers Club, and the Boone and Crockett Club: Charles Sheldon, George Grinnell, George Shiras, and Franklin Roosevelt, for example. And from their initiative was generated the concept of recreation as a national policy. One should consider the broad charter of the Conference "to develop and promote recreation in which the land, water, forest, plant, scenic, or wild life resources of the United States are essential." In fact

Ringland: recreation as a national policy as developed by the Conference embraced the scale from city playgrounds to wilderness areas.

Ingersoll: Did you get any feeling, at the time you came into the picture, of this controversy between the Park Service and the Forest Service?

Ringland: I don't think controversy is quite the word. There was the problem of the relation of the national parks and forests of the two agencies where the boundaries were coterminous. It must be remembered that the national forests and the national parks were not created concurrently. The national forests were generally set up before the creation of the national park system--I refer to the organic act of 1916--although the Yellowstone and the Yosemite had already been established years before, so circumstances at times dictated the establishment of arbitrary division lines. But the problem of coterminous boundaries was a problem of administration because it was inevitable that certain areas might better be in a park or in a forest, as the case might be.

Coordinating Commission on National Parks and National Forests

In recognition of this problem, the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation requested President Hoover's Cabinet Committee on Outdoor Recreation to undertake a study of the problem. On February 10, 1925 the President's Committee formally appointed a commission, which included the heads of the Forest Service and the National Parks Service, to investigate and report to the President's Committee on all projects under consideration by the Department of Interior and Agriculture dealing with the proposed enlargements or adjustments of national parks or national forests which involved the interests of
Ingersoll: Swain also says that the Coordinating Committee was generally friendly to the Parks' expansion program. Could you comment on this at all?

Ringland: Well, friendly in this sense that where they recognized outstanding scenic values of a character that were so predominant in relation to economic resources, the Commission proposed such areas for administration by the Park Service. An example of that is the Tetons in Wyoming, which were in a national forest, and the Commission recommended and it became the Teton National Park by act of Congress.

Ingersoll: Do you feel there was any reason why they should have been more friendly to the Park Service than to the Forest Service?

Ringland: No, I don't. No, I think that the Commission, by its very make-up, was one of well-balanced personnel. And since I served with it from beginning to end, I had no such feeling at all.

Ingersoll: Now, another writer tells that there was Forest Service propaganda during this period, and the Forest Service used their far-flung organization to generate grass roots support for the administration of more territory. Do you feel that this influenced the Commission in any way?

Ringland: Not at all! Now let me give another example of the Commission's recommendations which were concluded by action. And that was the effort by the Arkansas delegation in Congress to create the Mena National Park from Ouachita National Forest in Arkansas. I was familiar with this area because at one time it was under the administration of the Southwestern Region of the Forest Service. And I remember talking with Dr. Merriam of the National Conference in reference to the question

---

Ringland: Boswell asked of Dr. Johnson. He asked if the Giant's Causeway was worth seeing. And the Doctor replied, "Yes, worth seeing, but not worth going to see." I have always felt that that was the best criterion to measure national park values. It fitted the Arkansas case very well. The Ouachita National Forest did include beautiful mountains, but not of a character that visitors would go, as they do, from one end of the country to the other to visit the Grand Canyon, the Yellowstone, the Yosemite, and the Tetons National Parks. Well, the net result was that the park was not created.

Ingersoll: Would you give us some feeling for just how the Commission operated, in the field and perhaps in Washington also?

Ringland: You must consider the make-up of the Commission and its consultants. The chairman was Congressman H. W. Temple of Pennsylvania, a scholarly man, keenly interested in the outdoors and its ways for public service. There was Stephen Mather, the first head and founder of the Park Service, and Bill Greeley, the head of the Forest Service. We had Colonel B.F. Cheatham who represented the Secretary of War, Davis of the President's Cabinet Committee on Outdoor Recreation. And he, Davis, was an internationally known sportsman, of Davis Cup fame, you know; C.A. Ramsdell representing Frederick Olmsted, famous landscape architect; Huston Thompson, head of the Interstate Commerce Commission; Charles Sheldon of the Boone and Crockett Club; W.A. Welsh of the National Conference on State Parks; Barrington Moore of the Council on National Parks, Forests and Wildlife; and Duncan McDuffie of the Sierra Club.

The Commission was an outdoor outfit. They sat around campfires after a good day's examination in the field riding or hiking over the areas in question.

Ingersoll: These men themselves went out to the areas that needed to be examined?

Ringland: Oh, absolutely. Oh, yes. It was a field examination in every sense, with pack outfits or whatever means was necessary to examine the areas. I must
Ringland: say it was a most enjoyable type of work along with its seriousness. Each evening around the campfire, or wherever we gathered, there would be an exchange of views on the observations of the day.

And it is important to note that the field examinations were supplemented by public hearings at points related to the areas in question: at Jackson, Wyoming; V.T. Park within the Kaibab National Forest, Arizona; at the Grand Canyon, Arizona; at Alberquerque and Santa Fe, New Mexico; Denver, Colorado; San Francisco, California; Diamond Lake and Medford, Oregon. Congressman Charles E. Winter of Wyoming, Congressman Carl Hayden (later Senator) of Arizona, and Congressman John Morrow of New Mexico accompanied the Commission in the field on certain projects and attended the related public hearings.

In the end, when the field work was completed, it fell to my lot to bring the notes, maps, and other data together in Washington. These would be carefully examined by the Commission and a report written for final action and recommendation to Secretary of War Davis as Secretary of the President's Cabinet Committee on Outdoor Recreation for action by Congress.

Ingersoll: In these campfire discussions, Mr. Ringland, do you feel that Stephen Mather was mainly upholding the interests of the Park Service and Greeley, probably quite naturally, tried to extend the domain of the Forest Service?

Ringland: Well, here's my feeling, and it's a conviction, really. These men had a grave responsibility to meet the objectives of their own particular service. But, the bridge between the two was what was best in the public interest. In that sense, as I look back and consider the talks, they met differences in a broad-minded manner, as you would expect of public servants of their stature.

Ingersoll: Were you involved during that period in the agreements about boundaries for Yellowstone, Yosemite, Sequoia, Crater Lake, or Mt. Rainier?
An important piece of field work was the examination of the Teton National Forest and its relation to the Yellowstone National Park, I spoke of this previously I believe. As an outcome, it was determined that the scenic values of the Grand Teton Range were of such a character that they were predominant, far exceeding any economic considerations. Approximately 100,000 acres of this Range were recommended as an addition to the Yellowstone National Park and as a separate unit. This was approved by Congress.

Was there any controversy or difference of opinion in this particular case, do you think?

Oh, no. That was so clear, so clear. And everyone that sees the Tetons must be impressed. The east front with its foothill lakes affords one of the superb scenic spectacles of the United States.

Had there been any controversy about it before the Commission went into the field, do you think?

No. The only controversy, if you can call it that, was with reference to the interests of the Jackson Hole community. And that was related also to the elk herds. Another story. However, I would like to draw attention to a letter I wrote which was published in the Herald Tribune, February 17, 1929, on the adjustment of the coterminous boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and the Targhee, Teton, Shoshone, Beartooth, Absaroka, Gallatin, and Madison National Forests. This letter sets forth in detail the problem that confronted the Coordinating Committee, and the principles which dictated its action. It was written to answer the published adverse comment of Mr. Williard Von Name of New York.¹

At the outset the Coordinating Committee on National Parks and National Forests agreed that the Park Service and the Forest Service had a common interest in additions to eight national parks

Ringland: and seven proposed national parks. It completed its program in 1925 and 1926, save for certain adjustments relating to the Yellowstone National Park which were later referred to the Yellowstone Park Boundary Commission in 1929.

The projects of the Commission were concluded by Acts of Congress, or settled by agreement between the Park Service and the Forest Service with no need for further reference to the Commission. It is significant to note that unanimity was reached in all cases except for a partial change in the boundaries of one part of the Yosemite National Park. I am placing in the appendix the Majority and the Minority reports in this case to show the meticulous care taken to reach a conclusion. By vote of the Commission, I was, as Secretary, permitted to record an opinion. I supported the minority of two—W.B. Greeley, Chief of the Forest Service, and Barrington Moore, Council of National Parks, Forests, and Wildlife as opposed to the majority of three—Congressman H.W. Temple, Chairman of the Commission; Stephen T. Mather, Director of the Park Service; and Duncan McDuffie of the Sierra Club. It is of interest to note that all three—Greeley, Moore, and Ringland—were graduates of the Yale Forest School.¹,²

The field work of the Coordinating Committee on National Parks and Forests, during the seasons of 1925 and 1926 was, shall I say without old school tie significance, in response to the resolution of February, 1925 of the President's Committee on Outdoor Recreation.³⁴ The work of the Commission may be recorded as of historical significance. The Commission's investigations developed fundamental principles which serve even today in the administration of the National Parks and Forests.

¹Proposed additions to the Yosemite National Park - Report of the Majority.
²Proposed additions to the Yosemite National Park - Report of the Minority.
⁴Field Report of July 1, 1927.
While the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation was considered officially closed July 1, 1929, there remained to be concluded certain adjustments relating to the Yellowstone National Park. In consequence, upon the request of the Conference, President Hoover appointed the Yellowstone National Park Boundary Commission, pursuant to the authority of S. J. Res. 206-70th Congress, January 31, 1929.

What was involved was an interchange in Federal administration and management of relatively small areas of land within the surrounding national forests and the Park to permit the highest utilization of these resources—economic in the case of the forests and spiritual in the case of the Park and the reestablishment of boundaries following natural features of the topography. In principle, this was the same problem that confronted the Coordinating Commission on National Parks and National Forests.

E.E. Brownell, a prominent conservationist and sportsman of California, served as Chairman. The other members were Arthur Morgan of TVA fame, Gilbert Pearson, President of the Audubon Society, C.A. Ramsdell of the American Institute of Landscape Architects, and I represented the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation. Congressman Winter of Wyoming, Superintendent Horace Albright of the Yellowstone National Park, and Ovid Butler of the American Forestry Association participated.

Congressman Winter was helpful from a public relations standpoint, and as a wit around the campfire he was brilliant. One evening, I think it was Dr. Morgan, who raised the question of ethics in a certain case. Congressman Winter resolved the doubt. He told us of a high school boy who was doing his homework one evening while helping in his father's clothing store. He said to his father, "What is ethics?" "My son," said the father, "you saw that sailor leave with a pair of five dollar pants over his arm. Well, when I went to the cash register I found I had two five dollar bills stuck together. Now, here is ethics. Shall I tell my partner?"
Ringland: Horace Albright later became Stephen Mather's deputy and subsequently succeeded him as Director of the National Park Service. His intimate knowledge of the Park and the surrounding Forests was indispensable, and as well his service as a member of the Commission on the Conservation of the elk of Jackson Hole.

Ovid Butler, the distinguished editor of American Forests, and a member of several project committees of the National Conference on Recreation, brought to bear his ripe experience as a senior field officer of the U.S. Forest Service.

The Yellowstone Boundary Commission completed its field work in the summer of 1929 and its report was published as House Document 710, 71st Congress, 3rd S. Washington 1931. Final action by Congress established the boundaries of the Yellowstone National Park and the adjoining national forests.

Permanent Preservation of the Yellowstone Park Elk Herds

Ingersoll: Knowing your interest in elk, I cut an article out of the Washington Post. It reads:

The shooting of excess elk continued in the Yellowstone National Park despite protests in Congress. Sen. Cliff Hansen (R-Wyo) introduced a resolution to halt the shooting and his Democratic counterpart, Sen. Gale W. McGee, accused the National Park Service of backtracking on promises made four years ago to keep the herd at 5000 by trapping and transplanting. 'It's obvious someone goofed and we intend to find out who,' McGee said.

I notice that a project of the Conference concerned the Yellowstone elk. What were the issues involved when these projects were determined?

The preservation of the elk—I'm referring to the elk of what we might term the Jackson Hole country—was a major project of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation. It was considered so serious that the Commission on the Conservation of the Jackson Hole Elk was formally established, under the auspices of the Conference, to make a field investigation and appropriate recommendations. The membership included officials of the U.S. Biological Survey, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, representatives of the Governor of Wyoming, ranchers of Jackson, Wyoming, and of the Izaak Walton League, Camp Fire Club, American Game Protective Association, the American Society of Mammalogists and the Conference on Outdoor Recreation.

The reason behind all of that was simply that the life cycle of the elk had been disrupted by the settlement in the winter range, the plains, the fencing out, ranches, and whatnot. So when the elk came off the summer range, which was largely in the Yellowstone National Park, they drifted down, as winter approached, to the plains below, where there was not enough natural forage for them. So starvation ensued. Winter feeding of hay did not solve the problem though in disastrous seasons as many as 10,000 head were saved from starvation by appropriations of the state of Wyoming and the Federal government.

I served on that Commission, and our objective was to establish an optimum number of elk that could live a more or less natural life cycle—summer range to winter range, back to summer range. And we finally worked out an optimal number at about 20,000 head. We recognized that there would be a surplus, but that surplus should be met—to a certain extent it could be—by the shipment of elk to ranges elsewhere in the country, or by humane shooting under very rigid regulation. That in a few words was the conclusion of our Commission's findings which were published in a report to Dwight F. Davis, the Secretary of War, Chairman of the President's Committee on Outdoor Recreation, and Frank C. Emerson, the Governor of Wyoming, which
Ringland: is available in the Archives.¹ I think its findings for those days have some merit for consideration even today. However, at that time we did have to contend with certain very sentimental persons who couldn't contemplate the idea of regulated shooting of any of the elk to prevent starvation, despite the evidence we had--photographic and otherwise.

Ingersoll: Evidence that this was a necessary thing to save them from a far worse plight, then, is that it?

Ringland: Yes.

*Leisure Time Study*

Ingersoll: We talk about people's potential leisure time these days. Was this problem ever considered as a project for the consideration of a committee of the Conference?

Ringland: There'd been a number of studies of recreation made by the National Conference in the use of facilities in city playgrounds, county parks, state parks and forests, federal and national parks and forests, and means of promoting their use. And that gave thought to the most profitable use of leisure time. The hours of labor were becoming less and income greater in the late twenties.

I now must refer to a personal part. I was out in the Yellowstone country in 1929; that was when I was a member of the Yellowstone National Park Boundary Commission, which President Hoover had set up pursuant to S.J. Res. 206 - 70th Congress

Ringland: January 31, 1929. And while out in the field I was finally reached by a ranger who said there was a call for me from the White House. So I went with him, finally, to one of the stations where there was a telephone. And it was Mr. Strother, assistant to the President, and whom I knew, who said the President wanted an estimate for a study of leisure time and he wanted it as soon as possible, he wanted it even if I could give an upset statement over the telephone. Well, that made me . . . well, you can realize, I hadn't paid any particular attention to that phase of it, other than recognizing the value of such a thing. So I came up, over the telephone, and suggested that we should have about $25,000 to launch it. Mr. Strother said, "Well, we can develop that further when you come on in, into Washington." When I had returned, Strother met me and he said with a wry smile, "The President said to me, 'You tell Arthur to raise his sights! To about $250,000.'" That was in September.

Ingersoll: September of 1929 was it?

Ringland: 1929, yes.

Ingersoll: You really envisaged, probably, a very wide-scale thing, didn't you?

Ringland: Yes, but as you know, unhappily, the Wall Street Crash came in late October the 28th, 1929. And so the last thing one could think of was leisure time.

Ingersoll: How ironic. Really, people had a good deal of leisure time then, as they were unemployed, but not of the sort of thing one goes out to make a study about.

Ringland: But I think this is an example of Herbert Hoover's fertile mind, that he saw the value of this. And most assuredly something might have developed from it if this Crash—which had its origin, I think in Vienna—hadn't occurred.

---

Liquidation of the Conference

Ingersoll: What was the reason for liquidating?

Ringland: At this point it is desirable to refer to the minutes of the meeting of the executive committee of the Conference of May 8, 1929, attended by Mr. Hamlin, the chairman; Dr. Merriam; Dr. Kellogg; Dr. Ward; and Mr. Moore. At this meeting, the secretary—that is myself—presented a statement on the status of the Conference. I should like to include it in the appendix for it is a summary of the whole work.¹

This statement was adopted by the executive committee. The chair appointed a committee on liquidation to obtain authorization from the general council of the Conference and to proceed to liquidate the affairs. He appointed Mr. Barrington Moore, himself, and myself as the members.

On May 19, 1928, I wrote Mr. Hamlin and referred to the plan to publish a report which would epitomize the major fact finding surveys and projects which were undertaken by the Conference in response to the initial program adopted at the first assembly in 1924. This report was published as a Senate Document and it is included in the records of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation in the National Archives.

In view of the attainment by the Conference of its principal objectives, I said that my active services would not be justified, but I would continue on a voluntary basis and our office in the Navy Department would be kept open.

Mr. Hamlin gave his approval in a letter of May 25 and asked that our correspondence be sent to the members of the executive committee, seeking their concurrence. Letters of the committee’s

¹Minutes of the May 8, 1929, Executive Committee meeting. See Appendix.
Ringland: approval followed.¹

I also arranged for final disposition of the Conference files in the National Archives.²

Follow-up Action Proposed

Ingersoll: Were there any further developments after the agreement on liquidation of the Conference on Outdoor Recreation?

Ringland: Yes. At the conclusion of the statement I made on the reasons why the Conference could appropriately be liquidated and its acceptance by the executive committee, I submitted to the committee at the meeting of May 8, a supplementary statement to the effect that, since the Conference had been launched under the auspices of President Coolidge and since the President had set up within his Cabinet a special committee to further the program of the Conference, it was appropriate—if not an obligation—to suggest to President Hoover the desirability of follow-up action based upon our experience. "It is proposed," as I said at that time, "that the President establish, by Executive order, a joint board on Federal land planning."

Ingersoll: When you say "joint board," what would "joint" refer to?

Ringland: "Joint board" would mean one that would bring into its functioning primarily the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce. It was emphasized that basically the problem of Federal land administration demanded, in the field a

¹Letters confirming plans to terminate activities of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation. See Appendix.

²Letter to archivist.
coordinated effort of the responsible Federal agencies and the practical application of their rich store of biological and engineering knowledge backed by the findings of the laboratory. These common problems then should be projected into plans for the most appropriate use and disposition.

It was pointed out that on May 21, 1925, President Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, had said in part, "No policy of real guardianship of our natural resources will exist until we put all conservation bureaus in the hands of an Undersecretary for Conservation." Pending consideration of this phase of re-organization, a moot question, the proposed joint board on Federal land planning, it was thought, would serve a most useful purpose to further the necessity, as stated by Mr. Hoover, for a continuous, definite, and consistent policy directed to the intelligent conservation and use of natural resources. As part of this plan for a board, there was submitted a draft of an Executive order. It was well received by the executive committee, and it was proposed that it be presented to President Hoover should it receive the sympathetic support of Secretary Wilbur of Interior. There, apparently, the whole proposal rested, for I do not recall that any further formal steps were taken.

In concluding my recollections of the work of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, I am continually impressed with the value of its pioneer work. President Coolidge, at the initial session in 1924 emphasized the need for "a definite and clearly prescribed national policy" on outdoor recreation. Manifestly, this could not be completed for, by its very character, it was dealing with the continual change inherent in social and economic conditions.

Ultimately, a national policy contemplated National planning so broad in scope that within congested centers of population there would be adequate provision for playgrounds for juveniles, athletic fields, recreation grounds, and parks, boulevards and parkways; and connecting these centers of population tree-lined rural highways flanked by public campgrounds, county and state parks,
forests and game preserves, of easy access for summer and winter recreation. The great mountain ranges, the White Mountains of New England, the Appalachians of the South, the Rockies, the Sierras, and the Cascades of the West, as well as the headwaters of the Mississippi will supplement the State reservations and embrace the great National Forests, National Parks, and National Game Refugees.

In this there appeared to be nothing visionary. In his letter to me of August 20, 1959, (note that this was 30 years later) Mr. Hamlin, who served as Chairman throughout the Conference, wrote, "In the intervening years, a very great deal of what we originally recommended has been adopted. The growth and development of State and County parks throughout the Nation has been phenomenal. The National Park System with its monuments and historic sites has grown apace. Furthermore, the educational impact of these parks and historic sites has been given a tremendous boost through the establishment in them of so many museums."

This development is a recognition that wholesome leisure out of doors represents, as was stated by Herbert Hoover, a fundamental need in American life.

Included in the Appendix is the obituary of Mr. Hamlin who died in 1963. In it reference is made to his service as Chairman of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation and to his many activities in the public interest. He was my Chief for the four years of the Conference, an association I found most rewarding.

---

Ingersoll: I understand that your position as European Forestry Representative for the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture was quite a unique assignment, Mr. Ringland. How did you get into that job?

Ringland: After the liquidation of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation I took the examination to enter the Foreign Service of the Department of Commerce, passed and was appointed commercial attaché to our embassy in Prague. A death in the family compelled me to forego the appointment. Subsequently, and because of my interest in the whole field of natural resources, I was given the opportunity to go overseas as the forestry representative for the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Description of the Job

Headquarters were maintained in the offices of this Service at our embassies in London and Berlin. And my first station was in London, in the summer of 1931. And my first assignment was as representative of the Department of Agriculture to the French Colonial Exposition in Paris. Immediately after in company of a number of European foresters as guests of the French Service des Eaux et Forêt, we motored from Paris to Nice by way of the Alps. A purpose of the trip was to observe the merit of wood gas generated from beech chips which powered a truck which followed us. The journey took about five days with ample opportunity to see and discuss French forestry.
We enjoyed gourmet meals, even at a ranger station; the highlight was a banquet in our honor by the city of Lyons and presided over by the statesman Harriot. Despite the gourmet meals the chief of the Belgian forest service grumbled to me one day, "Toujour les haricots vertes."

Later, I was stationed in Berlin. Funds for the project were provided by the Federal Farm Board, upon the assumption and expectation that an appropriation would be provided by Congress for ensuing years. This project was undertaken with a view to making it a permanent activity of the Foreign Agricultural Service and the work was planned accordingly. The strength of the project rested in the plan to provide for a permanent technical service of information and a direct and continued liaison with the forestry departments of the various European governments. The first task, therefore, was one of exploration, the establishment of necessary contacts with public officials to effect working relations and cooperation and to obtain and develop sources of information of interest and value to meet American needs. The field was so large and the work so varied in subject matter, as outlined by the liaison committee of the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce and as demanded in specific requests for information from numerous American forest agencies, that there was time only for partial investigations. As it was, considerable progress was possible and field inspection made of typical projects in the British Isles, France, Switzerland, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Danzig Free State, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium.1,2

The work was severely handicapped, and sometimes hamstrung, through lack of authority to secure any direct assistance for necessary translations of correspondence and technical material

---

1 Letter of October 9, 1931, from Arthur Ringland to F.W. Reed, secretary of American Foresters. See Appendix.

2 Index to articles on European Forestry by Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.
developments in European forestry

Ingersoll: What were some of the most important current developments in forestry in each of the countries you viewed, Mr. Ringland?

Ringland: It should be realized that the wide variations in the physical or biological aspects of European forestry and the diverse economic and social influences operating within twenty-eight different political entities continually presented multiform problems, demanding new methods of attack and solution. For example, in Germany prices were influenced in part by Russian competition. And they dropped to a point where there was no longer a margin of profit. Standing timber was a frozen asset—I say frozen, I mean at the time of which I'm speaking. And thinnings, replanting, and other cultural operations could not be profitably carried out. However there was a keen competition in the use of wood substitutes. To combat these conditions, Germany was mobilizing every force of research, designed to lower costs of production and
stimulate increased consumption through devising new uses of wood. At Eberswalde a special laboratory was organized with the support of the forest industry to carry on the work, and special studies were underway at laboratories at Stuttgart, Munich, and elsewhere. In East Prussia, the German government undertook a land use study, and the Reich appropriated over sixty million dollars for the stabilization of forestry and agriculture in this province. These conditions may be said to be comparable, from an economic standpoint, with those in the Lake states.

In Sweden and Finland a survey, an inventory, of the forest resources of these countries had recently been completed which would dictate new measures in the stabilization of the forest economy, which means so much in their exports. In Switzerland, precise experiments on the relation of forests to soil conservation and stream flow had been in progress for more than thirty years. I remember I wrote an article on that. I think it's listed in the list there. I think you can find it.

Ingersoll: That was "The Partnership of Wood and Water"?

Ringland: That's it. In Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, new legislative measures were under way, defining the relation of the state to the private forest industry. In Great Britain, France, Holland, Spain, and Denmark great projects for the forestation of wastelands were in operation. I've written reports, especially relating to Great Britain, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, and Italy.¹

These examples might be continued, for in every country, in the field and in the laboratory or in the legislative hall, there was some problem or project of technical, economic, or political interest in the promotion of forestry; and in the national problems and projects formulated by the economic section of the League of Nations, as well; and also at international conferences at Vienna and Stockholm; and at the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome.

¹Ibid
Ingersoll: Before we leave these close-up looks at what was going on in individual countries, do you have any comment on forestry in Italy under Mussolini?

Ringland: I had the opportunity to make quite a study in Italy of what were termed Bonifica Integraле, literally "integral improvement," but it had specific reference to the improvement of land by various measures. Bonifica Integraле was an enterprise that was presented to Mussolini as something to be worked out, as I recall it, over a period of 75 years, because it involved the whole of Italy and projects that ranged from reforestation in the mountains to the reclamation of land in the plains, including all sorts of public works, dams, irrigation—the whole gamut. As I recall it, Mussolini said, "That's too long. Make it thirty years." And it was on that basis that the plan was launched, the cost to be amortized by the expenditure of postal savings, I think it was—postal, or other forms of insurance. I'd like to check that, but that was my impression. I had the opportunity to investigate some of these projects.

I'm thinking now of one on the site of the ancient Greek city of Sybaris. There, when I was with my friendly Italian colleagues, I saw the excavations—old structures there, Greek columns and whatnot. But the project as a whole was one to capture not only imagination but admiration, for it involved the control of the flood waters of the Crati River, site of Sybaris, and the regulation of grazing on the mountain side and reforestation. And, on the plains where malaria had developed—in fact, it was because of malaria that the ancient settlement was abandoned—the Anopheles mosquito, the villain, was losing out, because the larvae was being eaten by the importation of American trout. Model farm villages were being erected there, on the recovered lands. And so the whole watershed of the Crati River was a working example of what could be done through a concerted effort. You know our expression of "sybarites"? Of course, it came from the luxury of living in the old city. One of the fables was that a prominent citizen complained because there was a wrinkled rose leaf in his bed. The Sybaris project was one example of what was underway under this Bonifica Integrałe.
Then I saw an interesting piece of reforestation on the outskirts of the old city of Assisi. Mt. Subasio is almost on the edge of the city, a mountain that has been grazed over and cut over and the land variously abused for centuries, and it was under process of reforestation. And that was because the city fathers wanted to commemorate, I think it was the six hundredth anniversary of St. Francis, who was born in Assisi. Their plan was to put up a conventional monument. But Mussolini said, "No. If you want to commemorate the saint, who loved nature, animals, and birds, go and reforest Mt. Subasio." And that is what they were doing there. The technique was interesting because some of the slopes were quite precipitous. In such cases they built, following an ancient agricultural practice, broad steps, about a meter in width, and not too far apart, following the contour of the slope. These curbed even heavy torrential rains. The plantings of the seedlings completed the initial control.

It was a dramatic sight to see the vastness of the enterprise and undertaken by the unemployed. When I was there the planting was just more or less in the making. But I've been told since there are now mature trees and forests.

Oh, how interesting. There was no question, then, that progress was being made, in these areas at least, under Mussolini. Was there?

Yes. It was Undersecretary Serpieri for Bonifica Integrale, I believe, who said, "You can't measure civilization with a yardstick." Something like that. That was his answer to the expenditures, which, of course, were great.

I had other experiences in that Italian study which brought to my mind these recent floods in Florence, because I'd gone over the watersheds of the Arno River there with my Italian associates. But apparently what was done was not sufficient to prevent a great tragedy. The great war must have curbed reclamation work and its suspension
Ringland: may have contributed to the disaster. Here at home some of our domestic plans may have to be reconsidered in the light of war expenditures.

Ingersoll: I've been impressed, as we've talked about various phases of your life—particularly those that came before World War I, and then later World War II—how many progressive things that were happening on either the American, or the European, domestic scene were snuffed out when a country, either through choice or by being forced to do it, turned toward war measures. It seemed this has happened in a number of cases.

Ringland: Yes. And consider this, that with that great destruction, and despite the tragic loss of lives of millions, we're still now worried about the population pressures, with diminished resources to sustain them.

You spoke of Italy. Do you have in mind the whole of the work I did overseas at that time, or was it Italy in particular?

Ingersoll: I thought about asking you about Italy because you had told me before about your feeling about Italy. Particularly, I think you said, one day when we were talking, that you felt that if Mussolini had only stuck to the sort of program you saw being carried on when you were there, that instead of turning toward war, that he really could have done great things.

Ringland: Yes, of course. I'm thinking now of, let us say, what might have developed between Italy and Yugoslavia—Yugoslavia with its vast raw resources, Italy with its highly developed techniques and technologists and scientists and everything else of expertise. An exchange there would have profited both countries immeasurably. Of course, suppose it had been developed, I'm speaking now—of 1933—suppose that had been developed: would it have all been topped over in 1939?

1 I was given a detailed map of the Arno watershed, and in the course of World War II it was made available, upon request, to our Intelligence people. Happily, in so far as I know, there was no occasion to use it.
Ingersoll: Yes, that's possible, too, I suppose. Who knows.

Projected Work

Ingersoll: Was there any further work projected if this post had been continued?

Ringland: Yes. There was, in several fields. I shall refer later to the suspension of the work, due to a failure to obtain necessary appropriations. Had the work continued, it was the plan to concentrate on the following four general subjects as offering the most fruitful fields of work of value to the Forest Service, the Land Utilization Conference, the United States Timber Conservation Board, and the inquiry initiated in the United States Senate. That was Senator Copeland's resolution. These subjects were: forestry in the solution of land problems; forest influences; private forest practices; and forest surveys, that is, the inventory of resources and control of production.

The Attempt to Continue the Post

Ingersoll: This whole European Forestry Representative job seemed so important, so interesting. Why was it that this post was discontinued, Mr. Ringland? What was involved in all of that?

Ringland: Well, to use one or two words— one word— apparently it was a matter of appropriations, money to support it. Although the official support for its continuance couldn't be better. The whole purpose of having a study made abroad was with the thought we might set up in our Foreign Agricultural Service attachés— foresters, that is, as well as the agriculturalists whom we already had. I was assigned
to undertake a study, and ascertain to what extent the findings might be of continued service not only to our Federal and state services of conservation but also to industry—the lumber industry and all. And I spent some—I suppose about two years, if I remember right, just about two years—and had an opportunity, to establish working relationships with the forest services of the different countries, and with the International Institute at Rome, the fore-runner of FAO.

And that was followed by field trips. And then out of all of that came a constant flow of information to my office. I had the opportunity to see some very interesting work, like the recovery of wastelands in control of encroachment by sand dunes in Denmark; some of the research work that was going on in Germany in wood physics, wood chemistry; I've already spoken of Italy and its protection of watersheds; alpine forest engineering in France, of use of unemployed in Holland in reforestation. Well, I could go on. And the crisis came when my work became so heavy, and the demands of travel, that I needed an assistant to translate and handle some of the correspondence, because my knowledge of French left something to be desired. I could read, slowly, you know, these technical journals but I couldn't dictate. And my German was cafe German. But I had come in contact with a young German who had studied at our University of Syracuse, forestry background, an able young man, whose father was high in the German ministry, who was quite willing to come and help. That was when I moved from my office in London to the embassy in Berlin.

To digress a bit, it didn't work out. His employment would cost about $65 a month, as I recall it, and I couldn't get it.¹

Do you think this was due to depression conditions in this country at that time?

Ringland: Oh, I suppose indirectly. But I wanted to add this about Dr. Trendelenburg, whom I had hoped to get as an assistant. Even though this was washed up I kept in touch with him. One time I visited him at the University of Freiberg. And I say at the university, which isn't quite accurate. We went outside of the university to a rather remote café. The reason was that the Nazi pressure was then commencing to be felt, and he didn't feel he was a free agent on the faculty, at that time. And that atmosphere rapidly developed; I saw the Brown Shirts march into Berlin. Well, I had a different feeling looking at them than when I saw the "kakhi shirts" of Mustapha Kemal Pasha march into Constantinople in 1922. We were glad to see them.

    Well, you asked me about the way the job was snuffed out. It went further than just the denial of an assistant. The appropriation to continue the work failed. I think it involved the formidable sum of $15,000, to carry out that work for another year. But I was gratified that I had the support of Earle Clapp, who was then the Acting Chief Forester; and his associate Bay Marsh, with it too Acting Secretary of Agriculture Rex Tugwell; also, I think, the Secretary of Agriculture himself, then. There were memorandums even to the President.3

Ingersoll: It really was taken to the highest circles, wasn't it?

Ringland: You've seen those papers. I think I've shown them.

Ingersoll: Yes, and we'll put them all in the appendix, if you like. They're a very interesting exchange.

1Earle Clapp to Arthur Ringland, March 2, 1932. See Appendix.

2R.G. Tugwell to Col. Louis MoH. Howe, secretary to the President, June 27, 1933. See Appendix.

3Memorandum for the President (Roosevelt) from the Secretary of Agriculture (Henry A. Wallace) Aug. 16, 1933. See Appendix.
Ringland: It washed up. I was hopeful out of it all there would be a recognition of forestry in its place in the agricultural foreign service. My thinking was there should be a forestry attaché at our embassy in Stockholm for the Scandinavian countries, where the economy of Sweden and Finland is so heavily based on the timber industry and forestry is so well established for production. And then there should be another attaché, say, at Berlin, who was either a wood chemist or a wood physicist, or a research biologist in the field of silviculture; and another in Rome covering the Mediterranean countries and the developments there--Spain, Italy, Greece, so on--for observation of their measures to overcome the devastation from ancient times by reforestation or other measures of protection of the soil. "The goat is the enemy of civilization" said an Italian forester to me. Those three, and perhaps one in the general commercial field stationed in London, quite an intelligence center. Well, that was the picture I had in my mind.

Ingersoll: Has any of this ever developed?

Ringland: No, no, it has not. There are no forestry attachés--insofar as I know--I think I'm right. But there has been an active exchange between these governments, of foresters, and ours. And here in Washington there is, and has been for some time, a forestry attaché in the German Embassy.

Whether there are others I'm not sure. But the great change is this: the Forest Service has established an international section, there's been a continual exchange of professional personnel and meetings and whatnot. There are too the services and field projects of the Forestry Division of the Food and Agricultural Organization in Rome, and actively participated in by American foresters. And last year the World Forestry Congress in Madrid was attended by some fifty American foresters. As an out-growth there is now an active international professional society and the president is an American, Tom Gill.

And Congress is generous in support of our conservation here, our organizations. It seems ludicrous when you think you couldn't get $15,000. Why, that--well, I don't need to elaborate on that now, the appropriations now run into the millions, you know.
Ingersoll: Yes. How different, how very different.

Ringland: But since that's an index of collective intelligence, I'm all for it!
Ingersoll: I understand that between 1933 and '34, you were Conservation Liaison Officer for the CCC. Between whom did you do this liaison work, Mr. Ringland?

Ringland: I was assigned to the Fourth Corps Army area to carry out liaison between the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Army, with headquarters at Fort McPherson, on the outskirts of Atlanta. The Fourth Corps area embraced North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Tennessee. In each of these states camps were established to carry out conservation work in national forests, national parks, and state parks and forests.

CCC Leadership

The camps set up included about two hundred enrollees and the staff included an officer of the Army, and as civilians—a superintendent, a foreman, an educational adviser, and technicians, foresters, engineers, soil erosion and wildlife experts or other experts in whatever particular work the camp was directed to conserve.

Ingersoll: What was your feeling about the caliber of the civilian leadership?

Ringland: It was good.

Ingersoll: Were you acquainted with any of the political aspects of the CCC? When you speak of the supervisory personnel, do you think there was any pressure in the appointment procedure?
Ringland: Yes, there was in respect to the foremen, not to the technical staff or the Army. But the foreman was a key man and as I recall it, and I'm speaking now for the CCC as a whole, they were appointed only after clearance through the Democratic county committees, or similar political bodies. This is not to suggest they didn't appoint good men. Of course, sometimes they got very poor ones and the effect was damaging to morale and efficiency. But the good men, as I said, were key men. I think my old colleague John D. Guthrie put it very well when he said that the foremen had the job of teaching these green kids, that he was father, mother, and big brother, and would tell them the right end of an ax, shovel, or crosscut saw, show them how and where to work, give them advice and guidance during the daytime and instruct them in the evenings.

Origins of CCC Concept

Ingersoll: I know you're quite interested in the beginnings of things, the philosophical roots of ideas. Do you have any notion where the ideas for CCC came from?

Ringland: It was an action taken directly by Franklin Roosevelt himself. Although I haven't seen it, I understand he drew it out more or less organization-wise on a piece of paper. I remember, though, that a politician in Florida tried to capitalize on it by insisting that it was he who dreamed up the Civilian Conservation Corps. I don't know why, but it came to my lot to handle this. And this I did, most effectively, by simply quoting William James' essay On the Moral Equivalent of War.

Ingersoll: How did you do that?

Ringland: William James, in 1910 said, "It is but a question of time and opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities, when the youthful population would
Ringland: be organized to perform for a certain number of years a part of the Army enlisted against nature." And in 1915, George H. Maxwell, the conservationist, in his book, Our National Defense: The Patriotism of Peace, outlined at length a plan for the enrollment of youth for public service. This was the last we heard from the gentleman from Florida.

Value of CCC as a Permanent Institution

Ingersoll: You went on to write several articles with some of these ideas in mind, didn't you?

Ringland: Yes. I was so impressed with my experience and observations that I felt that the Civilian Conservation Corps could well become a permanent institution. With that in mind I wrote an article, quoting from Maxwell, entitled "The Patriotism of Peace," which was published in the American Forests--the immediate date escapes me.1 Another article, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Natural Resources Board," was reprinted by the Journal of Forestry in December of 1934.2

Description of Liaison Work

Ingersoll: Could you tell us a few more of the aspects of your own work with the CCC as liaison officer?

1 January, 1934.

2 See Bibliography "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Natural Resources Board," (Appendix) with 2 letters (1) Jan. 17, 1935 from H.S. Graves, Yale School of Forestry; and (2) Dec. 5, 1934, from F.A. Silcox, U.S. Forest Service.
As I said, as liaison, my office served as the clearinghouse to bring problems that affected in common the military and civilian services. So I visited the camps and became familiar with the forms of administration through my talks with the staff, both civilian and military, and saw something of the character of the work that was being done. Sometimes General Mosely, who was the Fourth Corps area commander, accompanied me on these inspections as well as officers of his staff. He took a keen interest in the whole program and gave me every possible support when he succeeded General King, who was the Corps area commander when I reported. General King was enthusiastic and most helpful to me; he recalled that my brother Frank was one of his squadron commanders at the cavalry post at Ft. Leavenworth.

Do you feel generally it was a good move to have the Army administering these camps to the extent that they were?

Yes, under the circumstances. The Army could mobilize equipment and meet the physical demands of camp construction and the like, carry on house-keeping functions, and provide medical facilities for the enrollees, and do these essentials expeditiously when time was of the essence in this whole country-wide enterprise. No other agency, in my judgment, could possibly have taken its place at that time.

However, in giving thought to a permanent institution, it is pertinent to refer here to a memorandum my associate at the Fourth Corps area headquarters, Major Gage, gave me following, I think, some of my informal talks with him. He said that it was his opinion that "the Army to maintain its efficiency and its readiness to take the field against a national enemy, thus justifying the confidence which the people of the United States
Ringland: place upon it, should spare no effort to insure the prompt return to their respective organizations of all Army personnel now on duty with the CCC as rapidly as they can be relieved from their current tasks. I believe," he said, "you will agree with me if you will look at this matter from the broad point of view of the national welfare—that as soon as other agencies of the Government can be trained and equipped to take over this work, they should be required to do so."¹ I judge from this that should the CCC become a permanent institution and not one of emergency, it would not necessarily follow that the Army would need to be a part of its administration.

**Educational Program**

Ingersoll: As liaison officer, did you have any particular part to play in the education program of the CCC?

Ringland: Only in part, not directly. I did assist in the development of some of the plans of instruction. Of course, the program did play a very important part. Again I'd like to refer to Major Gage and his memorandum to me. He felt that if there should be permanent camps with an authorized educational setup, the enrollees' attendance in classes should be completely compulsory.

Ingersoll: Was this counter to your own feeling?

Ringland: No, not at all. I fully subscribed to that. Schedules in the camps did not provide for compulsory attendance; there was, however, facility for those who were interested in the educational program.

¹Memorandum from Major P.S. Gage to Arthur Ringland, Nov. 24, 1933. See Appendix
Evaluation

Ingersoll: How would you evaluate the experience the men got in the CCC?

Ringland: I think what impressed me most of the supervisory personnel; to go back to William James' ideas of seizing historic opportunity, there was a great drama attached to all of this. Instead of these young men trying to sell apples, or whatever people did on street corners in those days, they were doing a job that they realized had a purpose and a value. I think, as I look back, that wholly aside from the general economic and social benefits--that is through relief of unemployment, benefit to families, business interests, and the conservation of natural resources--the social value to the individual was great. The men were taught the value of team play and how to live with the other fellow through orderliness, cleanliness, and good manners. It was discipline at its best. And on the job, men developed self-reliance, resourcefulness, confidence, courage, and skill.

Ingersoll: How do you look at the Job Corps today, with the background of these views of the CCC?

Ringland: My attention was captured when I heard of its creation, but the provision for the number seemed small. Nevertheless it is an essential part of the anti-poverty program. It can hardly be considered parallel to the CCC. And yet, I'm convinced we need a CCC today under some auspices just as much as we did back in the days of the depression; the Job Corps may be a means to that end.

Ingersoll: Do you feel that in those days it was possible to cope with the vast number of boys who went through the CCC? Was it really possible?

Ringland: There were some 600,000, I believe, in all that served in these camps. Many developed leadership, and when we went into the war, they served overseas as noncommissioned or commissioned officers.

At the time, in a sort of flight of fancy while looking at a CCC map, I wrote:
A map of the United States published in 1932 by the Corps of Engineers shows the location of the camps established at that time for the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It is unlike any other map save those which showed the various theaters of action in Europe during the World War. Here "the Front" is in every state. Masses of small red circles flank the Pacific slopes of the Cascades and the Sierras from the Canadian boundary to the Mexican border; another attenuated mass follows the continental divide of the Rockies, with outlying circles in the Great Basin, in Arizona and New Mexico; the great and vast Mississippi Valley is dotted from the Lake of the Woods on the International Line almost to the suburbs of New Orleans; and in the East the red circles follow the whole Appalachian Range from Northern Maine to Northern Georgia fanning out all over the coastal plains of the Southern States. There are 1,500 red circles each representing a camp site occupied by 200 men! This is realism! This is action!

Maxwell certainly supports the thought that many should have an experience like the CCC, organized on a permanent basis, in his proposal to enlist young men in a national construction corps to build great works of internal improvement and material development, to fight forest fires and floods, to plant forests, to reclaim deserts and swamplands. "There'll be enough work," he said, "for such a corps to do for generations to come. It would show the patriotic spirit with which work in the public service can be done to protect the country from nature's devastation."
WATERSHED CONTROL AND THE FLOOD CONTROL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (1937-40)

Development of Flood Control Legislation

Ingersoll: You were Chairman of the Flood Control Coordinating Committee of the Department of Agriculture, I understand, from 1937 to 1940. In your article entitled "The Flood Control Act of 1936"1, you wrote about the long efforts to get this legislation enacted. Could you comment on this as background for how the Flood Control Coordinating Committee came into being?

Ringland: I was glad to have the assignment to the Department of Agriculture's Flood Control Coordinating Committee for the prospect of unusual service was most engaging; I pictured in my imagination a reconstruction of the wondrous sandpiles of my childhood.

In the course of my European studies I had been impressed with the upstream engineering and reforestation work in the Alps of France, Switzerland, and Austria, and in the Apennines of Italy. I reported in detail on some of the techniques developed to curb flash floods, retard storm surface-run-off and check erosional debris endangering life and valuable agricultural land. These measures seemed to me adaptable under certain

1Written for Soil Conservation, July 1938. Manuscript with Ringland papers.
Ringland: circumstances to American conditions.¹ There had been a recognition for some time of the need to develop the relationship between the great public works and dams constructed by the Army engineers and the upstream tributary watersheds. The Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, was designed to bring about coordination in that relationship.

I think, Mrs. Ingersoll, for an appreciation of this extraordinary legislation I shall want to quote here at the outset a paper that was prepared at the time to provide a complete understanding of its history and the conclusions to be drawn for application to the Department's part in a national flood control program.² In a note transmitting a copy to the Chief, Land Policy Division (Mr. P.M. Glick), I said, "If a tumbleweed policy is to be avoided we must sharply define the limitations of our responsibility."

Several bills were introduced into the Congress to authorize independent operation by the Department of Agriculture on watersheds outside of its flood control programs authorized by Congress. Because of the importance of the policy involved and the threatened impairment of the principle of integral treatment of waterways and their tributary watersheds fought for during and from the days of Senator Newlands, I would like to place in the Appendix three memoranda

Watershed Control in Italy. Soil Conservation, May 1937.

²August 26, 1937. Application of the Department Program under the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936. See Appendix.
relating to adverse action on H.R. 10173 (April 29, 1938),\(^1\) H.R. 2895 (March 10, 1939),\(^2\) and S 3865 (May 14, 1940).\(^3\) Particular attention is invited to the adverse report of the Secretary of Agriculture on March 10, 1939 to Judge Whittington, Chairman of the House Flood Control Committee.

The Secretary said in this letter that the principle of common action by the Department of Agriculture and the War Department to achieve technically and economically the common purpose of flood control upstream and downstream within the same drainage should be maintained and not impaired by independent action, weakening the development of a coordinated attack upon a common problem.

---

\(^1\)April 29, 1938, adverse report on proposed redraft of H.R. 10173 to Mr. P.M. Glick in charge of Land Policy Division. Appendix.

\(^2\)March 10, 1939, adverse report on H.R. 2895 from Secretary of Agriculture to Chairman of the House Flood Control Committee. Appendix.

\(^3\)May 15, 1940, adverse report on S. 3865 to Mr. Wiesing. Appendix.
Ringland: establish procedures, and to provide for collaboration with the bureaus of the Department "to take the greatest advantage of existing funds and personnel."

On February 26, 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture stated that the organization of the Flood Control Committee "presents to the Department a rather extraordinary opportunity to coordinate the efforts of Federal, state, and local agencies with those of thousands of farmers and other land owners. The problem is not one of techniques and economics alone, but also one involving fundamental social principles including new forms of social control. In fact, the problem is so comprehensive that we must draw upon the experience of many other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. I know this experience of coordination will be productive and it may even pave the way to a broader application of this principle throughout the Department."

It was my privilege to be the ghost writer of this statement. So you will understand, Mrs. Ingersoll, my enthusiasm and the appeal upon which to build a new development in the field of conservation of natural resources.

Ingersoll: Would you comment on how the Committee was organized in Washington, and in the field, for this hoped-for cooperative action that Secretary Wallace spoke about?

Ringland: Following the Secretary's establishment of the Advising Committee, the Flood Control Coordinating Committee was organized in early January, 1937. My colleagues were Mr. Munns of the Forest Service, Dr. Patrick of the Soil Conservation Service, and Mr. Kelso of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The program was a coordinated enterprise of a number of bureaus. In order to carry out adequately the responsibilities of the Department, advisory and coordinating committees were set up to formulate policies, establish procedures, and provide for cooperation and collaboration between bureaus. At the same time, coordinating committees were organized in the field, representing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Soil Conservation Service, and the Forest Service, and
functioning on a basis comparable to the Flood Control Coordinating Committee in Washington. Additionally, representatives of other bureaus of the Department, such as the Biological Survey, the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils, and the Weather Bureau, were named in Washington and in the field to assist these committees.

Was it a good setup for the kind of work that had to be done?

It was good to the extent it brought together all of the experts of the department who could assist in meeting the problem. It was weak in the sense that there was confusion of purpose and action was too diffused. There were too many cooks with a spoon in the broth! If we had had a section or division, or whatever you want to call it, under an executive with all of these experts available from their respective fields in consultation and in work in the field, it would have been an efficient outfit. But with these many committees (about 40 in office and field) without any channel for decisive and direct action, there was a good deal of lost motion, delay, and needless expense. The enabling legislation first authorized the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service to be responsible for Agriculture’s part. This was dropped in recognition of the interest of other bureaus of the Department, particularly the Forest Service. But it is significant that Congress had in mind a single executive to head the program.¹

Did you, as chairman, sometimes feel that your hands were tied when it came to a really crucial decision?

During my tenure as chairman, it became increasingly clear that the structural character of the organization, designed to discharge the Department’s responsibilities, was an impossible one for an action program. With the three-bureau committee with coordinate authority functioning as such in Washington and carried into every project in the

¹See Notes On Recommendations on Flood Control Administration, page 3, August 1940. Appendix.
Ringland: field, not only were my hands tied but, in effect, the personnel of the whole organization, though the individuals were professionally competent. This was peculiarly unfortunate. We had the authority under the terms of the enabling legislation and with it generous funds to link the Department of Agriculture and the Army Engineers in complementary relationship. This integration to meet a common problem to control the behavior of flood waters made possible the opportunity to bring to fruition, after thirty years, the statesmanship of Newlands.

Measures to capitalize this statesmanship were referred to at length in the development of the history of flood control legislation. The need was felt to proceed as rapidly as possible to initiate operations. In a committee memorandum of December 16, 1937 on the program for the calendar year 1938, it was emphasized that the prior and unrestricted use of the man-power of the Civilian Conservation Corps was essential to carry out without undue delay the Department's operations on key watersheds in view of costs and inadequate appropriations. But it was not until three years later that any project was ready for operations—again due to organization difficulties.

Relationship Between War Department and Department of Agriculture

Ingersoll: Now, both in your article "The Flood Control Act of 1936," and also in your somewhat later paper, the one called the "The Relation of Headwaters

---

1August 26, 1937, Application of the Department's Program under the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, Section on Legislation.

2December 16, 1937. Program for the Calendar Year 1938. Ringland Papers.

3Soil Conservation, July 1938. Manuscript with Ringland papers.
Ingersoll: Control to the National Program of Flood Protection, "you explained the relationship that you have mentioned, of the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture for upstream control and those of the War Department, through the Army Engineers, for mainstream control. Did this primary division of responsibility between the War Department and the Department of Agriculture cause any difficulties?

Ringland: There were difficulties, but they were inherent because of the character of the Department's organization. I was able, nevertheless, to discuss problems freely with the Army Engineers--(one of them, incidently, was Captain Lucius Clay, later of Berlin fame)--to iron out wrinkles in cooperation.

My direct liaison with the Army Engineers was with Lt. Colonel Snow, Executive of the Rivers and Harbors Division. I first met him in France in World War I when I was an Engineers Reserve officer, and our friendly relationship at that time was most helpful when we met again twenty years later. He was most cooperative in ironing out with me some of the difficulties that arose affecting Agriculture's part in the flood control program. He was an able officer whose death was most untimely.

It was essential to bring about an understanding. Colonel Snow and I spent some time in working out in detail the principles of a plan to govern the cooperation of its two departments. These we formalized in a draft of agreement to be executed by the Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics on behalf of the Department of Agriculture. The draft agreement was transmitted to Mr. Tolley, BAE Chief, and to Mr. Eisenhower, Coordinator.

1Presented before the American Geophysical Union Meeting held in Washington, April 28, 1939.

2August 14, 1939, Memorandum of Understanding. The correlation of the Flood Control Programs of the Departments of War and Agriculture. Appendix.
Ringland: As I look back I don't know why it was not concluded, even if modified, it would have precluded some of the misunderstanding that arose in survey procedures and projected operations. I shall refer to this specifically in later remarks if I may. Let me add here a relatively minor source of misunderstanding.

The title, Flood Control Coordinating Committee, lent itself to confusion as to respective functions of the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture. Congressman Snyder, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the War Department, telephoned me on February 14, 1938 that the public was confused in relation to the flood control work of the Army Engineers. "Agriculture's work was run-off and water retardation and soil erosion prevention, and to keep silt out of reservoirs. This confusion should be brought to the attention of the Secretary, if necessary."

I said I believed his point well taken. I reported this to the Coordinating Committee and suggested as targets, "Watershed Flood Control Board," or "Watershed Protection Board." Some time later, I suggested "Watershed Conservancy Board," a broader concept and a recognition of ecological influences.

Recommendations for a More Efficient Organization

It became necessary to submit a number of proposals for reorganization: on the principle of functionalism as opposed to institutionalism;¹ a plan giving the Chief of the Forest Service and the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, respectively, straight line individual responsibility and authority for all watershed control project work of whatever character dividing the field according to the hydrographic divisions of the Army Engineers²

¹October 20, 1939 to Mr. Kimmel, BAE. Appendix.
²November 2, 1939 to Mr. Eisenhower. Appendix.
RIngland: on the need to bring the Forest Service and the Regional Foresters into the picture in a more responsible way than then obtained.1

At the close of my services in 1940 with the Committee, I brought together at Mr. Utz's request of June 14, 1940, my memoranda of recommendations. In this memorandum (of August 23, 1940 to Mr. Utz2), referring to these recommendations, I said "Most of these suggestions have been taken care of, as you so well put it 'by the well-known method of delaying action and allowing time to settle the issue.'

"You are dead right when you say it is 'extremely important to expedite the flood control work at the present time.' It is disconcerting to recall, however, that that was said, and in detail, well over a year ago (April 22, 1939, Memorandum No. 39, Subject: 'Operations Program'), and followed by a meeting in the field to spur action. This was done because a year before (March 16, 1938) in response to an inquiry from the President, the Secretary said, 'by July 1, 1938 the Department of Agriculture will be prepared to undertake comprehensive flood control work, on a carefully planned basis, on a number of critical watersheds if special funds are available.'" The funds were made available less than three months after this letter was written--$4,000,000 by the War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Act of June 11, 1938.

This memo was written to record and to make available for reference the efforts of the past three years to focus constructive attention on the Department's administration of the flood control program. And this was followed with a summary of the principal proposals.

1November 3, 1939, to Mr. F.S. Silcox. Appendix.
2August 23, 1940, to Mr. Utz. Appendix.
Ingersoll: I understand that the memo to Milton Eisenhower was a summary of the very complete report you wrote in August 1940. I found this extremely interesting as a statement in depth of the whole problem and suggest we fit it in the appendix.

Ringland: Yes, this is the report I have just mentioned. However, I would like to quote here the summary memorandum of September 24, 1940, to Mr. Eisenhower as the follow-up of the August report.

---

1Note on Recommendations on Flood Control Administration, submitted by Chairman of the Flood Control Coordinating Committee 1937-1940. Appendix.

2September 24, 1940, to Mr. Eisenhower.
September 24, 1940

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. M. S. RISENHOWER,
Coordinator, Office of Land Use Coordination.

Dear Milton:

Reference is made to our conversation of last Thursday. As I said
there have been brought together from the files, at Mr. Utz's request, the
recommendations submitted by me from time to time while serving as Chairman
of the Flood Control Coordinating Committee. Mr. Utz has the complete file
but copies are available if desired.

In an accompanying note to this file I said that whether these recom-
mandations have merit is not so important as the fact that we are contending
with a type of organization that makes objective thinking and action on a
Departmental level almost impossible. The orphan relationship of the flood
control organization to the Department has therefore operated to curb appro-
priate consideration and action on the remedial measures.

The following is a summary of the principal proposals:

The Department's program will continue to eat away appropriations
unproductively until:

A. The job of headwaters control is recognized, not as a sub-
stitute program for the action bureaus of the Department to undertake con-
servation measures already authorized and appropriated for by Congress,
but as a Departmental enterprise in its auxiliary and complementary rela-
tionships to "similar and related activities"2 of these bureaus and of
the War Department;

B. There is developed by the bureaus "a concept of departmental
autonomy as part of a coordinated whole"2;

C. This concept is translated into action by a simple mechanism
fixing responsibility with commensurate authority to discharge this re-
sponsibility purposefully and economically.

1/ During the past three years approximately $5,000,000 have been expended
for preliminary examinations and surveys of watershed projects. As of
July 1, 1940 no project was ready with plans for actual operations but the
President now has before him for approval the first operation - two partial
operations in the Los Angeles watershed in the Arroyo-Seco and the San
Fernando Valley.

2/ Section 8, Flood Control Act of 1936.

3/ Morris L. Cooke in an address before the Upstream Engineering Conference,
September 22, 1936.
1. A declaration of policy defining the limitations of the Department's responsibilities in relation to the War Department and the action bureaus and land-use program of the Department of Agriculture under the terms of the enabling Flood Control Act of 1936 and succeeding legislation.

2. The fixation of responsibility and delegation of commensurate authority to carry out this declaration of policy:

   (1) Elimination of interbureau committee administration in field and office, including survey "senior representatives";

   (2) Coordinator, Land Use Coordination -- to act for the Secretary and be responsible for the staff functions (as opposed to line functions) of the program as a Department enterprise which relate to general policies, legislation, budget, project priorities and their assignment for execution, research, and the approval of project reports for the Secretary; the Coordinator to be supported by a small staff of technicians and consultants.

   (3) Chiefs of Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service -- to be held independently responsible for the line functions of the program, acting directly through Regional Foresters and Regional conservationists without benefit of committees, that is for the single bureau administration and execution of the share of the program assigned -- preliminary examinations, surveys, and operations -- within broad hydrographic divisions as opposed to assignments on a project and committee basis, (groups of major drainage basins as employed by the War Department afford a common denominator); the administration by the Regional Foresters and Regional Conservationists to be supported by the detail of specialists reporting directly to them from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Forest Service Research, Soil Conservation Service Research, and other appropriate agencies.

   (4) Simplification of preliminary examinations and surveys and reduction in time and costs. Analyses of major elements of each project problem and synoptic evaluations by experienced specialists rather than by party surveys.

   (5) Study of allotment procedure and financial control in the field and set up of project cost accounting.

   (6) Study of field personnel, particularly of number of positions in relation to technical grades and the demands of the program and its objectives.

   (7) Establishment of adequate liaison in the field between Regional Foresters and Regional Conservationists and Army District Engineers by assignment of experienced liaison officers. Development of Memorandum of Understanding with the War Department.
(8) Initiation, in correlation with Army Engineer project plans, of relatively small typical headwaters control projects by the CCC and WPA particularly where lives and social security are in jeopardy and where the character of the work to be undertaken is clearly a public and Federal responsibility.

The Department has had at its command for three years the legal authority, the funds, facilities, and the personnel to initiate a creditable job in furthering one of the most far-reaching legislative enactments in conservation history. It still commands these resources but it has not adequate command of their use. Yet it is more imperative than ever, with increasing obligations for national defense, that an organisation be established without continued delay, and one that will command available resources to a definitive purpose.

Arthur C. Ringland.
Cooperation With the Weather Bureau

Hydrologic Data for Small Watersheds

Ingersoll: You have referred, from time to time, to the deficiencies in hydrological data in the development of watershed protection. Could you comment on this?

Ringland: Other than the weakness of the structural organization of the Coordinating Committee, nothing gave me more concern than the continued delays in developing cooperation with the Weather Bureau, relating to the behavior and influence of precipitation in small watersheds. And this for the simple reason, as I have said before, that it was in these small watersheds, tributary to the waterways authorized by Congress for improvements by the War Department where Agriculture's job lay in the first instance. I should like to comment on this in some detail.

On May 26, 1936 the National Resources Committee published a report, "Deficiencies in Basic Hydrologic Data." The gaps in our existing knowledge of hydrologic conditions were clearly pointed out, particularly of "rainfall at high elevations, rainfall intensities, snowfall on mountain slopes...the technique of observing and recording has been worked out and is constantly being improved. What is needed is additional support from governmental bodies to enable the work to proceed more intensively and on a broader scale."

Less than a month after the publication of this report of the NRC, Congress passed the Organic Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, providing for investigations and improvements of waterways and their watersheds. This Act and the amendments of 1937, 1938, and 1939 directed the investigation of about 600 waterways by the War Department and of their tributary watersheds by the Department of Agriculture. Shortly afterward on September 22,
1936, the Upstream Engineering Conference was held at the request of the President. This conference stressed the necessity of adequate knowledge of hydrologic conditions for intelligent work in flood control planning.

Thus, the Flood Control Coordinating Committee of the Department of Agriculture (organized in January, 1937) undertook its investigations with the knowledge of the deficiencies in hydrology based upon the considered reports of the National Resources Committee and of the authorities making up the Upstream Engineering Conference. The Coordinating Committee had, too, the experiences of the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation, and the Weather Bureau to draw upon.

Underlying the economic appraisal of costs and benefits of flood control measures is the primary necessity to appraise adequately the flood potentials of a project. Upon this appraisal the technical methods of control are devised. The cost of these measures in relation to the protection afforded then becomes the concern of the economist. But our economists were continually handicapped. Unquestionably the inacceptability of so many of our reports, prepared at great expense, too, was due to the lack of a technically sound base for the conclusions reached. This could hardly be otherwise when we knew so little of the behavior of water and its effects especially on headwater drainages.

"At present, to an incredible extent, we are groping in the dark." This is quoted from the National Resources Committee Report on Hydrologic Deficiencies. That was in 1936. In the spring of 1939 I had occasion to address a session of the American Geophysical Union. In the course of my remarks I referred to the fact that so long ago as 1922 G.H. Matthews pointed out in the proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers that small streams had not been taken seriously enough and that the absence of data was appalling. I said that rainfall records of high elevation where our flood troubles begin were lacking. Rainfall and run-off relationships must be established for headwaters drainages if flood potentials are to be
Ringland: appraised intelligently.  

Now, in 1940, we were still groping and a serious question was still posed--were we developing hydrologic basic data upon which to recommend the public expenditure of millions of dollars? A total of $6,500,000 was made available to the Committee for preliminary examinations and survey investigations. During this time some 75 preliminary examination reports were received. In case after case, the Weather Bureau commented upon the inadequacy of the hydrologic data and, therefore, its difficulty of appraising the flood potentials of the proposed projects.

Although, as I have pointed out, the need for hydrologic data affecting small drainages, where our job lay, was fundamental in the determination of flood potentials, there developed in the Coordinating Committee delay after delay in developing cooperation with the Weather Bureau. And this despite the whole-hearted willingness of the Chief, Commander Reichelderfer, and Mr. Bernard, Chief of the Bureau's Rivers and Flood Division. Ironically, they were working closely with the Corps of Engineers and had been since 1937.

On July 11, 1938, Mr. Merrill Bernard, Chief of the Division of Rivers and Flood of the Weather Bureau transmitted a memorandum to Mr. Eisenhower, Coordinator, on estimated costs of hydrologic service for the year 1938-1939 in view of specific provision in Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 to develop such a service in relation to preliminary examinations and surveys for flood control. "May I say in our efforts to establish this service in the past, and particularly in the several instances where we have attempted to serve the Corps of Engineers, and others, I have felt the need for Departmental support. This is perhaps due to the fact that the Weather Bureau functions in other fields than agriculture. My own opinion is

1Relation of Headwater-Control to the National Program of Flood-Protection. Address of Ringland reprint from Transactions of the American Geophysical Union, 1939. Appendix.

2Memorandum of February 23, 1940 from Ringland to Wieking, Department of Agriculture. (See Ringland papers.)
that the potential contribution of its specialized services to flood control have not, until recently, been appreciated by any of us. A further justification for the Department’s participation in the initial cost of the contemplated hydrologic service becomes apparent in the preliminary basin reports which have been sent me for review by Mr. Ringland’s Committee. In all cases, the deficiency in current and localized hydrologic data was quite revealing. I have the conviction the greatest dollar value in expenditures for surveys will be that expended in the accumulation of basic data. If then within the fiscal year, the Department can become identified with the program authorized by the amendment through the allocation of a modest amount from its funds for preliminary examinations or surveys, much would be gained. First, as I have said, Agriculture will be identified with the establishment of a service which will enjoy a high priority of effectiveness—that of gaining and disseminating basic flood control data. The service too will take on almost immediately a scientific and social significance that will reflect most creditably on the Department. Secondly, it would be regrettable if a year were allowed to pass before establishing precipitation records of which much will be expected in the next two to five years. In this respect some current work has been done which should not be sacrificed. The year should be spent in selecting a qualified personnel, setting up regional facilities, installing precipitation stations on basins of high priority to both Agriculture and the Army, and in becoming familiar, in a preliminary way at least, with the nation-wide problem anticipated by the amendment. The Corps of Engineers is in accord with the intent of the amendment which is to provide for a program not to exceed $375,000 per annum, from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control.1 ***It would be possible hereafter for the Department of Agriculture to retain a place in the cooperative service with a relatively small contribution. The following estimates by regions *** arranged in the order of importance to both our Department and the Corps of Engineers is attached for *** consideration."

1 Included by Congress in the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938.
There was seemingly a curious unwillingness to take advantage of the expressed authority of Congress. Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized expenditures on behalf of the Weather Bureau for a current information service on precipitation, flood forecasts, and flood warnings "from any appropriation heretofore or hereafter made for flood control by the United States." Under this authority the War Department supplied funds to the Weather Bureau and from the same appropriation made available to the Department of Agriculture.

Objection was raised in our Committee to the advisability of the allocation of funds which had been earmarked for preliminary examination and survey purposes. And yet the legislative authorization stated, "wherever...such service (hydrologic) is advisable in connection with either preliminary examinations and surveys or works of improvement authorized by law for flood control purposes."

In a memorandum of September 8, 1938, I said: "Congress has appropriated seven million dollars in the past two years for flood control examinations and surveys to be available equally to War and Agriculture. The estimates of 1940 call for eight million dollars more for the same purposes. The justification for the great appropriation is the need for basic information upon which to develop sound technical and economical plans for the control of major flood waters, or on which to preclude the initiation of ill-advised projects.

"Our survey job is therefore to obtain basic information upon which to plan the control of direct surface run-off and to a limited extent the control of channel flows, within numerous and relatively small feeder drainages of flood water and silt potentialities. Most importantly, to accomplish this control, we must have knowledge of the intensity and duration of rain, and of the infiltration capacity and moisture equivalent of the soil upon which it falls.

"We need," I continued, "to emphasize the acquisition of other basic survey data--snow fall, evaporation, stream discharge, and sedimentation, including reservoir silting--if we are to have
adequate knowledge of the behavior of water and its relation to the soil mass. Everyone of these factors which are admittedly of primary influences should be determined for each flood source tributary included within our survey program."

I reported to the Coordinating Committee that I had been working with General Tyler and Colonel Snow of the Corps of Engineers and with Mr. Bernard of the Weather Bureau in the development of an expanded program for Army-Weather Bureau hydrologic service as authorized by Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938. I said it seemed strange that as late as February 1939 we were not developing similar cooperation with our own Weather Bureau in our own Department, when both War and Agriculture were engaged in the same work and on the same projects paid from the same funds. Yet, though $3,500,000 had been appropriated to the Department for flood control investigations, not a penny has been spent for additional rainfall recording or for cooperation with the Weather Bureau. It seemed peculiarly ironic when the legislative amendment to further this information was not initiated by the Weather Bureau but by this office.

Finally, and I want to quote my conclusion: "We cannot plead lack of evidence of necessity; it is revealed in our own preliminary examination reports, the comments of the Weather Bureau, reports of the Army, of the National Resources Board, and by field experience and observation at home and abroad. We cannot plead lack of authority or lack of funds; Congress has given both in ample and generous measure. We cannot plead lack of opportunity for cooperation; it has been offered time and time again by the Weather Bureau and accepted from the beginning by the War Department."

The above was written September 8, 1938; and on June 19, 1939, Dr. L.C. Gray of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, a sage adviser and a help to me in meeting some of the frustrations with which I had to contend, reported on our flood control work, and he said, "Congress has definitely specified cooperation with the Weather Bureau in flood control surveys, and has authorized an expenditure of $375,000 annually for that purpose."
R Dingland: (He was referring to Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938.) In spite of this authorization and obvious Congressional intent, the Washington Flood Control Committee was guilty of long and inexcusable delay in approaching the Weather Bureau with a view to arranging for such cooperation. In fact, no steps were taken to that end until late in the winter. The delay is all the more regrettable because of the serious handicaps and deficiencies of the field program in regard to the hydrologic phase of the task. It must be said, however, that in the past several months the Committee has exhibited commendable zeal in trying to clear the hydrologic deficiencies of the program." I had previously given him background material on cooperation with the Weather Bureau.1

Dr. Gray had reference in his conclusion to the first expenditures for cooperation with the Weather Bureau. These were initially provided in April of 1939, and again in May and July. On August 12, 1939, effective action was taken to provide $100,000 to the Weather Bureau for precipitation data, though more than a year after authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938. Yet authorization to permit this cooperation had been specifically requested by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amendment to effect it "has my unqualified approval," he said.2

There was encouragement, however, in the understanding finally reached with the War Department providing for contributions on an equal basis with the Weather Bureau for the fiscal year 1941 for hydrologic information. Thus $187,000 was earmarked for the strengthening of the Weather Bureau network of precipitation stations, matching an equal amount from the Army to meet the annual amount of $375,000 authorized by Section 8 of the

1March 2, 1939, memorandum for Dr. Gray from A. Ringland, BAE. Appendix.

2Letter of March 28, 1938, from the Secretary of Agriculture to Acting Director, D.W. Bell of the Bureau of the Budget with enclosure of letter to Judge Whittington, Chairman, Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives. See Appendix.
Ringland: Flood Control Act of 1938. The War Department had been cooperating with the Weather Bureau since 1937, and felt that Agriculture had not sufficiently recognized its part.

A curious situation developed following the acceptance of the amendment in Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1938, providing for cooperation with the Weather Bureau by the Secretaries of War and Agriculture on an equal basis. Without our knowledge, the reference in the original language to the participation of the Secretary of Agriculture was deleted when formally acted upon. Subsequently, Judge Whittling telephoned me in reference to the amendment and I called upon him. He expressed great surprise and said he was at a loss to understand why the change was made, and that he intended to make inquiry. I told the Judge that while the Department was embarrassed and that the language as adopted was unsatisfactory, our solicitor and the Department would ask for no change in the wording in view of the clearly expressed intent of Congress to authorize Agriculture to join with the War Department in cooperation with the Weather Bureau.

I do not recall the outcome of any inquiry—"just one of those things" shall I say; fortunately Agriculture's solicitor was not sticky.

A meeting was held on November 7, 1939, with representatives of the Army Engineers, the Weather Bureau, and our Flood Control Coordinating Committee to formulate a statement to justify the hydrology program before the budget and the Congress. There was agreement on the F.Y. 1941 estimates (respectively of the War and Agriculture Departments) to further the precipitation network of the Weather Bureau. It was understood that both Departments would meet the needs for intensive observation within the network for their lump sum flood control funds and install their own gauges.

1 Memorandum of April 8, 1938, to Judge Whittling. See Appendix.

2 March 11, 1940. Excerpt from Memorandum to Mr. Wiecking. See Appendix.
Ringland: And the Weather Bureau, on its part, agreed to issue monthly for the use of the respective services the data collected from the various stations.

At long last, intelligent action was set in course to fulfill the expressed authority of Congress in the legislation of 1938 for Agriculture, as well as the War Department, to cooperate with the Weather Bureau in the development of a national flood control program.

Surveys and Operations

Ingersoll: As I understand it the purpose of the preliminary examinations and surveys of watersheds by the Department of Agriculture is to determine the necessity of operations to complement the major works of the War Department. To what extent were such operations undertaken?

Ringland: I am compelled to say, Mrs. Ingersoll, that as of July, 1940, no operations were underway by the Department of Agriculture despite the provision and expenditure of several millions for examinations and surveys over the preceding three years, and despite the appropriation of several million specifically to permit such operations. A number of factors contributed to this dismal result.

The Department’s Role

Agriculture assumed a great responsibility in the development of its share of the national flood control program projected by the enabling legislation of 1936. The Flood Control Act of 1936 was the fruition of the Newlands’ philosophy that a river should be controlled from the springs
Ringland: to the mouth. Senator Hayden and Congressman Ferguson drafted the language in the Act of 1936 to fulfill the Newlands concept and to provide for the correlation and integration of measures for the flood control of waterways with those of their tributary watersheds.

The bill as originally prepared and reported to the Senate made no reference to the watershed protection of waterways. However, when it was under discussion Senator Hayden said, "Mr. President, I am perhaps in a measure responsible for the suggestion contained in the amendment, and it was made in consideration of the fact that flood control projects from now on are to be examined by two departments of government. The watersheds above the dams to be built are to be examined and reported upon by the Department of Agriculture...so this Bill, if it shall pass in the form in which I think it ought to be enacted, will properly divide these two functions. The Secretary of Agriculture will report to Congress upon what shall be done upon the watersheds of streams to retain the rainfall, and the Secretary of War, using the Board of Army Engineers as a source of information, will report to Congress as to what shall be done with respect to the construction of dams, or levees, or floodings or whatever is necessary to remove the menace of destructive floods."

I shall add here, Mrs. Ingersoll, my talk with Congressman Ferguson: he emphasized that upstream work must be on flood control projects authorized by Congress, "a joint partnership of the Departments of War and Agriculture" as he put it.

So with the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1936, the Department's role and responsibilities were clearly defined and the obligations it must assume as its share of the national flood control program.
Misdirected Efforts

Ringland: The provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1936 constituted the Department's charter. Nevertheless, failure to appreciate the limitations of the Department's responsibilities was reflected in the field in survey relations with our own Bureaus and with the Army Engineers. Preliminary examinations or surveys were undertaken or proposed that were in contravention of these provisions and of the policy expressed by Secretary Wallace on the principle of common action by Agriculture and War. Some investigations contemplated independent operations, or ignored priorities, or misinterpreted authority. As illustration, I want to place in the appendix memoranda relating to Cherry Creek, Colorado; Wabash River, Ohio; Washita River, Oklahoma; the Trinity River, Texas; the Republican and the Purgatoire River in southeastern Colorado and northeastern New Mexico.

The survey of Cherry Creek in 1939, a flood menace to Denver, should have been directed to the consideration of an upstream plan to complement those of the Army and the Reclamation Service for storage reservoirs. Instead the survey was directed to an alternate or independent plan flatly contrary to the terms of the enabling flood control legislation. And, as well, contrary to Secretary Wallace's letter of March 10, 1939, which I have referred to. And to top it, a wire was received from the field, four months after the survey was started: "Has Agriculture authority under Congressional acts to formulate and prepare alternate flood control plans without regard to the plan of the War Department?" This was three years after the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936 directing correlation of War and Agriculture's plans. As Senator Hayden said, "The

1 October 11 and 13, 1939, Memoranda to Dr. A.L. Patrick, Soil Conservation Service and member of Flood Control Coordinating Committee. See Appendix.
watersheds above the dams to be built (by the War Department) are to be examined and reported upon by the Department of Agriculture."

As for the proposed survey of the Wabash, this river of slow-moving currents did not rate priority over the flash flood potentials of the Appalachian slopes. Consider the loss of property damage incurred in the small watersheds of Frozen and Quicksand Creeks.

Here was a simple question of recognizing priorities. The Wabash flowed slowly through one of the richest farm areas in the country. On the other hand the Farm Security Administration suggested to our committee that much could be done on upstream headwaters work in the Appalachian region to meet pressing unemployment problems and a serious social condition.

On these small basins the Army Engineers asked, What can Agriculture do? This was a challenge which I had felt for a long time we had failed to meet. I felt the facilities we had made it possible to augment appropriations with CCC and WPA labor—that upstream work on small tributaries would have significant economic, technical, and social values.¹

A survey of the Purgatoire watershed was urged by the field committee because of its relation to the siltation problem affecting the Caddoa Reservoir (under construction by the Army at an estimated expense of over $11 million), rather than the Republican River, as recommended, which included a vast drainage as yet to be authorized by Congress as a flood control project.²

¹April 25, 1940, Memorandum to Mr. Wieking on the survey of the Wabash River in contrast to flash flood surveys. See Appendix.

²April 24, 1940, Memorandum to Mr. Wieking on priority of the Purgatoire survey over the Republican River survey. See Appendix.
Again, there was an overlapping of War and Agriculture functions in the case of the Washita Watershed and confusion of purpose in that of the Trinity River Watershed. The Washita survey projected reservoir construction involving structures impounding as much as a hundred thousand acre-feet and estimated to cost over two million dollars—a clear assumption of responsibility with which Agriculture was not charged.

Mrs. Ingersoll, in giving thought to these cases, I forgot to include the conflict of bureau interest between the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service that held up a survey of the Arkansas-White River basins for over a year. In a memorandum of December 2, 1939, to Mr. Eisenhower, Land Use Coordinator, I pointed out that these basins fell within the Ozark-Ouachita highlands, and that because of the physiographic character the region was of key importance in respect to the flood potentials of the Mississippi River Valley. The War Department, under an authorization of $46 million was already constructing reservoirs. The headwaters include some five million acres under Forest Service administration as national forests. In view of this, I recommended that responsibility for action be placed upon the Forest Service without further delay, recalling that the Secretary had said, in his letter of August 24, 1939, to Senator Newlands and to Arkansas congressmen, “action would be initiated.” I added that the conflict of interest was an unfortunate example of the inability of the bureaus to recognize flood control as a Departmental enterprise.

The Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande and the Alamogordo Dam on the Pecos were constructed by the Reclamation Service. An amendment to the

---

1July 17 and 18, 1940, Memoranda for Mr. Utz on the Washita and Trinity River surveys. See Appendix.

2November 20, 1939, to Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, from District Engineer, on overlapping of functions between War Department and Department of Agriculture. See Appendix.
organic Flood Control Act of 1936 was necessary to authorize the Department of Agriculture to carry out work on the watersheds of the Rio Grande and Pecos. Following a field inspection, I reported that it did not seem advisable to authorize the usual type of survey of such a vast watershed as the Rio Grande. Regional Conservator Calkins agreed, however, that small important tributaries of flood water and sedimentation potentials, such as Spring Canyon, should be the basis of working plans.\(^1\)

The romantic and doctrinaire notion was entertained by some that land-use treatment of itself would curb floods. An example was the ignoring of the storm history of the Youghieghenny and the implication that the great flood of March, 1936, resulting from prolonged and relatively gentle rains over a great drainage area, could be controlled by land-use practice. Such practice at present has definite limitations in reducing flood hazard. Abundant experiential data show the general relationship of land use practice to surface run-off and soil erosion. But they cannot be used for qualitative comparison until they are analysed in terms of storm intensities, soil conditions, and stages and densities of vegetative growth associated with the observations. In time improved land-use management will become progressively more effective as a supplement to engineering works in reducing flood hazards. But at this time the complexity of the problem demands additional research.\(^2\) The major elements of a particular project problem—the water cycle, water dynamics, water economics, and land influences—should be studied analytically by specialists. I suggested at one time that Agriculture should make possible graduate studies at our technical institutions for our personnel, as is the case of the Army Engineers.

---

\(^1\) November 25, 1939, letter to Regional Conservator, Soil Conservation Service, Albuquerque and Memorandum of January 12, 1940, to Mr. Wleking in reference to Rio Grande surveys. See Appendix.

\(^2\) Land Use in Flood Control, Arthur C. Ringland and Otto E. Guthe. 1941 Yearbook, Department of Agriculture. Ringland papers.
Appropriations for Operations

Ringland: In March of 1938 the President asked the Secretary of Agriculture how soon he could go forward with the upstream engineering and land-use phases of a flood control program. The Secretary informed the President that by July 1, 1938, the Department would be prepared to undertake comprehensive control work on a number of critical watersheds if special funds were available.¹

Senator Hayden wrote the Secretary of Agriculture on or about April 21, 1938, asking for advice on an amendment which would permit Agriculture to share with the Army in the $37 million which the President had earmarked for flood control.

On Saturday the 23rd of April, the Senator's secretary called me in haste to say that the Senate Appropriations Committee would meet on Monday.² Immediate advice was necessary for there was no time to answer the letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I said we were prepared to spend four million dollars on operations though no more. The Coordination Committee was of one mind on this point but we hoped to expand our funds with CCC and WPA labor and meet the President's desires. President Roosevelt,³ Morris Cooke and Robert Fechner⁴ had emphasized the usefulness of the CCC in watershed control work. And fourteen years earlier, Frank W. Olmstead, Consulting Engineer, Gila River Flood Control wrote: "The peril of firing tabulations of disconnected data

¹Extracts from the Secretary's letter of March 16, 1938, to the President. Appendix.

²Memorandum to Mr. Wieking from Ringland.

³March 21, 1933, extract of message to Congress by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

⁴March 30, 1938, extract of address in Philadelphia.
and unread reports at the destructive forces of nature should have about passed, and an actual constructive warfare begun...the building of small retarding structures by young men interested in conservation work..." That was in 1919, reported in Senate Document No. 436, 65th Congress. And this recalls the philosophy of William James and George Maxwell on the employment of young men.¹

An understanding² was worked out to authorize not-to-exceed four million dollars, to be available until expended, for works of improvement for measures of run-off and水流 retardation and soil erosion prevention upon the watersheds of waterways for which works of improvement have been or may hereafter be authorized by law.

On June 11, 1938, the War Department Civil Functions Appropriations Act provided the $4,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture available until expended for watershed improvement upon waterways authorized by Congress. The appropriation permitted control operations upon certain watersheds of high flood hazard, such as the Los Angeles area, concurrently with the War Department.

Fortunately, the appropriation was made available until expended, for it was not until 1940 that even the first operating plans only were submitted for formal approval; these were for the Los Angeles project. Yet I had counted on seeing the CCC and WPA men at work by October 1939 as urged by Kotok, Redick, and me to supplement expenditures from an allotment from the $4,000,000 appropriation for construction.

The enabling flood control legislation of 1936 and the flood control acts of 1937 and 1938 were the authorities which directed the Secretary


² Memorandum to Mr. Wieking, April 23, 1938, with attachment of May 19, 1938. Appendix.
Ringland: of War and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out an integrated and correlated national flood control program. It should be noted that Senator Hayden agreed to an overdraft to the Act of 1938 providing for Agriculture authority for an appropriation without annual limitations. And in consultation with Senator Hatch a further amendment authorized Agriculture to carry out works on the watersheds of the Rio Grande and Pecos Rivers.

The Los Angeles Watershed Control Project

Ingersoll: You have spoken of the flood control problem in the Los Angeles area as one of the first priority. Would you comment specifically, in view of its importance?

Ringland: Yes, and I want for this reason to comment in detail. At the outset it is pertinent to quote from the report of the Army Engineers on the plan of flood control for Los Angeles County. You will understand from this why our program has always given the Los Angeles Project the first priority.

The populous city of Los Angeles and its suburbs are situated on a fertile plain which is under a more dangerous flood menace than any similar region in the United States. ...The rains are torrential, transferring the streams, normally dry or of little volume into raging torrents which transport soil, gravel, and boulders scouring the channels and flooding the lowlands. The impetus and fierceness of these floods can be likened to that of a discharge of a bursting dam.

1 May 26, 1938 (two memoranda) amendments to Section 7, H.R. 10618 and talk with Senator Hayden and his acceptance.

2 Consultation with Senator Hatch, and amendment to Section 7, H.R. 10618.
At the hearings before the House Flood Control Committee in the Spring of 1939, Congressman Vocrihees expressed great impatience on the slowness of the Agriculture Department in undertaking operations on the Los Angeles Project despite authority and funds that had been available for two or three years. He pointed out that the Army Engineers were working at full speed. Congressman Sheppard also expressed in private conversation with me, and much more emphatically, the same impatience. I told these gentlemen that I would go to California immediately and consult with them on my return.

I did so, and spent some weeks in an intensive field study of the Los Angeles group of watersheds (Los Angeles, San Gabriel and Santa Ana Rivers) working in daily contact with the staff of the Department's California Flood Control Committee headed by co-chairmen E.I. Kotok of the Forest Service and Harry Redick of the Soil Conservation Service. And too, together with these committee members with the State Advisory Committee, the Flood Control Committee of the State Chamber of Commerce, the Flood Control Committee of the Los Angeles County Chamber of Commerce, the Conservation Association of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, the WPA Administrator for Southern California, the Regional Forester of the Forest Service, and the Division and District Engineers of the Army.

I found myself in complete accord with the conclusion of Kotok and Redick, two competent and experienced senior officials. Their findings were reflected in a special report to Washington,\(^1\) which was fully discussed with me before my return. Let me quote here, Mrs. Ingersoll, some of the highlights:

> More than three years after the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1936 the Department is still lacking a satisfactory recommendation for an action

---

\(^1\)Report of June 3, 1939 to the Chairman, Flood Control Coordinating Committee, from E.I. Kotok and Harry Redick, Co-chairmen California Field Committees 18 and 20. Appendix.
program in this area and finds itself with no work underway or in immediate prospect on a watershed which admittedly presents one of the greatest flood hazards in the entire country.

And then they added that this is the situation.

In spite of the fact that on the flood plain of these watersheds the Los Angeles County Flood Control District has already spent $68 million, and that the Army Engineers are engaged in the expenditure of an additional $70 million on a program which it is anticipated will eventually exceed $230 millions.... Unhappily even a layman can still see at the mouths of many canyons draining into the plain the destructive effects of the 1938 flood, much of which originated on national forest lands which have been under control of this Department for nearly 50 years.... It seems incontestable that this situation should be met without delay on a basis comparable with its gravity.... We feel that we cannot go into another year in this area without initiating an action program if we are to maintain public confidence in the Department.... During Mr. Ringland's visit to this region we went into these matters very thoroughly and we are confident he will add his personal endorsement to the viewpoint that we take. He felt, as we do, that it is absolutely essential to submit for approval to the Secretary a program for immediate action, and we now propose the submission of such a program.

Immediately following my return around the first of June 1939 to Washington, I submitted a memorandum report to Dr. Tolley. 1 There was no flood control problem anywhere in the country

---

1 June 8, 1939, memorandum for Dr. Tolley, Chief, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Appendix.
Ringland: comparable to that in the Los Angeles area where so many lives and valuable property were in constant danger. And in this respect reference was made to the impatience of the House Flood Control Committee because of slowness in undertaking operations, and to complaints that had come from the Water Resources Committee. \(^1\) It was my opinion, I said, that the Los Angeles Project situation was primarily due to structural deficiencies in the present type of organization (Departmental) for flood control. Even so the Kotok and Redick report of June 3, 1939, to our Committee now presented a well-designed plan of action that would minimize, they emphasized, further delay and expense, a plan that would appeal to the President. It would too be supported by the local people because it provided a project of the highest possible necessity and contributed to the relief of an acute social problem. There were 72,000 people on relief in Los Angeles County alone. Moreover the Army had asked for assistance to protect as far as possible the millions invested in their works, a correlation expected by Congress, and one that could not be too long delayed.

The survey for the Los Angeles River watershed was finally received October 11, 1939. On October 26 I reported to my Committee that it was evident that an orderly procedure must be developed at once for the analysis and evaluation of the Los Angeles report. The Department's problem was to an overwhelming degree in the mountain areas, that we should go ahead now and present an action plan for the approval of the Secretary for such mountain areas, and present later a supplementary action program for the valley if such could be justified for flood control purposes. It would be indefensible, however, to delay action on the mountain phases awaiting a report on valley treatment. I emphasized, as I had before, the imperative necessity to go forward on at least one flood control project. The Department was committed

---

\(^1\) June 8, 1939, memorandum of telephone conversation between Captain Peranga, Corps of Engineers and Ringland. Appendix.
to the Los Angeles Project by our statements before the budget and Congress over the years.\(^1\)

In a memorandum of December 27, 1939, to Mr. Wieking, with a copy to Mr. Eisenhower, I said that the Los Angeles report would have been in the Washington office for nearly three months and without final action; that Congressman Voorhees and Sheppard had been promised action by October. Congress was to open January 2, and I agreed with Mr. Eisenhower that the Secretary must take action before the House and Senate committee hearings commence. I added that the next CCC period commenced March 1 but obviously plans for change in the camp program must be made far in advance. (Kotok and Redick proposed the assignment of 2000 CCC enrollees to begin October 1 in the mountain phase.) Finally I pointed out the length of time consumed on surveys and the great cost—not due to the competency of the individuals, the delays and the costs, and that applies as well to the delays and difficulties of the review of reports in Washington—was due to the impossible structure of the present organization.\(^2\)

You will recall my reference to memoranda of October 26, 1939, and of December 27, 1939, urging the imperative necessity to start now on an action program in the Los Angeles area—the mountain phases and not await a program for valley treatment. Nevertheless, as late as June 5, 1940, in response to an invitation from Mr. Utz of the Soil Conservation Service, who followed me when I withdrew as Chairman, I submitted a detailed analysis of the proposed operations including mountain and valley treatment within the Los Angeles Project.\(^3\)

My objection was directed not to the mountain operation (the Arroyo Seco), the urgency of which

\(^1\)October 26, 1939. Committee Memorandum, Los Angeles Flood Control Survey Report.

\(^2\)December 27, 1939, Memorandum for Mr. Wieking, Los Angeles Flood Control Survey Report. Appendix.

\(^3\)June 5, 1940. Memo to Mr. Utz. See Appendix.
was reported by Kotok and Redick in their report of June 3, 1939, and which had my warm support, but to the valley treatment (the San Fernando). I challenged the economic justification of an expenditure of $1,314,265, or $13 an acre, of Federal funds in this valley as a flood protection measure for 100,000 acres of agricultural lands, and I cited the comments of the State Engineer of California, the Chief Engineer of the Los Angeles Flood Control District, and of the Army District Engineer. The Los Angeles Flood Control District maintains all flood control channels from the San Fernando Valley to the ocean. From their experience with such work they believe no major flood problem is created by fine silt movement from agricultural land, "that most of it moves on to the ocean instead of being deposited in water channels and flood control structures, and that silt from this source does not constitute a major or important flood hazard." The lands in question are entirely within the limits of Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles.

As of December 1, 1939, the Los Angeles County Flood Control District had expended over $57 millions, the City of Los Angeles over $29 millions from local funds, and over $27 millions additionally from other sources. I pointed out that if the damages from the movement of fine silt were so serious it may be wondered why the County and the City have not made provision for protection at a relatively insignificant cost compared to expenditures made. The explanation may be that the problem of siltation was not considered sufficiently serious. As is well known the Los Angeles agricultural area is one of the richest in the country. I felt that if any inducement was necessary to the citrus growers, let it come from the demonstration work of the Soil Conservation Service; but to me it was quite significant that as yet no soil conservation districts had been organized in the Los Angeles agricultural area.

Flood Control funds available and in sight were so limited that they were needed, first, in the mountain area of the Los Angeles watershed where the impact of debris flows in the canyons, with a gradient as high as 3,000 feet to the mile have resulted in loss of lives and enormous
Ringland: destruction of property. Contrast the statement in the Los Angeles survey report as presented, that "...recently burned watersheds when visited by heavy rains have yielded up to 150,000 cubic yards of debris per square mile during a single storm," with a maximum of only 9,000 cubic yards per square mile of fine silt moving off slopes of 0-10 percent in the San Fernando valley.

I noted, and I have just picked up one of the comments made in a joint letter of March 6, 1940, to the chairman of our California committee from the dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of California and the chief of the Water Resources Division of the State of California:

Our conclusions fall short of your recommendations, chiefly questioning the use of flood control funds for those parts of the program that seem to us to have doubtful relation to flood control. We propose that the recommended program for valley land treatment insofar as it relates to private agricultural lands be carried out on a basis of cooperative soil conservation projects similar to those carried out in many counties of the state, rather than along the lines specifically recommended in the survey report. In questioning the use of flood control funds where flood control benefits seem to us to be doubtful, we have acted on the assumption that the amount of such funds likely to be appropriated by Congress for us in California will be far less than needed to cope with upstream flood conditions on streams where flood damages are serious.¹

From another memorandum it is interesting to bring out a comment by the Army on the Agriculture Department's survey of the Los Angeles River watershed. I want to quote this, and it's interesting to see that they spoke in terms of a prophet:

¹Included in memo Ringland to Utz, June 5, 1940, p. 2. See Appendix.
Ringland: If our estimate of the future trend in Los Angeles is correct, a large part of what is now agricultural land will gradually be changed to a suburban agricultural use. We believe that before embarking on any large expenditures for this portion of the program, joint study should be made with the local interests, such as the Regional Planning Commission, to determine areas where this normal change in use is likely to occur.¹

I haven't had an opportunity to look at this area in recent years, but I believe it's pretty well built up.

I would like to add that I felt, in my comments to Mr. Utz, that not only should our program be guided by projects in order of urgency, as directed by the President—and of course the Los Angeles project, including the San Gabriel and Santa Ana watersheds, qualified as first—but likewise we should be guided by the priorities of work within a project, specifically:

Our meager flood control funds should be conserved for the mountain phases of the Los Angeles project, including the San Gabriel and Santa Ana watersheds, and the debris basins and minor channel improvements along the foothills, including the so-called community construction as a protection of agricultural lands. Otherwise, our flood control work would have no definitive technical, economic, or budgetary limitations, and there will be confusion with the regular programs of the Department of Agriculture, especially of the Soil Conservation Service.²

¹Included in memo Ringland to Utz, June 5, 1940, p. 4. Appendix.
²Ringland to Utz, June 5, 1940, p. 9. See Appendix.
Ingersoll: Am I right, having looked over your memos to Mr. Utz, that the problem, as you saw it, was the use of funds which had been appropriated for flood control to do the normal work of the Department of Agriculture that would have been done in any case, and that probably should have come from the Department's own budget rather than the special flood control budget?

Ringland: That would apply to the Los Angeles Project and would, if carried out, establish a bad precedent for general application. It is pertinent to quote the following:

Through proper coordination land-use programs can effectively further the objectives of a national flood control program, particularly through the work of the Soil Conservation Service and the soil conservation districts; it is fostering, and the land acquisition of the Forest Service.\(^1\)

While technology has made tremendous advance, as you know, we must reckon with the political aspects. The general application of watershed control measures must, in places, meet the problem of coordinating the political relationships of the Federal, state, county, and municipal agencies, complicated too by the interests of land owners. Notable, however, has been the legislative enactments in 36 states which permit farmers and land owners to organize soil conservation districts. I believe Philip Glick of the Soil Conservation Service was the one who contributed to this significant landmark in conservation.

Ingersoll: Were such political relationships part of the program for your Committee?

Ringland: While we were aware of the problem, our study was academic, for we had not reached the operating phase; but if you consider the Los Angeles Project,

\(^1\)Application of the Department's Program under the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, p. 4. (See I, Development of Flood Control Legislation).
Ringland: for example, we knew it would require formal cooperation with the county, city and land owners, and a division of the costs, save in some of the small basins within the Los Angeles National Forest.

Ingersoll: As a result of these comments of yours, was the project changed in any way?

Ringland: I understand only that it was not carried out as originally projected, that is, in the manner proposed and with the appropriations involved. But I believe that the discussions were helpful in drawing the line between the use of emergent flood control funds and the conservation of agricultural lands not directly related to and an essential part of a flood control project.

Ingersoll: Shall we just put this whole memo of June 5, 1940, to Mr. Utz in the appendix so that people can refer to that? It's a very interesting note.

Ringland: I may conclude that Kotok and Redick said in their report of June 3, 1939: "We feel that we cannot go into another year in this area (Los Angeles) without initiating an action program if we are to maintain public confidence in the Department."

Well, another year and then some did pass. Four years after the enactment of the enabling Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, the Department presented to the President for approval the first operation plans. These were for works in the mountain basin of the Arroyo Seco and in the San Fernando Valley, partial phases of the Los Angeles Watershed Control Project.
Conclusion

Ingersoll: Do you have any thought, Mr. Ringland, about what this period of flood control coordination meant in the whole wider, longer development of flood control organization?

Ringland: My thoughts go back to an earlier period, to 1907 when Senator Newlands pioneered legislation for the development of water resources, "from the spring to the mouth"; to 1925 and Herbert Hoover's concern for water pollution and his proposal for an inventory of our rivers; to 1936 and Senator Copeland's conference with the White House and the part Senator Hayden, Senator Norris and Congressman Ferguson played in including, for the first time, "watersheds thereof" in the declaration of policy respecting the flood control of waterways and their tributaries. And I should add the help of Judge Whittington, Chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the House.

The pioneer efforts of these statesmen are now fortified by a developing national policy that embraces in its compass all aspects of the management of water and its related resources of river basins: control of flood-waters, pollution and water quality, protection of estuaries and tidal waters, recreation use of ponds and storage lakes, as examples.

This is reflected politically in constructive legislation since the recognition of upstream engineering in the charter Flood Control Act of 1936. The Flood Control Act of 1944 provided for revegetation of pilot projects through land use treatment and engineering work, and through small headwaters impoundments carried out by the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service in cooperation with local interests, public and private, and land owners. The Hope-Aiken Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1955, labeled the Small Watersheds Act, provided enabling legislation of great potential for small watershed management in the light of hydrologic knowledge developed over the years since the Thirties when
the Flood Control Coordinating Committee was struggling with inadequate data. In recognition of this problem our Committee initiated cooperation with the Weather Bureau (which they had urged from the beginning), the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the Geological Survey, the Reclamation Service and the Army Engineers. If investments in upstream watershed control were to serve the public interest, research on the behavior of water and its flood potentials was dictated.

Federal legislation to control pollution and establish water quality standards in cooperation with political units, states, county and municipalities is furthered by wide-spread public support.¹

It is of interest to remark here that Senator Hayden who did so much in 1936 to provide authority to control run-off and soil retardation of the watersheds of waterways of flood potential, has now under his leadership made possible legislative authority to bring the waters of the Colorado River to the desert areas of central Arizona.

The National Watershed Congress for the past fifteen years has, through its annual meetings, promoted this support which is reflected in the concept of river basin planning and interstate river compacts. This embraces not alone water management but that of related resources. This means integral conservation of the waterways and their tributary watersheds, a consideration of the application of ecological and biological principles to complement engineering works.²

"By water everything lives." This precept of the Koran is one that we too must appreciate.


PART II

Conservation of Human Resources
PART II CONSERVATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES

AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION - POST WORLD WAR I

Czechoslovakia-European Children's Fund (1919-21)

Ingersoll: Mr. Ringland, your work for so many years was the conservation of natural resources. What made you change after the war? What happened that got you into the relief field with Hoover?

Ringland: It was mere chance. I was still in the Army and on leave in Paris after convalescence from pneumonia when I met an old friend, Lieutenant Philip Platt. Philip told me that he was leaving the next day for Prague, where he was to be attached to the mission of the American Relief Administration European Children's Fund. He said, "If you're not keen about going home right away" (and I wasn't, because I was completely footloose), "why don't you get in touch with the personnel officer of the A.R.A.; they are recruiting people now for service in Eastern Europe." I did so immediately and was well received.

The first suggestion was that I join a party that was going, I believe, to the Baltic. But since I had just recovered from a severe case of pneumonia, it was thought more prudent that I go to the more clement climate of Czechoslovakia. Of course I was glad of that, because my friend Platt would be there, too.

I was given an interesting document, a letter of identity certified by Herbert Hoover and dated May 19, 1919, testifying that I was traveling in behalf of the United States Food Administration, of which he was the Director General, and that my travel was for the sole purpose of food relief. The document went on to request that I be allowed to pass freely and given protection and information to forward the purposes of my travel.¹

¹Hoover Passport, May 19, 1919, Appendix 1.
Arrival in Prague

Ringland: As I recall it, I arrived in Prague on May 21, 1919. I met on my journey Lt. Willis Nolan, assigned by the Army to the Prague mission as I was. Willis enjoys the special distinction of having been wounded in the heel, just like Achilles, while at the front. Our arrival was a joyous one at the main railway station, recently renamed in honor of President Wilson; the station swarmed with young women in colorful peasant costumes. I don't know what the occasion really was (although Willis and I liked to think that it was in our honor!), but I later observed that, even in times of hardship, the ebullient Czechs were always ready for a celebration. As we drove into the city and saw the historic Hradcany Castle on the skyline and the Gothic, Romanesque and baroque architecture of the buildings flanking the slopes of the Vltava, I could understand why Humboldt listed Prague among the most beautiful cities in the world.

Our first office was on a main thoroughfare, the Narody Trida. Later, we were given quarters in the Kinsky Palace. The window of my office looked down upon the statue of Jon Hus, facing the town hall. Often I watched the procession of saints marking the hours as they marched across the face of the clock in the town hall. For his religious convictions Jon Hus was burned at the stake, as we know, some five centuries ago. Sometimes, as I looked upon the face of this martyr, I wondered if we are not in this century engaging in barbarism equally reactionary as in the 15th century; and I may add with far less excuse!

My first assignment was as assistant to the Chief of the A.R.A. European Children's Fund Captain Shaw; later I succeeded him in this position. The head of the Czechoslovak Technical Mission was Dr. Lincoln Hutchinson, a distinguished member of the faculty of the University of California. He and several of us of the Mission leased an attractive villa on the heights overlooking Prague. There we held forth during the summer months—Philip Platt, Roy Wheeler, Ivar Wahren, Prentice Terry, Willis
Ringland: Nolen, Will Shaxroth and myself. But in winter we leased an apartment in town at Mariánská Ulice 19. It had been the apartment of a sugar magnate and was very spacious. We could and did on occasion seat eighteen at dinner.

Benes and Masaryk Views of Need

Ingersoll: When I read Hoover’s memoirs about this particular period in Czechoslovakia, I found it rather interesting that Dr. Benes, the Foreign Minister, should have had the illusion that there was no need for relief in Czechoslovakia, that the soil could produce enough, that the people by economy would have enough.¹ Yet Thomas Masaryk, the President, within 1918 or early the following year, did ask for this aid from Hoover and his Commission. Do you have any way of explaining the difference in the views of Benes and Masaryk at that time?

Ringland: I recall the statement which Dr. Benes made. He was then the Foreign Minister. It’s impossible to reconcile that with the actual facts, because of course the new Czech Government was asking for credits in order to import food to support its rationing system and otherwise to get the country on its feet. Except in its eastern tip, the country had not suffered any direct war damage, but the war had grievously affected it economically; the disorganization of industries and trade that followed resulted in serious unemployment, increased prices, and scarcity of food and clothing. All of this was particularly reflected in the cities where the incidence of undernourished children was alarmingly high.

So I’ve wondered about Benes’ statement that you mentioned just now. As I’ve shown you in my

documents, there's a personal letter from Dr. Benes to me. And I might add here a letter of May 20, 1920 to me from Dr. Tusar, the Prime Minister, in which he wrote, "You came to us at a moment of cruel distress." 1

Ingersoll: Yes, appreciating very much the work that had been done.

Ringland: It's an odd thing.

Ingersoll: You worked as assistant chief of children's relief in the beginning, is that right?

Ringland: Yes. I did.

Ingersoll: That's the position you held for a year and a half or so?

Ringland: No, not that long, only a few weeks or months. As a matter of fact, the program was initiated in April of 1919 and in September I became the chief, if not sooner.

Ingersoll: You then stayed the head of the European Children's Fund in Czechoslovakia until about the middle of 1922. Right?

Ringland: No, through the winter of 1921 into the spring of '22. That is when I went to Constantinople.

Dual Purpose of Relief

Ingersoll: I understand that there were perhaps two reasons for the organization of this relief work in Czechoslovakia— one, of course, to give relief and aid to the people, the other perhaps to try to halt the spread of Communism. Would this be your view of the situation, that it had the combined purpose?

1Tusar, Prime Minister. Appendix 2.
Ringland: Not really. The primary purpose was relief and to assist in the rehabilitation of the Czech economy. There was of course a possibility of danger, and it did develop while the A.R.A. was in Hungary, and Budapest was seized by Bela Kun and Slovakia was invaded. Kun's was a Bolshevik regime and it ultimately fell. The stabilization of economic and political conditions helped to ward off any westward spread of the Russian Revolution. But this was a political by-product; the main purpose of our action was to relieve human distress.

Ingersoll: Would your feeling be that Bela Kun and others like him would have had a greater chance of spreading Communism at that time if this relief hadn't been helping the people to build themselves up?

Ringland: Isn't it a truism that the field is fertile where there's disorder?

Ingersoll: I would certainly feel that it is, yes.

Organization of Relief

Ingersoll: Can you give us a little picture of what the important aspects of this work in Prague were?

Ringland: The work of the A.R.A. in Czechoslovakia was twofold in character. One essential aspect, and one in which our technical advisers played an active part, was the reorganization or establishment of economic relations between Czechoslovakia and the neighboring nations during the formative years of the new government. Transport was arranged between many frontiers; barter agreements were perfected—Czech sugar for Polish potatoes, and Czech coal for Vienna in exchange for raw materials from Austria. This vital aspect of our work was under the charge of Dr. Lincoln Hutchinson, Chief of the Technical Mission in Czechoslovakia, and of the technical advisers who worked with him on economic relationships. The other aspect was
Ringland: our show, the European Children's Fund.

Ingersoll: How was the European Children's Fund organized particularly in relation to the Czechs?

Ringland: The supplies that supported the European Children's Fund were gifts from America, from voluntary contributions, and a Congressional appropriation, supplemented by contributions mostly of flour and sugar from the Czech government, and a gift of cod oil from Norway. This support is to be distinguished from the general relief extended to the government for its rationing system and made possible through credits.

Child Welfare

The Children's Fund was organized in the field through the development of a national Czech committee known as the Pece o Dite, or Child Welfare in April of 1919. Thomas Masaryk, the President of the Republic, was the honorary head, and the active head was the Minister of Social Welfare, Dr. Ler Winter, working with the Food Minister, Dr. Edward Houdek, and Dr. Alice Masaryk, the daughter of the President. She was also the head of the Czechoslovak Red Cross. Dr. Anton Sum was the General Secretary of Pece o Dite, supported by Dr. Karel Fahoun, Secretary of the Food Ministry.

Local Leadership

A general framework of relief was developed and branch warehouses established throughout the country for shipments from the central warehouse at Aussig to Plzen, Brno, Opava, Bratislava, Mukacevo, Kosice, Karlovy Vary, serving the provinces of Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia and Ruthenia. The Pece o Dite, together with our
personnel and supplemented by a number of young women from the American Red Cross, established several thousand committees in every town and village throughout the country.

Am I right in thinking that your wife was one of these young women with the Red Cross teams that came from France to assist with the organization?

Yes, Dorothy Gerberding, who later became my wife, came to Prague. When they completed their work, she was taken over on the staff of Dr. Hutchinson.

Going back to the local committees, how many of these do you think there were?

The number was approximately 2,500 supervising that number of kitchens in Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, Slovakia and Ruthenia. It should be emphasized that these local committees were made up eventually of 15,000 public spirited men and women representing all parties, creeds and activities in the national life of the country. It was they who actually supervised the kitchens. The Czechs provided the equipment for these kitchens; but, save for the cooks, all those who worked in the kitchens were volunteers.

Would your thought be that these were people who were used to some local leadership function, that they were people who were used to making decisions, or do you think this was new to them?

I suppose there were in every community some outstanding persons who had served in one form or other, during the war years in some capacity, such as the Red Cross. Then, of course, the crisis itself brought out the leaders. To me that was the most impressive phase of the whole operation.

Can you develop that a little further, just how these local people acted?

Yes. I will outline the organization, which, starting from the personal interest of President Masaryk himself, ran right down to the smallest village committee. Note that the social fabric of Czechoslovakia had not been broken down materially by the war. There was available a highly competent personnel accustomed to organization and to well-developed social services. You must bear in mind
Ringland: the distinction between the Czechs, the Slovaks, and the Ruthenians, although all found themselves within the boundaries of the new Czechoslovak republic.

Dr. Josef Gruber pointed out in 1924 that Czechoslovakia, as one of the succession states of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, substantially maintained in both legal status and organization the child welfare institutions established by the laws of the old Empire.¹

Ingersoll: Did the children's relief program attempt to reach all the varied groups—the Czechs, the Slovaks, and the Ruthenians?

Ringland: Yes, the fact that the Czechs and the Germans of Bohemia and Moravia were educated and cultured people, while under the Hungarian regime the Slovaks were, in general, less so, and the Ruthenians largely illiterate, meant that you couldn't expect the same response. In an inspection of a Ruthenian committee's work, we found that the cocoa that had been sent was being used in one village to paint the schoolhouse! The backwardness of the people of Ruthenia, the illiteracy, the control of the peasant economy in the hands of a few, and the primitive conditions were evident. We were accompanied by my old friend, Arthur Du Bois of the State Department who had gone with Secretary Lansing to Paris, and by Dr. Selkar Gunn of the Rockefeller Foundation who was making a health survey in cooperation with the Prague Government. We were hosted in the same hotel in Mukacevo. Late one night I saw a light was still on in Gunn's room. I knocked and he called out for me to enter. There the surveyor of public health was seated in a chair, wrapped in a sheet, and reading. He was holding an umbrella over his head to shelter himself from bed-bugs dropping from the ceiling and the walls. I had no umbrella and retreated. We were all fearful of typhus and typhoid, following the occupancy of the armies. The food was so suspect that we peeled our fruit and shelled our eggs. Happily we left the hotel and were hosted in the great hunting lodge of Count Schonbrun, a Hungarian nobleman.

¹Gruber, Dr. Josef, Czechoslovakia, McMillan, 1924.
Ringland: Ruthenia, Podkarpatska Rus-Russia under the Carpathians, is now a part of the Soviet Union coterminous with Slovakia and strategically commanding. An army officer told us that, in 1918 when the Russians attempted to break into the Danube Plain, they were stopped and slaughtered at the crest of the Carpathians when they ran out of ammunition.

The peak of the work was reached in the winter of '20 to '21 when more than 500,000 were being fed daily.

Relief to Intellectuals

Since we are talking of organization, in addition to the provision of supplies to kitchens and the direct feeding of children a daily high-energy soup ration with biscuits and cocoa on the side, there were other relief measures which had influence. In 1920 a national Czechoslovak committee was formed representative of professional societies which recommended the cases of individuals or families among the intellectual classes in most need of relief. These were the college professors, especially from the universities at Prague and Brno, and throughout the professions, doctors, lawyers, school teachers, journalists, actors, musicians, engineers, architects, artists, authors--some of whom were in pretty dire straits, without employment and families of disabled and fallen officers. It was possible to bring assistance to them through the gifts to Mr. Hoover of the Commonwealth Fund at home.

Ingersoll: Do you remember whose idea it was to provide for these particular people?

Ringland: It must have developed not merely in Czechoslovakia, because I know the same activity was carried out in Austria. It probably developed in the London office or perhaps in New York itself. There must have been appeals, as of course there were, to universities and scholars. That spurred the committee formed in Prague in 1920 of which I have
Ringland: spoken. The intellectuals were aided largely through food supplies, probably the equivalent of several hundred thousand meals were given this group. It was a rather substantial number.

Ingersoll: Do you think this was thought of as a way of preserving the leadership or the potential leadership of these countries?

Ringland: I would think so, because after all it was they who would have to rehabilitate the economy, an essential part of the population.

Ingersoll: Were these people having a more difficult time than other urban people were?

Ringland: I would say so. Let me make a broad contrast there. Coal was an essential resource, and one of the mining areas was at Kladno. One of the first things that the Children's Fund did there was to provide relief to the miners' children and then later provision was made for the miners, for their production was so essential to get industry going and railroads running. Then there was the crisis in Vienna, which was without coal. There you have on the one hand an essential class, and on the other these intellectuals whose employment was not immediately possible but whose potential was essential.

Ingersoll: There were really short-term objectives in terms of essential work and longer term objectives to be fulfilled. It sounds like very wise planning went into much of this.

Ringland: One was immediate and the other was potential, and each had to be met at the time. That was one phase of it aside from the direct food relief to the children. Also, a limited number were provided with shoes, stockings, and cloth to be made into coats. Through the Peace o Dite the tailors' cooperatives were brought into the picture, some 1,500 tailors working in providing these coats. They in turn were helped out with food relief.

A very important kind of direct relief to individuals were food drafts.
Food Drafts

Ingersoll: What were food drafts?

Ringland: A food draft was almost, in its operation, like a draft that you might buy here for foreign payment abroad. It was a plan developed by Mr. Hoover through the cooperation of the bankers at home.

Mr. Hoover pointed out that the buyer of the draft would be charged the factory cost of the food plus a reasonable margin to cover the cost of insurance and transportation. The profits would be turned over to the A.R.A.-European Children's Fund. You could walk into any bank in America when the plan got into swing in January of 1920 and buy a food draft for $10 or $50 and send that to an individual or an organization overseas, and the recipient could draw the value of that in food from our warehouses. This food was of maximum nutritional value—flour, beans, bacon, milk, lard, corned beef, cottonseed oil, sugar, and cocoa. The packages could be drawn not only from warehouses in Czechoslovakia but in Austria, Hungary and Poland at that time where the A.R.A. operated. The drafts provided food when its scarcity locally made it difficult for the average person to buy with the money at his command, and when probably the only place to buy, to supplement the government ration, was the black market. It was unwise as well as extremely difficult at that time to send money abroad, for this would have made additional demands on local supplies and again would have aided the black market.

Ingersoll: Was this the first time this system had ever been used?

Ringland: I'm sure it was. It was an essential supplement to the government's rationing system. The food came from the outside, and so did the money that paid for it. Here I should like to add the name of William Wharton of Massachusetts, who contributed generously and continuously. Later when at home, I had a helpful relation with him because of his active part in the work of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation.
Ingersoll: It sounds to me as though this might have been a precedent for the system, perhaps with modifications, that was later used in the CARE program. Is that right?

Ringland: Yes, certainly, because of its success, it prompted consideration of some sort of similar scheme at the time I was on the staff of the President's War Relief Control Board during the Second World War. Under somewhat different circumstances, we worked out a plan which I would like to elaborate when we talk over the work of the President's War Relief Control Board.

Methods Adjusted to Abilities of Cultural Groups

Ingersoll: Going back to a remark you made about the vast difference there was between the educational levels and the degree of initiative taken by people like the Czechs or the Ruthenians, what methods did you have to use among the Ruthenians, for instance, to get the mission accomplished? I think this has some interesting implications for what's being done in the underdeveloped world now.

Ringland: As I have pointed out, the Czechs, and the Germans in Czechoslovakia, were able to organize without much difficulty. But Ruthenia was an extremely primitive province, with the illiteracy running high, high in the nineties. Relief work there was a direct operation with whatever inspection we could provide with the cooperation of a few Czech officials from Prague. We did, however, enjoy the good will and help, to the extent possible, of the political head, Mr. Zachovich who was an American of Slovak origin. He was an interesting character grappling with a difficult situation. Mrs. Zachovich was homesick for Pittsburgh and said she missed the Ladies Home Journal.

Ingersoll: What was the ration given out by the relief workers?
Ringland: Soup, milk, rice, fat, and flour supplemented by a biscuit of milk, fat, flour and sugar, with cocoa sweetened with milk. This ration was available also to ailing mothers and pregnant women and constituted about a third of daily requirements. Additionally, cod liver oil and soap were provided for hospital patients.

Techniques to Determine Eligibility

Ingersoll: What sort of techniques did you use to determine the eligibility of children to be fed?

Ringland: We, that is the American, Czech and German personnel working together, developed a corps of physicians, who undertook monthly examinations of the children to determine their progress. Interestingly, out of the physical examinations of the children, the famed pediatrician, Dr. von Pirquet of Vienna, developed a gauge of the condition of malnutrition, a technique based on the sitting height of a child and some related co-efficient to the digestive process.

In some cases where the necessity to feed was greater than the immediate resource available, those who had approached a normal condition were displaced by the children who were obviously suffering from malnutrition or even rachitic diseases. Their condition was rather obvious; you could see their distended bellies. But on the whole these records had a great value, showing ultimately that the whole operation had met its objective not only in improving the physical condition of the children, but also their mental activity.

Parenthetically, and this is a long-range right now, I think we at home today have not fully appreciated the fact that we need something like that on a far wider scale in our school lunch programs. At present through our Department of Agriculture, we are providing for some 19,000,000 children but the Department reports about 10 million are in cities and rural areas without feeding
Ringland: facilities. Programs are now running successfully in Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries and in Czechoslovakia too.

I should point out that the work of the A.R.A. had an influence in Czechoslovakia more lasting than emergency relief. There was recognition by the government and the people that there was a public obligation to provide for the physical development of the child as well as for his mental development.

In the closing days of our mission we cooperated with the government in the provision of a law for the continuance of child feeding. It was based on a plan of cooperation between the government and the cities which wished to avail themselves of the opportunity.

Obstacles

Ingersoll: What were some of the obstacles to your operation that developed?

Frozen Rivers

Ringland: They were physical rather than political. One was during the winter of 1920 when the Elbe was so frozen that the barges could not come up the river to Usti (Aussig), a central shipping point. This form of transport had been agreed upon between the Allies and Germany to provide that supplies to Czechoslovakia and other inland countries should be landed in Hamburg and those for Czechoslovakia shipped by barge up the Elbe River to Usti. This was the natural route and largely avoided use of the inadequate port and rail facilities of the Adriatic and the southern rail route from Trieste. When the barges were unable to move and consequently not only our supplies for the children but those for the civilian population as a whole were blocked,
Ringland: I was asked to consult with the authorities in Berlin to obtain rail transport.

Ingersoll: Was this successful?

Ringland: Yes, it was. In order to give me an added bit of prestige, I traveled in a private railway car. In Berlin I met an A.R.A. colleague, Allan Goldsmith. Allan had grown up as a boy in Berlin, where his father was the head of a great American insurance company; so he spoke German as well as he spoke English. Arrangements were made, and we had a helpful interview with President Ebert, popularly known as the "Honest Saddler." Through him we had appointments with the Food Minister and the Minister of Railways. It was the latter in whom the answer lay. I'm sorry I can't give his name, because in one respect he left an indelible impression.

Ingersoll: What respect was that?

Ringland: After we had put the situation before him, there was a pause, and he turned away. Then, when he faced us again, he said, "Yes, rail transport will be provided. You may like to know why. I must tell you; my son died of malnutrition."

The Usti (Aussig) Demonstration

Ingersoll: Mr. Ringland, in the course of your work in Czechoslovakia, was there ever a time that conditions got so bad that there was rioting or anything like that?

Ringland: There was an incident that had certain aspects which might have been serious. Our food supplies were received by barge up the Elbe River from Hamburg and warehoused at Usti (Aussig) in Czechoslovakia. James Foley, of our mission staff, was assigned to supervise warehouse management, including the allotment of supplies to the district warehouses, strategically located throughout the country; the packing of the ten and fifty pound packages to be called for by food drafts sent from
America to relatives and friends in Czechoslovakia; and the submittal of monthly commodity reports to headquarters in Prague. The food situation throughout 1919-1920 was critical. In the spring it was serious. Usti (Aussig) is in the German part of the country. The discontent of the workers in this area reached a point where they threatened to ransack our warehouses, asserting that the Czechs were getting more food than was allotted to them. 

Early one May morning, Foley was awakened and told that the German workers in the Usti (Aussig) area had gone on a general strike in protest and would demand more food or seize it. Foley immediately advised the military commandant for the district and telephone me in Prague. Jim says (he is retired and living in Washington) that I told him facetiously to put on his American military uniform and with an American flag waving, go to the warehouse and protect it. But what I did tell him was that I would talk with the Czech Minister of Food at once and advise him whether the demands of the Germans of Czechoslovakia would be met. In the meanwhile the workers had gathered in the public square in front of the bürgermeister's office, and the demonstration seemed to be getting out of hand, though the military commandant sent two companies of soldiers to protect the warehouses.

After talking to the mayor and advising him of his telephone call to me in Prague, Foley was asked to speak to the throng in the public square from the balcony. This he did, but he reported that they did not seem satisfied. They agreed, however, to meet again in two hours to get my reply and the reaction of the government to their demand. In less than an hour, I was able to telephone Foley that the government had agreed to give the German area ten tons of flour and other food supplies for immediate delivery, and that their allotments would be increased, effective immediately.

Foley left the commandant's office and reported to the bürgermeister the result of my meeting with the government. The throng was still milling in the public square when the bürgermeister and Foley appeared on the balcony of his office. Through an interpreter, Foley told them that these demands would be met immediately, and a tremendous cheer arose. Everything simmered down, and Foley reported operations were back to normal the following week, although soldiers guarded the warehouse for another
Ringland: couple of days. The Usti (Aussig) affair was the most serious we encountered, though there was always a latent feeling of discrimination, mostly political, in the German districts.

I do not want to give the impression that Prague or any part of the country was in a state of siege because of food deficits. The whole operation, with few exceptions, was carried in a most orderly, intelligent fashion. It was one of simply rehabilitating a solid group of citizens who were familiar with organization methods.

Inspiration of Czech Leaders

Ingersoll: Could you give us a picture of any of the individuals who were involved? I understand that Alice Masaryk was one of the women who was quite influential and hardworking in all of this.1

Ringland: Of course, Alice Masaryk was a noble person. She was a humanitarian, and an educator. She had done graduate work in sociology and had completed a Ph.D. degree in this field. Aside from her activity as head of the Peace O'Dite and in the Red Cross, which she founded in the first year--1919--of the Republic, she was instrumental in bringing to Prague a group of young American women. Some of them were from the YWCA, but, like Dr. Masaryk, they were trained sociologists and developed rather far-reaching plans under Dr. Masaryk's direction. I said far-reaching, because these were measures desirable in the development of a new society, whereas our relief was intended to meet a temporary emergency.

Our work brought us in continual association with Dr. Alice Masaryk. Her background, and her

---

1Letter written for the Presidency of the Czech Red Cross (A. Masaryk) to Arthur Ringland (1920) and note from Alice Masaryk to Arthur Ringland January 1, 1922. See Appendix 3 and 4.
social relationships with the people, and the respect in which she was held, facilitated our services in ways that were of singular value. I enjoyed, too, at the Hradcany or at the summer residence at Lany her personal friendship and through her, some cherished occasional talks with her father, the President. She came to this country following the mysterious death of her brother, Jan, in 1948 and the year of the Communist seizure of the government. Subsequently, Senator Lehman spoke, movingly, in the Senate on March 6, 1953, in support of his bill to grant her the right of permanent residence and asylum. "Her entire life has been a splendid example of what we consider the most noble of human traits." In 1966 she died in Chicago, an honored American citizen.

I was recovering from the flu in the winter of 1921. President Masaryk, too, had been a victim; and his doctor ordered him to go to Naples for convalescence in the sunshine of Italy. Much to my surprise and delight, the President invited me to go with him. And so I did but I nearly missed his special train. I was told to board the train at the Wilson station; but when I arrived the train had left earlier than scheduled but was to remain on a siding some 30 miles in the country to permit the President to go to sleep. I was warned to hurry. Fortunately, our mission chauffeur, Konka, was an accomplished driver and had served as such at the Hapsburg Court. I shall always remember the speed of that midnight drive in the moonlight and through the quiet villages. We made it, and I paid my respects to the President in the morning, in the lounge of the train. It was a veritable library with rows of books in English, Czech, Russian, German, and French.

Let me add here what Herbert Hoover said in substance. A world figure, Dr. Thomas G. Masaryk, emerged into leadership of the Czechs, an intelligent and plucky people, able to preserve their language, their culture and their moral independence. President Masaryk was a noble figure—scholarly, tolerant,

---

1 In the Senate, March 6, 1953.

Ringland: wide vision—a deep student of government. And Senator Lehman spoke in the Senate—"He was a great scholar and writer. His contributions to the writings of our times on the subject of democracy are of lasting significance. His death in 1937, at the age of 87, brought to an end one of the most fruitful lives of our times."¹

I should add that in our work, and I would not want to forget it, was our opposite number of numbers in the European Children's Fund. There was Dr. Anton Sum and Dr. Karel Fahoun, of the Czech Foreign Office. Their services were absolutely indispensable. They not only had a command of English and German, the latter of which most educated Czechs could speak, they were the active heads in effecting our relations with the Czech government and in turn in the field with the field committees. So their part was far greater than one of liaison, but one of wholehearted and complete executive cooperation. Dr. Fahoun wrote a pamphlet entitled "Hoover in Europe." On the flyleaf is printed, "Dedicated to Mr. A.C. Ringland, Chief of the A.R.A. mission in Czechoslovakia in remembrance of three years of friendly cooperation, Prague, March, 1922."²

I had a warm regard for them both. Dr. Sum later served as Social Attaché in the Czech Embassy in Washington, and, though a relatively young man, died on his return home. Dr. Fahoun, not of the scholarly mien of his colleague, but something of a boulbardier, was shot, I understand, at the time of the Communist coup in 1948.

Over the years, I have maintain a keen interest in Czechoslovakia and its people. And until the Communist seizure in 1948, my wife and I enjoyed the hospitality of the Embassy in Washington, and in particular of Minister Hurban and Madam Hurban. Sometime later I met Dr. Friedrich, brother-in-law of Dr. Sum. He told me that the son of Dr. Sum, named after Herbert Hoover, was under arrest and in a concentration camp—this under the Gottwald and Novotny regime of Stalinism. He had been Jan Masaryk's Secretary and was present at the autopsy. It seems evident that he knew too much of the mysterious death of his chief.

² Hoover in Europe—Dr. Karel Fahoun, Ringland Papers.
Another important Czech whose memory still influenced the country was Count Lutzow, author of a number of books on Bohemia and Bohemian history and I am the happy possessor of a number given me by his widow. I might cite one Bohemia: An Historical Sketch. On the flyleaf: "To Captain Ringland with kind regards and the memory of his visit to Vanberk to the count's grave. From the count's widow. Zampach, 24th - 8 - 1920."

The occasion of my visit to Zampach (the Lutzow country home) at that time was a memorable one. I was a weekend guest and the only other guest was H.G. Wells. He had come to pay his respects on behalf of the English Speaking Union. At the nearby village of Vanberk we gathered at the tomb of Count Lutzow, flanked by most of the villagers, the women in their colorful costumes. After the ceremony we entered the town hall and were requested to sign the Golden Book. When Mr. Wells completed his signature and handed the pen to me, I started to write my name some place below his. He took my arm and said "Be a real American and sign right under mine."

During the weekend I walked with Mr. Wells in the garden of Zampach each morning. He was, as we know, keenly interested in education. At that time radio was about to become in public use and he remarked that with this facility every little red school house in America could have the world's best instruction. When we left Mr. Wells gave me a postal drawing of Zampach and the garden on which he had sketched two droll figures labelled with our names. I cherish it very much. What a privilege it was to meet him under such circumstances and reflect as I have many times since on his imaginative perception of things to come.

We, Dr. Hutchinson, later my wife Dorothy and I, often enjoyed the hospitality of Zampach (known to us as "jam pots"). Countess Lutzow was famed in English society as a brilliant conversationalist and this attribute was something we appreciated. She

1 Ringland Papers.
2 Ibid.
had an extraordinary steward, an Englishman named Monroe. He would stand behind her chair at dinner and at times if the countess hesitated in recalling some event or word, he would complete the remark for her. A guest was assured of Monroe's favor if given a nightcap; happily we were favored, but that could not be said, we were told, of all the guests that came and went at Zampach.

Our friendship with Countess Lutzow, and here I am referring particularly to Lincoln Hutchinson's, was due to representations he made to the Czech government to save the Lutzow estate from partition as part of the Republic's land reform as related to the great estates of the Austrian and Hungarian nobility. The government readily recognized the patriotic services of Count Lutzow on behalf of the Czech people and any contemplated action was dismissed. A splendid sculptured bust of Count Lutzow stands in the city hall of Prague, or did. I say "did" for I am not certain whether it is there now or not. Probably not when I think of the political influences which since 1948 have prevented the Czech people from expressing their heart-felt sentiments in respect to their great patriots.

Notable Exiles in Prague-Kerensky and Others

Could you tell us something about the political exiles you met?

There were some notable exiles in Prague during our time: Alexander Kerensky, Catherine Breshkovsky and George Lazarev from Russia and Count Karolyi from Hungary.

On one occasion when I was in Vienna consulting with Colonel Causey, head of the A.R.A., he reached into a drawer in his desk and handed me a large roll of bills. He said "I've been waiting for an opportunity to deliver these Hungarian pengoes to Karolyi, who as you know is in Prague. Now do take them and deliver them." When I reached
Prague I got in touch with Karolyi who was living very quietly in the city and gave him the money. He was anxious to obtain a passport to the United States and for his wife too. But that was something outside my field of action.

The Russian exiles were historic figures, and particularly Kerensky whose government, unhappily, was overthrown in 1917 following the revolution by the Bolsheviks, thus wiping out the prospects of a democratic regime. In the spring of 1921 the Prague exiles were well informed about the tragic conditions that were developing in Russia. They were in close touch with us and at this point I think it is pertinent to refer to two memoranda, one of May 25, 1921 from Ivar Wahren, of our Prague staff, to Walter Lyman Brown, the European Director of A.R.A., on the discussion that followed with these three--Kerensky, Breshkovsky and Lazarev at a dinner in our apartment in Marienska Ulice 19;¹ the other from Philip Carroll of the A.R.A. on his interview with Kerensky.² This last is undated but it was written before Maxim Gorky's appeal of July 13, 1921, to the American people for "bread and medicine." These two memoranda reflecting the views of Kerensky are so important historically that they should be included in the appendix.

On September 14, 1921, Alexander Kerensky, Catherine Breshkovsky, and George Lazarev again came to dinner at our apartment. Happily I found our guest book in the attic of my Chevy Chase home so I note the date with assurance. Mme. Breshkovsky, known as "the grandmother (Babushka) of the Russian Revolution," wrote in the guest book, "Friend of Mr. Kerensky and of this house." She was of the minor nobility of Russia and had spent years in exile in Siberia as a socialist. She was of a noble character and took a particular liking to Dorothy ("she is like a granddaughter"), later my wife.

¹Letter of May 25, 1921, from Ivar Wahren to Walter Lyman Brown. Appendix 5.

²Interview of Philip Carroll with Alexander Kerensky. Appendix 6.
Dorothy has a remarkable photograph of this extraordinary woman.  

It was about this time that Mr. Kerensky talked at length with us about the famine conditions in Russia and the need for American help. And particularly because a month earlier on August 20, 1921, the American Relief Administration and the Soviet government concluded the Riga Agreement. It was in Riga, Latvia that the negotiations were conducted by Walter Lyman Brown for the A.R.A. and Litvinoff for the Soviets.

We entertained many interesting guests. One comes immediately to mind, Countess Lützow. She was the widow of the famed Czech historian, Dr. Francis Count Lützow. As a Czech nationalist and opponent of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy he exiled himself to Switzerland, where he died in 1916. At a memorial service Dr. Francis Udrzal, vice president of the National Assembly said: "To Count Lützow the honor is due to be remembered by the free Czechoslovak nation among the first spiritual legionnaires who paved abroad the way to the political independence of the Czechoslovak nation."

Sources of Financial Support

You mentioned the Commonwealth Fund as one of the sources of support and a particular help to the intelligentsia. What other sources of support besides American and Czech government funds were there for the Czechoslovakia aid work?

The Commonwealth Fund was, of course, a private fund. There was the American Red Cross in various capacities including the important one where they

---

1Letter from Catherine Breshkovsky to Arthur Ringland, March 20, 1922. Appendix 7.
Ingersoll:Ringland: Ingersoll: Ringland: helped us by providing a team to assist in the organization of the town committees with Peace o Dite. And, as I mentioned earlier, Dr. Selskar Gunn of the Rockefeller Foundation made a nation-wide health survey.

There were some of the church groups. These agencies were able to draw on our warehouses when they wanted food supplies. As far as direct relief was concerned, their operations were necessarily limited. I said "limited," which needs some qualification. For example, a large number of Americans of Czech origin in the Midwest had a deep interest in their kinsfolk and generously supported the purchase of A.R.A. food drafts; also some of their societies made cash contributions to the Children's Fund.

Ingersoll: Did the contributors at home in any way act as a political pressure group to try to formulate policy for relief, or was that not possible?

Ringland: That was never in the picture in any degree. Do you mean the A.R.A. and the people at home?

Ingersoll: Yes.

Ringland: Oh, good Lord, no! On the contrary, it was an expression of the compassion of people without any reservation politically. Mr. Hoover, in those days, was not in the partisan political field. In sum, the financial support came in gifts from voluntary contributions and a Congressional appropriation, from commodity contributions of the Czech Government and intangibles of non-commodities provided by the Czech government and the Czech people--facilities, office equipment, and the like, evaluated at well over $2,000,000.
Financial Support for Wider Needs

The European Relief Council and the Cincinnati War Chest

Ringland: In the fall of 1920, Mr. Hoover initiated as chairman the organization of the European Relief Council composed of, in addition to the American Relief Administration, eight other national agencies—American Red Cross, American Friends Service Committee, Council of Churches of Christ in America, Jewish Distribution Committee, Knights of Columbus, National Catholic Welfare Council, YMCA, and YWCA. Its purpose was to effect coordination particularly as applied to child relief. It was estimated that 3,500,000 ill and undernourished children would require support until the harvest of 1921, in eastern and central Europe, and that $33,000,000 would be required for mass feeding and clothing. It was the greatest collection from the American public for charitable purposes ever undertaken by any organization up to that time.

The drive began in December 1920 and ended in April 1921. It was an outstanding success. Almost $30,000,000 was collected as reported by Mr. Hoover at a cost of 2.31% of the contributions—this cost was paid for by the A.R.A. from food draft credits. The A.R.A. European Children's Fund was allocated between 15 and 16 million of the collection.

I was home from Prague for a short leave at the time of the drive. One afternoon while in the New York office I was abruptly asked to go to Cincinnati immediately and attend a meeting the next morning of the trustees of the Cincinnati War Chest. The meeting was to determine the disposition of a substantial surplus. There was no time even to pack and I caught a sleeper and arrived in time for the morning meeting. In the anteroom I met several others representing organizations hoping to be the beneficiaries of the liquidation of the chest. Well, I caught a train back in the late afternoon with a check for $179,180.82, pinned to an inside pocket. I was a mere messenger in fact and although I had to appear before the trustees and make some sort of
Ringland: statement it was the confidence in Herbert Hoover and the drive he was heading to collect $33,000,000 that made the task an easy one.

The American Friends Service Committee Relief for Germany

Mr. Hoover in his memoirs pointed out that "Germany came out of the Peace Conference at Versailles as a mangled and shaken nation... because of the Lodge amendment which prevented the use of any Congressional appropriation for relief in enemy countries, we were able during the Armistice to give only partial aid to the rehabilitation of the German children. After the peace we in the new American Relief Administration were determined to extend to Germany our canteen system for children, nursing mothers, the sick and aged...." Mr. Hoover requested the American Friends Service Committee—the Quakers—to undertake such a program. The choice was appropriate and admirable and the Friends were quite willing to undertake the task.

I was instructed to approach German officials in company with Mr. Rhodes, representative of the Friends, and arrange for the necessary cooperation, and this was effected in December of 1920. The arrangements were concluded through the good offices of Herr von Winterfeld, the President of the German Red Cross. An incident stands out in my memory. We were staying at the famed Hotel Adlon and could not return to Prague or Karlsbad (Karlovy Vary), where we were to join Minister Crane and his wife and a number of our embassy personnel at a Christmas party, because a heavy snow and storm had interrupted rail traffic. Dorothy and I to our surprise and pleasure were invited to spend Christmas Eve at the home of the von Winterfeld's. We had a memorable time with the family including the children; it was a most unusual and rare event for foreigners, certainly at this time, to enjoy the hospitality of a German home.
Ringland: While the support of a Congressional appropriation for the Friends program could not be obtained, Mr. Hoover was able through voluntary sources and the sale of food drafts to make possible the administration of the formidable program under the Friends' direction. The program was terminated in the spring of 1922 having overcome the critical condition of the German children.

Recollections of Herbert Hoover

Ingersoll: Could you give us some picture of Hoover and his ways of working?

Ringland: I was not in close touch with him since my work was in the field. He exercised remote control over a great number of us, as you can well understand. He had the great job with the Economic Council in Paris, then London and New York, and in Washington director of the Food Administration, far beyond the European Children's Fund. His work was related to all the measures which made up the peace following the Armistice. His relations with President Wilson (his book, *The Ordeal of Woodrow Wilson*) portrays this. He had a great admiration for Wilson, and Wilson backed him completely.

I first met Herbert Hoover in Prague, in the summer of 1919. Mr. Hoover was on a tour of inspection of the work of the American Relief Administration which he had started in the Eastern European countries. He was accompanied by Lewis Straus, his secretary, who in later life became the distinguished Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Hoover was received with all official honors by President Masaryk and his ministry for his relief services to Czechoslovakia as in other countries. He came at a time when the aftermath of World War I had posed difficult economic and social problems for the new government in the domestic field and as well in relations with the new governments of its neighbors, all once part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
Ringland: My next contact with Mr. Hoover was when he was Secretary of Commerce and I reported to him in 1924 on completion in November of 1923 of my A.R.A. service with the Russian refugees in Constantinople. Moreover, he became in 1924 a member of President Coolidge's Cabinet Committee on Outdoor Recreation at the time I served as Executive Director for the National Conference of Outdoor Recreation of which the Cabinet Committee was a part.

When I served on the President's War Relief Control Board and its successor, the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the State Department at the time of the Second World War, occasionally I had appointments with Mr. Hoover when he was living in the Waldorf Towers in New York. He always listened most carefully and largely left me to do the talking, and then he would wind it up with a very cogent remark. But I have some personal notes from him which mean much to me.

Mr. Hoover never was quite satisfied from the standpoint of efficiency that so many American organizations were engaged in relief after the Second World War, thus making too many duplicate demands on the generosity of the American public.

But there were some reasons for the number: in the case of church groups for example, which maintained their independence in the fields of their own constituents. Then there were the ethnic groups which played such an important and helpful part, for example the American-Czechoslovak Relief, American Relief for Poland, American Relief for Italy, Council of Relief Agencies licensed to operate in Germany (Cralog), the great group for Germany. Each had a specific following to whom they made their appeals. It should be noted, however, that CARE, as a lay organization with neither church nor ethnic affiliations, made a wide appeal to donors who were interested in neither one nor the other.

Ingersoll: As chief of European Children's Fund in Czechoslovakia, did you feel that you were operating under a good many directives from Mr. Hoover or from other higher organization men, or did you feel that the field was quite your own to make policy decisions in?
Ringland: We operated under the general and able direction of Walter Lyman Brown, who was the European Director of the American Relief Administration and for its European Children's Fund as well with headquarters in London. The guidelines were clean-cut and applied to all the countries engaged, and the operations within those lines were developed through local knowledge and supported by the London office. There was always the greatest freedom of action in each field mission because the target was so clean-cut and decisive action could be taken without delay.

Ingersoll: Who do you think was responsible for drawing up these guidelines? Was this the responsibility of Walter Lyman Brown, or ultimately of Hoover himself?

Ringland: I think those were largely developed through the experience that Mr. Hoover and his associates, such as Mr. Brown and a number of others, had with the Committee for the Relief of Belgium, which operated during the active war before our entry. Out of that experience came the background for development when the peace came. For one thing, quite a large number of the personnel that served with Mr. Hoover in Belgium carried on in these missions during the peacetime with all their direct knowledge and experience.

Ingersoll: I wondered where the personnel had mainly come from.

Ringland: I noted one time in reading some of Mr. Hoover's memoirs that when he was in Paris with the Allies in the Economic Council, he talked with General Pershing and Admiral Benson and said he wanted to recruit personnel for these relief operations. He wanted several thousand, who otherwise would have been ordered home. I don't know which one said it, but the upshot was that Mr. Hoover was told that he could have anyone from a corporal to a general or an admiral.

Ingersoll: So he had a rather wide range to draw from, didn't he?

Ringland: Yes, he did.
Evaluation

Ingersoll: As you look back on all of the work in Czechoslovakia now, how would you evaluate its effectiveness?

Ringland: I should like to quote here from a report submitted upon the conclusion of our feeding operations from April 15, 1919 to September 1, 1921.

The relief problem among children in this Republic is no longer economic, broadly speaking, but social and educational, and therefore a problem that is shared in common in greater or less degree the world over. Therefore it is my carefully weighed opinion that conditions are now so nearly normal in Czechoslovakia that no further material assistance in respect to relief is needed from American people; that although relief is still positively needed, the Czechoslovak Republic is now in position to carry out, unaided materially, their own welfare measures in respect to feeding undernourished children.

A continuance of feeding on the present restricted and voluntary basis will not meet the problem at all - it will serve admirably for educational purposes. There is needed recognition by the Government and by the people that it is as much their duty to provide for the physical development of the child as for his mental development. National legislation is needed, provided in cooperation with the municipalities and districts, for the compulsory feeding of all undernourished school children. Action to this end is now under way in Austria as the only means of meeting one of the most serious post-war problems. The A.R.A., in cooperation with the Peace o Dite should draft such a plan of legislation. The Minister of Food requested (July 15th) that this be done. Its accomplishment will be a fitting result of the work of the past two years.
The A.R.A. should liquidate its Mission to Czecho-Slovakia on September 1st and turn control over to the Peace o Dite, leaving an American adviser to assist in an educational and legislative plan and necessary supervision of feeding.\textsuperscript{1}

These recommendations were carried out.

In conclusion, I should like to quote a letter of May 29, 1922, from Dr. Eduard Benes, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Dresednictvo Ministerske Rady.

V Praze dne 29.V.1922.

Dear Sir,

Having successfully concluded the work of the Hoover Mission, you are leaving the Czechoslovak Republic, thousands of whose citizens will ever bear in grateful remembrance the noble relief efforts of which you have been in charge.

In the name of the Government I thank you for your very successful conduct of this work, which has resulted in the noble intentions of the magnificent American Relief action being accomplished to the full. I wish you an equal success in the further important function which has been entrusted to you.


To complete the picture, reference is made here to: (1) American Relief Administration Bulletin of 1 June 1921, including an article by me entitled, "The Economic and Food Situation in Czechoslovakia," pp. 13 and 14, Appendix 8; and (2) a letter of May 29, 1922, from the Ministry of Food Supply to me, expressing appreciation of the work of the Mission, Appendix 9.
Ringland: I should be very grateful if you would kindly convey to the Headquarters of the American Relief action an equally sincere expression of my thanks.

Yours faithfully,

s/s Dr. Eduard Benes
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Captain Arthur C. Ringland
Kinsky Palace
Prague

Ingersoll: In terms of today, how would you evaluate the work under the Novotny regime of Stalinism?

Ringland: You know, I've asked myself the question. Let us say the average age of a child that was fed by the A.R.A. and its helpful partner, the Pece o Dite (Child Welfare), was ten to twelve. That same child today would be approaching sixty. The greater number of their parents are gone, so we can't say what feeling of gratitude that child might have acquired or retained. The only thing you can say is that if there is any history available to the Czech people of our work, it might have some influence because of its humanitarian aspects on the relationships between the ordinary Czechoslovak citizen and the American people here at home.

Of course I was shocked when the Communists took over the government of Czechoslovakia in 1948. As for the question of whether those men in power who were then children think back to those days, I would say it must be rather doubtful. But in some of them, history-wise, there was certainly no respect for the past. There was an ugly aspect when this Communist-Czech government declared Thomas Masaryk an "unperson" and refused to accept our commemorative stamp of Masaryk, who was the recognized George Washington of Czechoslovakia. I like to believe, and I know I'm right, that he is still first in the hearts of the Czech people.

Ingersoll: In spite of all the changes that have come over the years?

Ringland: Yes, I do.
Honors

Ingersoll: It seems that both Americans and Czechs appreciated the work you did. I note in your papers the letter from Lewis Einstein, U.S. Minister to Czechoslovakia.¹ I understand that you were awarded the Order of the White Lion of Czechoslovakia.

Ringland: Yes, I was. That was something I naturally appreciated.²

When I left, rather touching, I think, almost every district sent a gift that was characteristic of its products. For example, I had some beautiful Bohemian glassware from one district and some rare wine from another. I remember when I arrived at Customs at home. The inspector said, "Everything goes right through except the wine." It was during Prohibition days. Those rascals took the wine—that good wine—and you can imagine what became of it.

When I left Prague, it was a moving occasion, because a great number of children marched down to the station to see me off. That was the way I left and with a lump in my throat!

Postscript 1968

The world press reflects today the changing drama of Czechoslovakia's history. The Bohemian historian Lutzow wrote, "When throwing a stone through a window in Prague, you throw with it a morsel of history." What a history! Consider but the last 50 years since the founding of the new republic in 1918. There followed the rapacity of

¹May 27, 1922. See Appendix 10.
²Citation July 31, 1926. See Appendix 11.
the Nazi seizure in 1938; the liberation of 1945; the Communist seizure of 1948; and, again, the short-lived liberation abruptly terminated by Soviet military might in 1968!

After 20 years of political tyranny, 1948-1968, the fresh breeze of freedom blew through the ancient halls of the Hradcany. The forthright leadership of Dubček in the tradition of Palacky, the historian of nationalism, inspired the whole nation. No longer were the Masaryks, father and son, "unpersons" as officially branded by the lackeys of Stalinism. The old who served so gallantly in the making of the republic lived again in the tradition of their leaders. And the young demonstrated their hope for the future. They massed around the statue of its martyr, Jan Hus, familiar to me for I looked upon it from my office window of the American Relief Administration in the historic Kinsky Palace in the hungry years of 1919 and 1920. Those years brought back thoughts of Thomas Masaryk and his association with Woodrow Wilson and Herbert Hoover at the critical time following the declaration of independence and the struggle to develop a viable economy in face of post-war conditions.

The intoxication of unaccustomed freedom, freedom to talk, to listen, to think, to read, lasted but six months! One night with no warning Soviet tanks, with an umbrella of planes, invaded the province of Slovakia, then Moravia, then Bohemia, and then the ancient capital of Prague! And now the people of the nation are again subjected to military occupancy and political tyranny!

It is singularly appropriate to conclude these remarks by quoting here the lines engraved on a medallion given me by Dr. Alice Masaryk, then President of the Czechoslovakian Red Cross and translated for me. It was struck, I believe, to commemorate the Independence of 1918. It depicts a figure, Praha, in flowing robe, looking upon the River Vlatava.

Thou hast shed more tears, oh Sister, than the waters of my river could contain. More misery was thine than a stone could bear.
Ringland: Wishing to crush thee, the murderous enemy has only succeeded in strengthening thee. Therefore hold up thy head, Praha, for Victory is Thine!

Pravda Vitezi! The Truth Prevails\(^1\) in 1968 as it did in 1918!

---

\(^1\)The national motto of Czechoslovakia.
Constantinople - Relief to Russian Refugees (1922-23)

Ingersoll: In 1922 you began the work of the American Relief Administration in Constantinople, didn't you?

Ringland: Yes.

Ingersoll: Could you tell us something about that?

Ringland: Well, in the early spring of that year, the Czechoslovak program of relief to children was in course of termination. It had, with the effective cooperation of the Czech government and several thousand public spirited men and women in cities, towns, and villages, accomplished its objectives. At the peak over 500,000 were fed daily.

Background of Russian Refugee Operation

At this time, appeals were made to Mr. Hoover to help meet the desperate situation of Russian refugees in Constantinople.

Ingersoll: How did these Russian refugees happen to be in Constantinople in the first place?
Ringland: They were washed up there, so to speak, as a result of the Great War's aftermath. As you will recall, civil war broke out in Russia not long after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. At first, the Allies supported the Whites because they feared that the Reds, by abandoning the war against Germany, would permit the Germans to transfer their eastern armies to the Western Front. Later, the Allies supported the Whites for ideological reasons. The strongest of the various White forces was that organized in the south of Russia by General Denikin. For a time they fought successfully, but their hopes of defeating the Soviets were finally dashed when the Russo-Polish war of 1920 ended in an armistice. This freed the Red Army to commit its whole weight against the Whites in the south. Unable to withstand this new offensive, the Whites retreated gradually into the Crimean peninsula, where, with their backs to the sea, they faced the choice of surrender or exile. They chose exile. In November 1920, 100,000 fighting men and 50,000 civilians were evacuated by sea to Constantinople on the remaining vessels of the Black Sea Fleet, Russian merchantmen, and a number of Allied ships. Arrived in Turkey, the soldiers (still in their units and commanded by their own officers) were put in campus at Gallipoli, on the island of Lemnos, and at Catalca, west of Constantinople; the civilians were dispersed in scattered camps and quarters in and about Constantinople.

From the first these Russians were an embarrassment. As long as there had been some chance of crushing the Bolsheviks, the Allies viewed the White forces as a precious asset; but now that the Civil War was definitively lost, they had become a liability in that their very existence was an obstacle to the accommodation that had sooner or later to be reached with the Soviets. This was Realpolitik, I suppose. And furthermore, feeding and caring for these erstwhile allies was no small burden.

The Allied High Commissioners on the spot, no less than their home governments, were naturally receptive to any schemes that held out hope of reducing the ranks of the Russian refugees. The remaining vessels of the Black Sea Fleet were sailed to Bizerte and there turned over to the French Navy. Some thirty thousand soldiers and
Ringland: civilians were accepted as immigrants by Serbia (or rather, the "Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes," as it had by then become), whose king was a great russophile. Fifteen hundred men or so accepted repatriation to Russia, and a small number went to Brazil, lured by extravagant promises.

But this still left the bulk of the refugees in Turkey. Threatening to cut off the food supplies of those who remained, the French High Commissioner forcefully urged the refugees to repatriate, or go to Brazil or, at least, find local employment. None of these courses commended itself particularly: repatriation was out of the question, reports from those who had gone to Brazil showed the situation there to be far from promising, and the idea of finding work in poverty-stricken Turkey was preposterous. Fortunately, however, several other Balkan countries, notably Bulgaria, offered to take the bulk of the remaining refugees (whole military units, in fact), so the gravity of the situation was a certain extent mitigated. But as I said, there were still some 27,000 refugees left when I arrived in 1922. These were the ones we had to cope with.

I should add a note about the attitude of the Turks. The Sultan's government was weak and exercised no effective authority outside of Constantinople. In the eyes of patriotic Turks it was discredited as a tool of the Allies—who were bent on dismembering Turkey. Anatolia, however, was in the hands of the new nationalist government in Ankara, the Grand National Assembly, dominated by Mustafa Kemal Pasha, the war hero who was later to become the first president of the Turkish Republic. With the blessing of the Allies the Greeks had seized a large part of Anatolia, and the Ankara Turks were engaged in a life-and-death struggle to drive them out—which they ultimately did. After this it was only a matter of time before the authority of the Ankara government was extended to all of Turkey—including Constantinople.

Meanwhile, the only power friendly to the Ankara government (for reasons of its own, of course) was Soviet Russia. The Soviets were the first to recognize the Grand National Assembly as the sole legitimate government of Turkey (this was in 1921) and they helped it furthermore with money
and arms. In these circumstances, with the Allies trying to get rid of them, and the only effective Turkish government on close terms with their enemies, the Bolsheviks, the Russian refugees remaining in Constantinople found themselves in a precarious situation indeed. Help for them was left to local committees and the foreign colony, in effect, an impossible task. There was no opportunity for employment, and the situation was embarrassing for the Turkish government economically and in its political relations with the Soviets.

Recommendations for use of the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Fund

The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Fund made available to Mr. Hoover $100,000 for the relief of these refugees. Since I had wound up my service as chief of the American Relief Administration, European Children’s Fund in Prague, I was greatly pleased when Walter Lyman Brown, Mr. Hoover’s representative in London and in charge of European operations for the A.R.A., sent me to Constantinople to determine what action should be taken. I arrived there March 24, 1922, after an interesting trip on the famed Orient Express. Without delay, I called formally on Admiral Mark L. Bristol, the American High Commissioner to Turkey, for as yet formal diplomatic relations with the Turks had not been resumed.

Did the fact that there weren’t formal diplomatic relations and channels established make your work difficult?

Constantinople was, in effect, occupied by the Allies. Offhand, I would say that the work was made easier by the informality of these relations and the great respect the local Turks had for Admiral Bristol and his integrity in approaching the problems that beset them in a very critical political situation. He likewise, of course, fully understood the humanitarian aspects of the refugee problem which were our direct concern.
Ingersoll: Did these officials at Constantinople feel that they really needed help with this refugee problem and that it was beyond them to cope with it?

Ringland: There's no question there, as I think I can point out. Admiral Bristol provided every facility for a thorough investigation by us. Upon its conclusion and with his support and that of Major Claflin Davis of the American Red Cross, who knew the problem intimately, I recommended to the London office of the A.R.A. that the Memorial Fund should be expended on relief, provided, and this is important to note, the League of Nations undertook parallel action to evacuate the refugees step-by-step. Relief without evacuation would only prolong the problem without solving it. The recommendation was approved, and I well remember the comment of the London office in substance, "Go to Geneva if you think you can reach an understanding to effect cooperation with the League."

Presentation of Plan Before the Council of the League of Nations

Ingersoll: Did you go to Geneva then?

Ringland: Yes. I went first to London and then to Geneva with Major Davis. In London we had an encouraging talk with Sir Samuel Hoare, the Foreign Secretary, and lunched with him at his home. He was most sympathetic and interested.

Ingersoll: Had the British previous to this time done some refugee work in Constantinople themselves?

Ringland: Oh yes, indeed they had. That was through the British Army and also in cooperation with the

Ringland: The job the Army had in common with the French and to some extent with the Italians, and I think also with the United States Navy, was the establishment of refugee camps, because these thousands poured into Constantinople and there was no means for their support.

In Geneva, Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, the famous Arctic explorer, then High Commissioner for Russian Refugees, made it possible for me to explain the A.R.A. plan of cooperation directly to the Council of the League of Nations. In the informal discussion that preceded the meeting, Arthur Sweetser, chief of the League's Information Office, was particularly helpful. At the Council meeting on May 13th, the proposal that A.R.A. relief should be undertaken conditional upon the League finding the necessary money to carry out evacuation, was accepted due to the effective support of Nansen and Lord Balfour. Balfour's spot pledge of 10,000 pounds sterling and his stout remarks, "It would be to the indelible discredit of the League if the necessary additional 20,000 pounds could not be found," were followed by contributions from Belgium, Brazil, China, Czecho- slovakia, Japan, and Switzerland totalling approximately $90,000. Even so, the final sum necessary to discharge the League's part was made possible only by the efforts of Major Davis and the donation of $60,000 by the American Red Cross to meet the deficit.

Ingersoll: $150,000 was the sum thought necessary to evacuate the refugees?

Ringland: Yes. The Associated Press reported the meeting, and it was published in the New York Times edition of Sunday, May 14, 1922, under the heading, "First American before the Council was Relief Official." As an added touch, Arthur Sweetser gave me a copy

---

1 League of Nations, official journal, minutes of the 18th session of the Council, May 11-17, 1922.

2 New York Times, May 14, 1922. See Appendix

Well, the interesting point of all this was the *New York Times* interpretation that the appearance of an American aroused interest in League quarters because of the possible implications of this appearance since we were not a member.

Ingersoll: Do you think the appearance of an American before the League had any further effect?

Ringland: It was further evidence of the interest of Americans in the problems affecting the victims of war, and gave added strength to Dr. Nansen's task as High Commissioner of Refugees for the League.

Ingersoll: And perhaps was one step in drawing us somewhat away from a complete isolationist policy.

Ringland: Yes, you could draw a line then between the political position taken by the Senate when it rejected our part in the League and the humanitarian approach.

Organization of the A.R.A. in Constantinople

Ingersoll: How soon was it before you were able to get food to these refugees?

Ringland: I would like to remark that upon the conclusion of the Geneva negotiations, I returned to Constantinople accompanied by Mrs. Ringland. We had married in London just before this. We went to Constantinople to await the arrival of the first cargo of relief supplies. In the meanwhile,


²Inscription on flyleaf, Appendix 4.
Ringland: this gave us the opportunity to effect the necessary organization. A first job was to develop coordination among the refugees' groups. These were a motley lot ranging from the Union of Fishers and Hunters to the League of Workless Pedagogues.

Ingersoll: What a combination!

Ringland: We, and by that time I had been joined by two colleagues—Will Shafroth and Russell Bell—selected Colonel Vladimir Olive, now a naturalized American citizen, as liaison officer, and coordination was effected. He was a good choice, educated and cultured, spoke English and, of course, French, and was of invaluable assistance.

Ingersoll: He was Russian himself?

Ringland: Indeed yes. Interestingly enough, he was of French origin. He went to Russia as a refugee at the time of the French Revolutions and his father had been President of the Red Cross. Olive had served as a cavalry officer in the Imperial Army and later, during the Civil War, in the White Army. Here at home he became an instructor in equitation in a famed girls' school. His son is a graduate of West Point and his daughters are married to Army officers.

Oldrich Konecny, an able young Czech who served on our staff in Prague had preceded me to arrange for the unloading and warehousing of our first cargo. In this he had an excellent helper, John Kovaloff, a young Russian refugee. Kovaloff became an American citizen and retired in California as a successful CPA with daughters in college.

The fortitude of the Russians was admirable. Many were of the old upper class but now quite impoverished, having left all possessions behind them, save perhaps some jewels. So one could see a General Pershing on one corner selling matches, and an Admiral Sims on the other selling newspapers.

Ingersoll: They were housed mostly in refugee camps at this time, were they?

Ringland: No, I should have made it clear. That form of help had ceased in 1921. The French were no longer carrying on that form of aid. This residue
Ingersoll: So they were completely on their own support, whatever that might be at the moment, living somehow in private residences. Was that the picture?

Ringland: Yes.

Administration of the League Contribution

Ingersoll: How was the evacuation contribution from the League and the American Red Cross administered?

Ringland: Dr. Nansen, who visited Constantinople in the fall of 1921, found the situation critical with money neither to sustain the refugees much longer nor to evacuate them. He came again in 1922. As High Commissioner, he reported to the Council that he had appointed a special committee at Constantinople to assist him in the administration of the 30,000 pound fund contributed by the members of the League and the American Red Cross for the purpose of the evacuation of the Russian refugees from Constantinople. The committee consisted of Colonel Proctor and Mr. Burnier, delegates of the High Commissioner, Major Davis of the American Red Cross, and myself representing the American Relief Administration. Admiral Bristol, as American High Commissioner, approved the appointments of the committee and the representation of the American organization, and agreed to afford the committee his support.

Now let me return to the point where I spoke of the fortitude of the Russians. Dr. Nansen's special committee was helpfully supplemented by a committee of ladies of the American colony--Mrs. Bristol, Miss Ann Mitchell, and Miss Alma Ruggles, representing the Anson-Phelps-Stokes Foundation, Mrs. Foster Stearns, wife of Foster Stearns of our Embassy, and my wife.

Although it was estimated that there were approximately 27,000 Russian refugees in the
Ringland: vicinity of Constantinople, the American Relief Administration could only undertake the support of those who were wholly dependent. A special registration showed 11,407 refugees in this class.

Problems

Strains Between Soviets and Turkey

But always there was the problem of evacuation. This was essential too, for the Turkish economy after the strains of the World War could not provide employment for anything like adequate numbers. There were the relations too between Turkey and the Soviets to be considered.

Ingersoll: Do you remember any indication of the strains between the Soviets and the Turks?

Ringland: Only what I was told from time to time—the fear that the pressure on the Turks might mean a demand for repatriation to Russia.

Ingersoll: What was the Russian refugees' response to these things?

Ringland: One of great apprehension. They couldn't view with any equanimity the return to a country from which they had been obliged to flee after a lost Civil War. In the course of the Revolution, I think return was impossible to contemplate. Yet they had to find someplace to go because they couldn't remain where they were.

It is pertinent in this respect to note the letter from the Charge d'Affaires, Bratman Brodowsky, of the Soviet embassy in Berlin of January 12, 1923 to Dr. Nansen.¹ In the Soviet official's letter, Bratman Brodowsky states that

¹Letter of January 12, 1923, to Dr. Nansen, Appendix 5.
no agreement concerning the fate of the Russian refugees had been made with the Turks, that is, with the government of Ankara. "And further, no offer has been made to make a demand on this subject. On the contrary, the Soviet Government will leave the Russians in Constantinople until our representatives can effect the 'filtration' of the refugees, and organize their repatriation to Russia."

Relationship of Allies to Sultan

At one time, it appeared that operations would need to be suspended because of a series of crises affecting the security of Constantinople following the abdication of the Sultan, and the delicacy of the relations of the Allies with Mustapha Demal Pasha and the Ankara government.

Refugee Saturation in Slav Countries

One difficulty was the fact that the Slav countries in central Europe and the Balkans had nearly reached a point of saturation in the reception of refugees. Eventually however, negotiations with Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia, through the cooperation of the League of Nations, assisted by the American Red Cross, finally accomplished evacuation of 22,000 of the dependents including those sent to the United States.

Was this number the people who were evacuated after your report to the League of Nations, or did this include the total number before and after that time?
It was the total number after the reports. The evacuation, you will understand, was done from time to time in relatively small numbers until the accumulated final number was reached.

Selective Immigration to U.S.

An interesting conclusion to the American Relief Administration's operation was the selection of the emigrants to the United States as one phase of the League's program of evacuation. Some 5,000 applications were received, though less than 2,000 could be accepted under the quota provisions. It was necessary to set up standards to assure no refugee would become a public charge and that he had the capacity to support himself and, if married, his family as well. The American High Commissioner appointed a board of American citizens in the colony to interview each of the 5,000 applicants and determine his qualifications and make recommendations accordingly to the Consulate, and I served as chairman. I believe that this board's work was the first attempt to provide selective immigration to the United States. Eventually 1,847 refugees were sent to the United States. The initial expense of evacuating this number was shared by the A.R.A., the League of Nations, and the American Red Cross, but this expense was offset by the pledges of the refugees to return the individual cost of evacuation. It should be noted that these pledges were redeemed in time almost 100%, for these refugees, once in America, fully justified their selection as potential citizens.

\[1\] Letter of July 20, 1924, from V. Glazoff, President, National Russian Students' Christian Association in the U.S.A. Appendix 6.
Evaluation

Ingersoll: How would you evaluate this total experience of the Constantinople mission, Mr. Ringland? What do you feel were its most important aspects?

Ringland: There were two phases of the program that stand out sharply in my recollection. One was the acceptance by the League of Nations of their part to parallel our part in the solution of the problem. Second, the set-up of standards and the selection of the refugees seeking to enter the United States.

Personalities

Balfour

Ingersoll: A rather interesting figure whom you mentioned at the League of Nations was Balfour. Can you give any more of a picture of him?

Ringland: Of course I was greatly impressed to speak before the Council chaired by Balfour as well as the distinguished delegates of the various countries composing the Council. Since that is the only time I had ever seen him, I felt he was austere, but any reservation I might have was swept away by his unrestrained language in supporting a solution for the problem of the Russian refugees. I am inclined to believe, without knowing as much about him as I should like, that that was characteristic of his public service.

Ingersoll: A strong support for constructive measures, you feel?

Ringland: I mean his candor, directness, unequivocal approach as reflected in his remarks suggests to me that that was the way he met his political problems as Prime Minister.
Nansen

Ingersoll: How about Nansen?

Ringland: Nansen was a Viking and looked it. We had seen him a number of times in Constantinople when he had occasion as High Commissioner for Refugees to go to Moscow. Always we were impressed, whether in official contact or socially, with his exuberance and tremendous energy, a reflection of course of his great explorations in the Arctic. In Geneva, his part was indispensable: first his background knowledge as High Commissioner of Refugees, and because of that his familiarity with the problem that we were presenting to the League for support of the American proposal.

Admiral Bristol

Ingersoll: Can you tell us a little bit more of these human pictures of people and events that went on during that period? How about Admiral Bristol? Can you tell us a little bit more about him?

Ringland: Admiral Bristol, as Commander of the American forces in Near East waters and as American High Commissioner to Turkey, in effect acting ambassador, gave unstinting support to the American Relief Administration operations from the beginning to the end. Indeed, without the services of navy communications and the facilities of the American embassy, an effective program would have been impossible. But more than that, it was Admiral Bristol's direct interest that was so stimulating. He was always accessible, and on occasions I would visit him in his office at the end of the day, a day which he always closed by dictating his diary to Betty Carp, his remarkable secretary, a helpful friend to all of us. Fortunately, I enjoyed his confidence, and that was expressed in a letter to Walter Lyman Brown, Mr. Hoover's representative in
Ringland: London, of November 13, 1923, when the A.R.A. program was concluded.1,2

Ingersoll: This is a letter that we will put with the attachments to the present interview.

Ringland: It is a tribute to his leadership and ability to inspire those with whom he worked to note that five of the naval officers on his staff—Hepburn, Kinkaid of World War II fame, Ghormley, Merrill, and Wheeler—became admirals, and the first secretary of the embassy, Howland Shaw, became Assistant Secretary of State, and the second secretary, Foster Stearns, a Congressman from New Hampshire.

Because of his later service in command of the Asiatic squadron in the Far East, the Admiral became interested in the control of narcotics. When he was about to retire as Chairman of the General Board of the Navy, he looked forward to appointment by the President as Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics. Much to my delight, he said he wanted me on his staff should he be appointed. But the Admiral's note of September 25, 1930, to me explains his disappointment. I was particularly sorry that he felt the President was indifferent.3 This was reflected at another time when I was approached to obtain his diaries for the Hoover War Library at Stanford University. Admiral Bristol's death in May of 1939 was untimely. Although retired by statutory necessity from the Navy, it is unfortunate that his great abilities were not made use of even by the Roosevelt administration. "Here," and I am quoting J. Franklyn, who served in the Embassy at one time, "was a man who had been a great proconsul of the republic, a man who had held under his authority the key to many critical situations, a man who had tasted immense responsibility and power....We who served

1See letter of November 13, 1923, from Admiral Bristol to Walter Lyman Brown, Appendix 7.

2Letters of April 15, 1924, from Walter Lyman Brown to Arthur Ringland, Appendix 8.

3Note of September 25, 1930, Admiral Bristol to Arthur Ringland, Appendix 9.
Ringland: with him, however briefly, will not forget him. That's what I thought of him.

Mudanya Incident

Ingersoll: Tell us a little bit about the Mudanya incident.

Ringland: Admiral Bristol, in his capacity as the American High Commissioner, was under some criticism at home on the assumption that he was pro-Turk and prejudiced against the Armenians. There was only one answer—he was pro-American, period. The Armenian press, in publicizing the massacre of Armenians by the Turks, understandably indulged in some exaggeration, despite the fact that there were awful tragedies of this nature. When one of the many crises arose, and this was at a time of the war between the Turks and Greeks, I was invited to join a naval party to visit Mudanya, on the Sea of Marmara, the headquarters of the Turkish command. It was burning at the time, for the Turks had driven the Greeks out.

We called on the Turkish commanding general and found him in rare good humor. As we enjoyed the hospitality of coffee and cigarettes, he told us that he had intercepted a message from Athens and had the honor of informing the Greek commander who was his prisoner of his promotion. The Greeks had been occupying the Anatolian Peninsula for some two years, and their morale was low and their intelligence poor, he explained. This made it possible for the Turkish cavalry to move up under a camouflage of boughs (we thought of Macbeth), and rout the Greeks. The retreat of the Greeks to Smyrna and the burning of the city ended their occupation in 1922.

It should be added, although I was not there, that Admiral Bristol dispatched immediately some

1The Evening Star, Washington, D.C., May 19, 1939. Articles concerning Admiral Bristol are filed with Ringland papers.
Ringland: destroyers to Smyrna, now called Izmir, to help in the rescue of the refugees fleeing the city and to prevent, as well as they could, a situation that had the aspects of a holocaust.

Galipoli

Ingersoll: Did you get any interesting impressions of Turkey in that post-war period.

Ringland: Through the courtesy of Colonel Sherman Miles, our military attache at Constantinople and son of the famed General Nelson Miles, I was able in company with a British officer to walk over the Galipoli battlefield near Chanak overlooking the Dardenelles. It is there, it will be recalled, that the British and French fleets and armies were repulsed with tragic losses by the Turks in 1915 when they attempted to capture Constantinople. Had they succeeded the course of World War I would have been materially altered.

I want to quote here what I saw when we walked among the many cemeteries where the British had fallen:

The cemeteries at Galipoli are unlike those of any other battlefield in Europe... the dead were buried where they fell. Consequently a score or more of cemeteries were made, some with only a hundred graves, others with thousands, and they lie on every height where the fighting reached the zenith.

On the hillside above Chanak there is lettered by the Turks "March 18, 1915," the day the Allied fleet was defeated. This was not there at the time of our visit, but now stands for all to see from the ships as they pass through the Dardenelles.
Impressions of Russia

Ingersoll: Did you get a chance to get any views of Russia while you were in that part of the world?

Odessa - Talk with Harbor Pilot

Ringland: Yes, I did, and there an amusing incident occurred when I accompanied a navy party on a destroyer to Odessa. It was in the winter of 1923, bitterly cold, and some of the time I was seasick. When we arrived in Odessa, I went ashore with a liberty party, and we were met on the dock by a representative, presumably of the Soviet Foreign Office. He said that permission would be necessary from Moscow before we could visit the city, and he left, we thought, to obtain that permission. He came back after a while and said that no response had been received. In the meanwhile we had been stamping our feet and trying to keep warm. As a consequence, we agreed that should he once more come down and say that no permission had been received, we would, through the interpreter, express ourselves in plain language. When he came down again, the most profane sailor in the group was selected. He told the official where to get off and when he got off where he could go in purple embroidery. As we watched the face of the official, he gave no indication that he understood, but listened to the sugary response of the interpreter. He then disappeared and came back rather quickly with peremptory orders for us to leave the dock and the ship to leave the harbor. The harbor was mined, and it was necessary, I suppose, in any case, to take on a pilot, but when we got outside, a heavy sea was running off Cape Fontana, where the pilot should have been dropped. But this was impossible, and we had to take him with us to Constantinople. The pilot became greatly perturbed for fear that he would be considered a deserter by the Soviet authorities. However he soon realized he was in the hands of friends and he talked freely to us in the wardroom in response to our questions.
Ringland: One in particular interested us. When he was asked why it was that a small political group could control such a vast country, he said this was because of the lack of communications and roads. If a disturbance occurred in a village, it was a simple matter for troops to seize the open wells, and soon thirst would force the ringleaders to surrender. We carried the pilot with us to Constantinople, and arrangements were made for his return to Odessa.

Moscow

Ingersoll: Did you get to Moscow during your stay?

Ringland: Yes, I did. It was desirable to effect liaison with the A.R.A. office in Moscow, so I took advantage of the opportunity to accompany Colonel William Haskell, chief of all the A.R.A. operations in Russia, when he passed through Constantinople en route to his station. As chief of mission, when we arrived in Odessa, he was given every facility including a private railway car to take us to Moscow. I found the Russian first-class very comfortable, particularly because of the wide gauge, and the services of the provadnik, who had tea available at any time.

Ingersoll: Is this someone who would come running out to the car as the car stopped?

Ringland: No, he was sort of a porter-conductor combination. Passengers in the other classes ran with kettles at every stop, where hot water was available from great tanks on the platform.

In Moscow, I was a guest at the A.R.A.'s quarters known as the "Pink House." This had no political significance. It had been the mansion of a magnate and had reference to some rather ornate decorations. This was a time when the A.R.A. was contending with famine conditions, especially in the Volga area. Colonel Haskell, a very forthright and determined Army man, kept the text of a cablegram
on his desk for reference to Soviet officials, in which he was informing Mr. Hoover of the necessity to conclude operations because of this and that, but the occasion never arose. Colonel Haskell asked me if I cared to take a little leave and go to Petrograd, which I did in company with his son, Cadet Haskell, who was on furlough from West Point and who, I believe, lost a leg as a paratroop colonel in World War II. Jim Hodgson of the A.R.A. staff was with us too.

Petrograd

In Petrograd, we were sheltered in a most luxurious suite in a deluxe hotel, the Europa, on the Nevsky Prospekt, a hotel which still contained all of the original furnishing and more or less the services. It was obviously frequented by profiteers for, I remember, we indulged one time in strawberries and champagne. A commissar of the Soviets was our guide, and he showed us the historic sights. We went out to the summer palace at Tsarskoye Selo. It was interesting to note that all the furnishings of the palace were intact, including even the desk accessories in the Czar's study, and the statues in the grounds were there and unbroken, although one might have expected vandalism. In the city the great paintings of the Hermitage gallery were protected, as well as historic costumes. I've forgotten the name of the museum where these were housed. This safeguarding was made possible by the Commissar of Education.

A grim experience was to be shown the fortress of Peter and Paul on the banks of the Neva, including a chute for disposal of bodies into the river. A cell that interested us was one that had been occupied at one time by Catherine Breshkovskaya, who became a prisoner in exile in Siberia as one of the prominent members of the nobility in the minority party, the Mensheviks.
Diary of Catherine Breshkovskaya

Ringland: She was, at the time of our visit, in exile in Prague, as well as Kerensky, and she wanted to obtain her diary. This, we understood, was in the hands of an intimate friend, Vera Figner. Later, Lincoln Hutchinson of the Moscow staff was able to obtain the diary from Vera Figner. It was carried out of the country, as I recall, by Father Edmund Walsh of the Vatican Relief Mission who, in later years, became the distinguished dean of the Georgetown School of Foreign Service.

As I recall it, my wife while in London tried to have the diary translated. It seems the translator was a White Russian who took exception to some of the philosophy of Breshkovskaya so it was suspended. Later Dr. Hutchinson, to whom I have referred several times, had the diary translated and published at his personal expense when he returned from Russia to his home in Berkeley, California.

Relief Effort of American Women

Ingersoll: Speaking of Mrs. Ringland, could you tell us a little bit about any part she played as a member of the committee for refugee consideration?

Ringland: The committee I spoke of in Constantinople?

Ingersoll: Yes.

Ringland: I think it was largely through the interviews and talks with the refugees in obtaining material for action on problems which the local committee could handle without reference to the major program of relief itself. For example, Miss Ann Mitchell, to whom I made reference, was a sister-in-law of Anson Phelps Stokes, canon of the Washington cathedral, who was most generous. He and Miss Mitchell herself had expended personal funds to help out in ways
Ringland: which we could not very well do in our official program. Mrs. Bristol as wife of the High Commissioner was a most out-giving person, tremendously popular with everybody, so interested in social service that my wife and others looked upon her as the leader in this relationship. They, as I said, could do things which we could not, in a more direct, personal way. Not long after Admiral Bristol's death she was crippled for life in a car collision in Washington and later died.

Honors

I might bring in a note of levity here. One day Mrs. Bristol invited us all to luncheon, and when we were seated she said, "This is a special occasion. I've just been decorated by the Sultan." We all expressed our gratification. "Yes, I've been decorated with the Order of Chastity, Second Class."

Ingersoll: Perhaps I should interview Mrs. Ringland and ask her what kind of decoration of this sort she obtained.

Ringland: Well, she did get one—the Order of Saint Anne for her work with Mrs. Bristol's committee (as did the other ladies) and a letter (June 18, 1923) of appreciation from the Russian Diplomatic Representative at Constantinople on behalf of General Wrangel. This committee, as I've indicated, carried on close personal relations with the refugees hardly possible in the administration of the general relief program.

Ingersoll: And I understand you received the Order of St. Stanislaus.2 What was that?

---

1 Citation—Order of Saint Anne, Dorothy Ringland, Appendix 10 and 11.

2 Citation—Order of St. Stanislaus, A. Ringland, Appendix 10 and 11.
Ringland: The Order of St. Stanislaus was awarded for both military and civilian services. It was given me, together with a letter of appreciation of June 18, 1923, by the deposed ambassador, the Russian ambassador of the old regime, on behalf of General Wrangel, who, as commander-in-chief of the Russian Army, had his headquarters at that time in Sremski Karlovici, Serbia.

Ingersoll: Was this given at a special ceremony?

Ringland: Well, I wouldn't say special, just a very pleasant thing.

Last Ceremony in the White Russian Embassy

But where we did have quite a ceremony (I say 'we' because the whole colony engaged in it) was the last ceremony of the old Russian Embassy in Constantinople before it was turned over to the Soviets. The embassy was an imposing building with a broad terrace that looked out on the Bosphorus. We, in common with the other members of the colony and the diplomatic corps, all came to this marvelous reception in which the Russians were celebrating the end as they saw it. For one thing, they decided to be very proper; they would leave in the embassy for the Soviets to take over those things that by matter of protocol should be left, but they would not and did not leave the great wine cellar. All during the course of the evening, the night, and the early morning, the last celebration was carried on. I remember again and again how a group would gather around on the great terrace and sing a song to some person, and then all would throw their glasses down and break them on the pavement of the terrace.

Ingersoll: And start with another round of glasses and wine?

Ringland: And start with another round, yes. We all carried on until breakfast. It was a touching thing as well as being a very extraordinary event, as you can well imagine. It marked the end of the regime
Ringland: of a great empire which they represented, and its turnover to the revolutionaries. I'll never forget that party; I've never been to one like it since.

Ingersoll: These representatives of the Revolution then came and took over this same embassy building to run it in future years?

Ringland: Oh yes. But remember what I said—the old regime was honorable about what should be left.

Homeward Bound

The time came in November of 1923 to close our Mission and leave our apartment in the American Han where from our balcony we could almost throw a biscuit to the Muezzin as he canted the call to Allah from a minaret of the mosque of Dolmabahce, and from where we counted the allied Men-of-war at anchor in the Bosphorus as crises rose and fell.

In the company of Foster Stearns, Secretary of our Embassy, and Martha Stearns, my wife and I journeyed to Paris in November of 1923 by way of a 10-day voyage from Constantinople to Marseilles. And in the next month, Peter Ringland, our first hostage to fortune, was born December 18, 1923, in the American Hospital at Neuilly. In January we sailed for home, three of us, a Sealyham terrier and the Lord knows how much of this and that!
THE ADVISORY COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE (1940-1941)

Ingersoll: You've told me that you served on the staff of the National Defense Advisory Commission when the country was preparing for defense. What did this work involve?

Ringland: Following the conclusion of my services as chairman of the Flood Control Coordinating Committee of the Department of Agriculture, I received the interesting assignment, in 1940, to serve as consultant on the staff of the agricultural division of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. This opportunity came about through the good offices of Milton S. Eisenhower, then the Coordinator of Land Use in the Department of Agriculture.

Staff of Commission

The Commissioner for the agricultural division was Chester Davis, a governor of the Federal Reserve Board. Happily, because of his position, we occupied offices in what I consider the most beautiful of the government buildings in Washington, that is the Federal Reserve Building. The Deputy was J.P. Hutson, well-known economist in the field of agriculture. John Kenneth Galbraith, it should be remarked, was one of the staff economists. Here were three men of outstanding ability. I had the further opportunity to serve in association with Mr. Davis when he was a member of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the State Department and I was the Executive Director. Hutson, I had come to know very well, particularly when we were both attached to our embassy in Berlin in 1933, I think it was. Subsequently, he served as Deputy Director-General of the UN. He was a good friend.
The Problem

Ringland: At this time, the War Department was actively engaged in preparations of national defense. The necessities of this defense demanded extensive acreages for plant sites for the manufacture of munitions, and larger areas for military training and maneuvers of troops, or for bombing ranges and anti-aircraft firing. This involved over one million acres of land. Sometimes the land needed would embrace a farm population of several thousand. It was assumed that the number of farm families in process of dispossessment and relocation to new sites would approximate ten thousand, or a rural population of not less than fifty thousand if agricultural laborers and dispossessed villagers were included. The agricultural division of the Commission, in response to requests for advice and assistance, made a field inquiry in the South and Middlewest in cooperation with the War Department and the Department of Agriculture of the problems confronting farmers and the effects upon rural interests when the land was summarily acquired for defense purposes.

Ingersoll: What was your own part in this?

Ringland: I was assigned to undertake field inquiries of the problems confronting farmers in respect to a number of specific projects which had been selected by the War Department for acquisition. These included sites for ordnance works in Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Tennessee, and Alabama; an anti-aircraft training area in Georgia; training areas in Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. The projects were carefully studied.

Ingersoll: What were your personal feelings while you were making these field inquiries?

Ringland: It involved very speedy action, seldom more than sixty days. So it was a poigniant experience to meet with the farmers who were to be dispossessed. I recall an examination that I participated in for an ordnance site in some rich farm lands in Illinois. These farms had been under occupancy, some of them in families that dated back for many, many years. As I say, it was very poigniant, because
Ringland: I can picture right now the farmer with tears coursing down his cheeks. They all recognized the inevitability of this because we were moving into war. And it was a sacrifice that they realized had to be made. But I think you or any one could appreciate tearing up family roots in the manner in which it had to be done was almost a tragedy. And I am speaking of this aside from any financial settlement, which was difficult at the best—but of the emotional aspects, and the sentimental influences and all, that tied them to the farm and the home. And then, too, the uncertainty of the world into which they were being pushed, the new world. So I must say, it was a feeling of some relief when the job was done. I don't know whether it could have been done in any better way than we did under the circumstances. We had to wield an ax, and the ax was used, and that's about it!

Ingersoll: But, you were, of course, in your recommendations, trying to salve over, as much as possible, things for uncertain people in uncertain times, weren't you?

Ringland: Oh, yes. And then, too, the readjustment of these dispossessed families was made as easy as possible. And every facility was provided to that end. But even so, that doesn't get away from what I said here, the dispossession...I think it's a different situation than when you have a great, sudden natural catastrophe. There it just strikes, and it strikes you and many all around you, and that's it. But....

Ingersoll: Everybody's rushing in to help.

Ringland: This in a way, despite the short time, was an agonized piece of surgery with a long time in the recovery room.

Ingersoll: Who made the studies?

Ringland: Representatives of the Farm Security Administration, the Extension Service, and from other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, state and county land use planning committees, county farm bureaus, and of the Real Estate Branch of the War Department. It became apparent that the depopulation of farm areas under emergent conditions imposed a responsi-
farmers in readjustment and relocation. The purchase of the land, however fair the payment might be, was not sufficient to discharge the obligations that the government incurred by its summary action. Land acquisition under normal conditions limits compensation to the fair market value of the realty. But this afforded no criterion for acquisition under emergency conditions.

Reports and Recommendations

As a result of the field study of projects assigned to me, I drafted a memorandum of December 26, 1940, on the principles to guide the compensation to resident owner-operators and tenants. This was circulated for comment to the field--officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, state and county agents, and colleges.\(^1\) Also, a detailed report was made by me to Deputy Commissioner Hutson on April 24, 1941, entitled, "Land Acquisition for Defense Purposes,"\(^2\) and, on the same date, I submitted a syllabus of reports on disturbance conditions at each of the sites.\(^3\)


\(^2\) See Appendix, Detailed report, April 24, 1941.

\(^3\) See Appendix, Syllabus, April 24, 1941. The appendix to the "syllabus" (condensation) reports on disturbance conditions at each site: Elwood and Kankakee Ordnance Works, Wilmington, Illinois; Camp Stewart, Anti-aircraft Training Area, Hinesville, Georgia; Weldon Springs, TNT Plant, St. Charles County, Missouri; Iowa Ordnance Works, Burlington, Iowa; Camp Leonard Wood, Rolla, Missouri; Camp Robinson, Little Rock, Arkansas; Anniston Ammunition Storage Area, near Ft. McClellan, Alabama; Army training areas in the vicinity of Alexandria, Louisiana; Jefferson Proving Grounds, Indiana; Wolf Creek Ordnance Works, Milan, Tennessee; and Coosa River Ordnance Works, Childersburg, Alabama.
RIngland: I would like to call attention to certain paragraphs in the detailed report which state the problems and solutions as we saw them. There were a wide variety of direct and indirect damages to the individual farm family.\(^1\) We were particularly concerned with the losses suffered by sharecroppers and farmers.\(^2\)

In the report, I quoted paragraphs from a letter to Undersecretary of War Patterson in which the suggestion was made for setting aside five percent of all funds allocated for purchase of land to be used for payment of disturbance damages to those working, living, or operating such land.\(^3\) Patterson did not agree with our position, possibly for legal reasons, so we suggested that a special appropriation be made to the Department of Agriculture with which farmers could be paid for their losses.\(^4\) The only outcome of this suggestion was the statement by the Director of the Budget that all departments concerned should work together to ease inequities.\(^5\)

Ingersoll: Was formal authority for an appropriation from Congress ever sought?

RIngland: As I recall it, no formal authority was sought from Congress in respect to disturbance damages; time may have been a factor. But, short of this, everything was done through interdepartment cooperation and with the support of agricultural agencies in the field itself--state, county, and local--to alleviate the hardships of the landowner, the tenant, or the sharecropper. The report mentions some of the formal and informal steps taken.\(^6\)

---


\(^3\) *Ibid.*, p. 10


Ingersoll: Can you envisage any situation other than national defense that might create some of the same problems of dislocation for the farmer that you found?

Ringland: The crux of the problem is loss of title to the homestead, and that is what happened to those dispossessed for emergent military reasons. But loss of title does not necessarily follow in the case of disaster due to floods, extreme droughts or great fires. In such cases there are provisions for temporary assistance by the Federal government declaring a disaster and in support of state and local help. Yet should the land itself be lost by the force of nature some of the problems of dispossession that confronted the acquisition of land for defense purposes would follow. The loss of soil in Spain due to the search for a missile bomb and the claims against our government afford a singular but historic example of unforeseen disturbance damages. Should we be confronted again with an emergent need to dispossess home owners, we can profit by the recorded experience of those of us who wrestled with the problem as a prelude to our entry in World War II.
THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE ORGANIZATION OF VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID (1939-1953)

Introduction

Ingersoll: You told me, I recall, that your last active service was in the State Department as a foreign affairs officer. Let's talk about that.

Ringland: On the completion of my work as a consultant to the National Defense Commission, early in 1941, it was suggested that I talk with Joseph Davies, former Ambassador to Russia, who had just been appointed by President Roosevelt as Chairman of the President's Committee on War Relief Agencies.

The suggestion was prompted, in view of my detail from the Army following the armistice of World War I in 1918, to the American Relief Administration under Herbert Hoover. I had served as the Administration's Chief of Mission in Czechoslovakia, as the Administration's Adviser to the American High Commissioner in Turkey, and to the Council of the League of Nations, Geneva, in the evacuation of Russian refugees, following the defeat of General Wrangel's Army by the Bolsheviks.

As a result of my talk with Mr. Davies, I served successively as consultant to the President's Committee on War Relief Agencies in the period of American neutrality; assistant executive director of the President's War Relief Control Board, during American participation in World War II; and, in the postwar years, as Adviser, Voluntary Foreign Aid Staff, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs, and ex-officio Executive Director of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, Department of State, until the transfer of the Committee to the newly
Ringland: organized Foreign Operations Administration, July 1, 1953. It was then that I retired.

Character of Relief in World War I and II

Ingersoll: Mr. Ringland, from your vantage point of having been associated with relief work after World War I and then before, during, and after World War II, could you give us your view of the differences in relief problems and their solutions in these two, and perhaps their similarities, too?

Ringland: While the common denominator was, of course, the need for food, clothing, and medicine, the military, economic, and political circumstances of World War I and II dictated quite different measures of administration. The need was met, upon our entry in World War I as an outgrowth of Herbert Hoover's organization, in 1914, of relief in Belgium. That organization, Commission for the Relief of Belgium, was of a unique character. It has been well said that it was, in effect, a neutral state, because it had its own flag at sea and its passport was honored on land. And its machinery practically supported the whole economy of the Belgian state from 1914 until our withdrawal as a neutral and entry in the war in April of 1917. The Commission pioneered modern methods of distributing food in war-time, the experience proving invaluable when the American Relief Administration was organized immediately following the Armistice of 1918.

After the Armistice, in the light of that Belgian experience, Mr. Hoover developed a somewhat similar framework in the newly created nations, or the reconstructed ones. The personnel was taken from the experienced group who had served in Belgium, with some additions from army and navy officers whose active service, after the Armistice, was no longer needed and who were made available for assignment to the American Relief Administration. When Mr. Hoover appealed
to General Pershing and Admiral Benson he was told he could have anyone he needed from corporal to general or admiral.

"The problem," Mr. Hoover said, "was not alone of foodstuffs. It was a problem of the establishment of actual governmental machinery which would recreate economic life." With this in view, some of these officers were designated to organize the problems of children; some in charge of ports and great railway systems, communications, coal districts, and canals; and some as technical and economic advisers to the newly organized governments. Not the least among the problems was the interchange of commodities among the new nations—a problem of barter without currency or banking connections.

Field services in World War I, other than the American Red Cross, were confined to a relatively few agencies, mostly church groups. And these drew on the resources of the American Relief Administration to provide for the institutions that they were trying to relieve in the war areas. They were not in a position to provide and administer general relief. That was the function of the American Relief Administration. Nevertheless, the support of these agencies was an invaluable adjunct to ARA operations. And in Czechoslovakia, for example, the young women of the American Red Cross gave indispensable help in organizing the committees at feeding stations.

But the American Relief Administration was mainly government financed, was it not?

The funding came from government and voluntary sources. The division was between provision of general relief for the public by the American Relief Administration through the rationing system of the newly organized governments, and the setup of the European Children's Fund as an auxiliary of the American Relief Administration.

The fund received substantial support from the government as well as from voluntary agencies and public sources through a nation-wide appeal made by Mr. Hoover. That appeal, which collected some thirty-odd million dollars, as I recall it,
Ringland: was the largest collected for charity up to this time. But, again I want to bring out, that in World War II the National War Fund was well over several hundred millions.

Period of American Neutrality, 1939-1941

Ingersoll: It is evident that under Mr. Hoover's leadership voluntary relief in World War I was efficiently organized and productive. But weren't the American people, with the best of good will, in a difficult position to help when World War II broke out?

Ringland: Some three years elapsed, as you know, before our entry into World War II. But the invasion of Poland in 1939, by the Germans, precipitated a flood of appeals for American help; and these multiplied as country after country became involved in the war. Hundreds of committees were hastily organized, particularly among groups with blood ties overseas. But there was no coordination of appeals, no assurance that the funds collected could be productively used, no protection from exploitation. To be sure, the Neutrality Act of November 4, 1939 required the registration and regulation of all American voluntary relief agencies engaged in solicitation and collection of resources for relief in countries declared belligerent by the President. But the Neutrality Act was designed primarily to protect the neutral position of the United States by the prohibition of various forms of economic relations with the belligerent countries. Relief to neutral countries was not affected; and the public was confronted with hundreds of appeals by organizations not subject to the registration and regulation terms of the Neutrality Act. The resulting confusion of purpose, duplication of effort, and waste of manpower and material resources dictated the need for coordination and control.
Ingersoll: And, of course, the problem confronted in World War II, the area of devastation and the needs of increased population, this sort of thing, must have been more intensive during this period than it was during the period of the first World War.

Ringland: Yes, and complicated by the extraordinary drift of refugees.

Herbert Hoover's Proposal to the American Red Cross

Ingersoll: Of course, Mr. Hoover was such a central figure during the first World War and American Relief Administration days. Did he, with his vast experience, have ideas about how relief should be given by voluntary agencies when World War II erupted? In view of what you have just said of the confusion after the invasion of Poland in 1939, comment would be timely at this point.

Ringland: I obtained permission to use, for possible guidance by my Committee, copies of the letters exchanged between Mr. Hoover and Norman Davis, then Chairman of the American Red Cross. This was in September of 1939 immediately following the outbreak of World War II, on Mr. Hoover's proposal for the Red Cross to preempt the whole field of civilian war relief in Europe.1,2

Immediately following the invasion of Poland, in 1939, Mr. Hoover suggested to Mr. Davis that the

---

1Letter of November 14, 1941, Perrin C. Galpin to Ringland. See Appendix.

2Letter of October 24, 1968, Ringland to Galpin with note of November 1, 1968, regarding telephone call of November 1, 1968, to "use the correspondence as you see fit." See Appendix.
American Red Cross undertake to organize and administer relief to the war distressed; for he well knew that the need for some form of action would rapidly develop. It was his feeling that the American Red Cross was admirably constituted to fulfill this function. In his letter of September 15, 1939, to Mr. Davis, Mr. Hoover said, "I stated that my strong recommendation is that American participation and American effort in relief of distress should be conducted under the leadership of the American Red Cross."\(^1\)

And in his letter of September 20, 1939 he added, "I was disappointed to hear that there was hesitancy on the part of the Red Cross in undertaking one of the greatest obligations that has ever come to them."\(^2\)

Mr. Davis, in his reply of September 22 to Mr. Hoover, said,

"The Red Cross has always taken the position that there is a fundamental distinction between emergency relief, which is its normal function and which can be financed by private contributions, and that of mass feeding and relief over an extended period, which requires such substantial outlays of money as to necessitate governmental financing.... I thoroughly agree with you that insofar as practical and possible the Red Cross should assume the leadership in voluntary efforts to alleviate the suffering of non-combatant victims of war as well as that of combatants."\(^3\)

Mr. Hoover's proposal for the Red Cross to undertake the preemption of the whole field of relief,

\(^1\)Letter of Hoover to Davis, September 15, 1939. See Appendix.

\(^2\)Letter of Hoover to Davis, September 20, 1939. See Appendix.

\(^3\)Letter of Davis to Hoover, September 22, 1939. See Appendix.
Shipment from Chicago of the Christian Rural Overseas Program of the Church World Service. Officers of CROP and Arthur Ringland, Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, at dockside of Norwegian freighter, November 1951.

Left to right: Ambassador Sen, Madame Chiroprova Sen and Mr. Arthur Ringland, Executive Director of the State Department's Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. June 21, 1952

Accompanying Press Release states:

"More than a million pounds of food, donated by Christian Americans to alleviate famine distress in the Chittoor District of India, started on its way to that hungerswept country with the loading (Saturday, June 21) in Baltimore...for Bombay and Karachi.

"The shipment - wheat, rice, relief cereal, and powdered milk - was made possible through the contributions of thousands of American farmers to the Christian Rural Overseas Program (CROP) of the Department of Church World Service, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA...."
Ringland: not merely a part, did not develop. Mr. Hoover's position was a reflection of his philosophy of organization. Witness Belgium in 1914, and what he wanted done in Poland in 1939.

Organization of Voluntary Foreign Aid

The President's Committee on War Relief Agencies

Ingersoll: Were there further developments when Mr. Hoover's proposal was not acceptable to the Red Cross?

Ringland: It is significant to note that Mr. Hoover made his proposal at the very outset of World War II, that is, in September of 1939. But the provisions of the Neutrality Act of November 1939 which followed, as I have pointed out, were inadequate to meet relief needs. So the situation of misery abroad and frustrated good-will at home obtained until President Roosevelt appointed the President's Committee on War Relief Agencies, on March 13, 1941.

Personnel of the Committee

This committee was set up at the initial request of Secretary of State Hull, in view of the growing complexity of the whole problem of extending relief overseas to the war-distressed people--particularly complicated because of our neutral

---

1Letter of Hoover to Davis, September 24, 1939. See Appendix.

position at the time. The members were: former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, Charles P. Taft, son of the former president, and Frederick R. Keppel, president of the Carnegie Foundation. Upon Mr. Keppel's death in 1943, he was succeeded by Charles Warren, a distinguished lawyer.

The committee was charged by the President to examine the whole problem of war relief in relation to local charities and national defense needs, and to recommend measures that should be taken in the public interest.

The appointment of the Davies Committee was timely. Mr. Hull pointed out that some 300 organizations were registered with the Department under the terms of the Neutrality Act of 1939 in order that they might solicit and collect contributions for the relief of war-ravaged Europe; many were raising funds without full knowledge of the relief resources already at hand and the actual relief requirements. Since there was no coordination there was confusion, duplication of effort, and waste of man-power, and material resources.

The reasons that dictated the creation of the President's Committee on War Relief Agencies were in substance those that Herbert Hoover foresaw a year and a half earlier in September of 1939, the month the war broke out. This Committee was the first of three war-time regulatory bodies of this character; the others were the President's War Relief Control Board, and the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, under the umbrella of the State Department. Each served the circumstances of the time—the period of neutrality to 1941, the active war 1942-1945, and the post-war 1946-1953.

Duties of the Staff

My talk with Mr. Davies resulted in assignment as a consultant to his committee, probably as I have said, because of field experience in Europe with Mr. Hoover's American Relief Administration
as Chief of Mission in Czechoslovakia and in Constantinople. I was happy to join the Committee and to take part at the very beginning of its work. My colleagues were: Homer Fox of the State Department; Judson Dickerman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; Raymond Bland of the Department of Agriculture; and Pendleton Turner, unattached. We took over from the State Department the records of the registered agencies and, with these as a base, prepared and distributed a questionnaire designed to give our Committee a picture of the status of some 600 private agencies engaged in, or related to, war relief.

The duties assigned to me by the Committee at its meeting on September 16, 1941, included war relief legislation (including its relation to foreign countries, particularly Canada which had set up a somewhat comparable committee to control voluntary relief); a study of the modification of the Neutrality Act in respect to continuance of the State Department's control of foreign relief agencies, the current refugee relief problems, general relief intelligence; and—quite importantly—postwar relief studies, with particular reference to probably requirements to be worked out in cooperation with the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Treasury, the National Resources Planning Board, and other Federal agencies, the American Red Cross, and others, specifically for measures of mass feeding, clothing and medical aid, refugee settlement and rehabilitation.1

Development of War Plans

Everyone knew that the period of neutrality was temporary, that it was only a question of time when we would enter the war as an active participant. And it was for that reason the Committee was concerned with the development of plans and procedures to take effect when the change

1 Memorandum of duties assigned to Mr. Ringland after meeting of September 16, 1941. See Appendix.
Ringland: would take place, which would be a very marked one in relation to voluntary relief. The large number that were attempting during the neutrality period to provide relief was greatly reduced, largely by persuasion, so that when war was declared, the agencies that were cooperating effectively with the Committee would be of the strongest types.

The task of bringing order out of confusion had its emotional moments. I recall a meeting in our office of the representatives of two American-Italian organizations seated on opposite sides of our conference table. They were unable to reconcile their respective interests and plans for relief, and accept one organization for recognition. They became so emotional in their pleading that tears coursed down their cheeks! We respected these people for their selfless services and their compassion for their kinfolk in the old country. As leaders in their communities, it was natural to seek personal recognition but, to their credit, all accepted our good offices and together organized one agency to appeal for contributions on behalf of war victims in Italy.

The Period of American Participation in the War (1942-1945)

President's War Relief Control Board

Ringland: As the country moved from a state of neutrality to a state of war, our Committee drafted a plan, including the establishment of a single authority with adequate regulatory and supervisory control to be exercised through the President's war time police powers. This led, following the recommendation of Chairman Davies and of Secretary of State Hull, to the establishment of the President's War Relief Control Board, by Executive Order of July 25, 1942, as a regulatory body, exercising the war powers of the President. (Mr. Davies continued as Chairman with his colleagues Mr. Taft
Ingersoll: Did your own personal job change very much from the time of the Committee on War Relief Agencies to the War Relief Control Board? Or were the functions which you listed as those with the Committee on War Relief Agencies pretty much extended into the War Relief Control Board?

Ringland: Well, I should say more or less they extended into the second period because of the basic philosophy underlying it all. But my status was changed from consultant to Assistant Executive Director.

Ingersoll: What do you consider the most significant developments while you were on the President's War Relief Control Board?

Ringland: I consider the following developments outstanding for they reflect the unity and cooperation made possible by the patriotism inspired by the war. The President's War Relief Control Board initiated

1 Report of the President's War Relief Control Board, March 1946, "Voluntary War Relief during World War II." See Section on "Published Reports," VE.


3 Memorandum of August 4, 1942 of Charles P. Taft, Acting Chairman of the President's War Relief Control Board, on the classification of Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.
the development of some of the agencies involved, and, in all, played an influential part: The National War Fund, the United Jewish Appeal, The United National Clothing Collection, the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and CARE (Cooperative American Relief Everywhere).

The stimulus of active war greatly accelerated the resources made available to the registered agencies in support of their overseas operations for British, French, Dutch, Norwegian, Greek, Czech, Yugoslav, Polish, Italian, Palestinian, Russian, and Chinese war sufferers. But it is significant to note in terms of organization, that the greater part of these resources were contributed by the public to the National War Fund, the United Jewish Appeal, American Overseas Aid, United Nations Appeal for Children and the United National Clothing Collection. CARE was organized under the aegis of the Board but public support developed after the war.

I would like to refer to some of these developments because of their unusual character.

**National War Fund**

It will be recalled that the President's War Relief Control Board was empowered to consolidate organizations with common objectives in the interest of economy and efficiency. With this in view, the National War Fund, under the presidency of Winthrop Aldrich, was established early in 1943 on the Board's initiative and with President Roosevelt's approval, to raise funds for domestic and foreign war-related agencies. The President, in giving his approval, said on January 11, 1943:

"It will contribute greatly to our unity, enthusiasm, and powers in the war effort."

State war funds were established in each state, with local campaigns in most communities combined with community chests. The fund was eminently successful in raising during the campaigns of 1943, 1944 and 1945, the greatest amount of money given to charity by any people in the world. I believe the sum exceeded seven hundred and fifty
Ringland: million, and was allocated for both domestic and foreign war-related needs, the latter in the amount of 143 million through 26 agencies registered with the President's War Relief Control Board. The great success of the Fund was due to its superb organization and the leadership of its personnel nation-wide.

The United Jewish Appeal

Parallel with the National War Fund, the major Jewish charities, acting jointly as the United Jewish Appeal, were no less successful in the raising of funds, I believe over $400 million, to meet the greatly expanded relief needs of Jewish war victims. The primary operating agency was (and still is) the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, an organization that has a historic record of service dating from World War I.

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service

The Council was established in 1943, with the encouragement of the President's War Relief Control Board, as a federation of the principal voluntary relief agencies representing both secular and religious interests. The work of the Council, with a membership of some 45 agencies, has been carried out with notable success (and it is still active) by functional, country, regional and ad hoc committees, on matters of common concern. The findings of these committees served most usefully as a consensus on procedures and policies for the guidance of the whole membership, and for representation.

1 The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, membership list. See Appendix.
Dr. Joseph P. Chamberlain initiated the organization of the Council and served as its chairman until his death. He, and Charlotte Owen, as executive secretary until her retirement, made the Council of invaluable assistance to the President's War Relief Control Board and its successor body, the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Department of State. It continues today to be an essential service to its member agencies and to AID, the Agency for International Development.¹

**CARE (Cooperative American Relief Everywhere)**

The impetus and guidance the President's War Relief Control Board gave to the creation and organization, in 1945, of CARE, was a signal service. It became a unique international institution soon as well known as the Red Cross.

It was apparent to the Board, well before VE Day, that the people of the war-ravaged countries of Europe would need help in measure greater than that which obtained following World War I.

In view of field experience with Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration in Europe, I was directed, as a member of the Board staff, to undertake a study of ways to meet the inevitable crisis upon the cessation of hostilities.

Ingersoll: What past experience did you draw on to meet this crisis?

¹On the occasion of my retirement from the State Department, I was elected an Honorary Associate of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.
Planning for Post-war Relief

Hoover's Food Draft Plan in World War I

Ringland: I drew upon several types of operations for the Hoover organization in World War I not only supported the rationing programs of the various governments in Central and Eastern Europe through the import of grains and fats, but carried on supplementary mass child-feeding operations. But while these measures provided general relief, there was no assured way kinfolk in the United States could provide needed supplemental direct relief to their relatives in the stricken countries, save through uncertain commercial channels. In consequence, Mr. Hoover initiated the Food Draft Plan.

The plan was a success through the cooperation of the American Bankers' Association and the five thousand or more banks across the country where food drafts could be bought for transmittal overseas. In Europe, the drafts were presented by the recipients at the warehouses of the American Relief Administration, where standard food packages of nutritional value were assembled and delivered. The system had the merit of substituting food for money--food which supplemented the local rationing system. Money from America, by promoting the black market, added nothing to the marginal domestic supplies. The operation of the plan was terminated in any country when food could be bought in that country cheaper than the cost of the food draft at home.

Ingersoll: What did you do yourself in all of this, Mr. Ringland?

Study of Similar Plan for World War II

Ringland: As I said, the Board charged me with a study of ways and means to meet the coming situation of people in the United States wanting to help their
people overseas. The ARA—that is, the American Relief Administration—food draft system as it was initiated by Mr. Hoover and in operation in post-first World War—was outlined by me to the Board on January of 1944. Its merit was so patent that the Board directed me to continue the study of ways to further the setup of a similar system for post-second World War.

There followed, throughout 1944, an exchange of views with the War Department, the Red Cross, and other agencies, Federal and private. Acting Chairman Taft of the Board wrote Assistant Secretary of War McCloy on January 8, enclosing a memorandum he had asked me to prepare. And Mr. McCloy replied on the 13th, "The War Department can see no reason why the step that you prepare to take would not be helpful—if the army is in the picture, it would be a boon to us if we could deal through one channel rather than have to deal with all the agencies that are involved." What Mr. McCloy had in mind was, of course, the carrying out of such an operation in the occupied areas at the close of the war—that is, in Germany, for example.

On August 15, Mr. Taft wrote Chairman O'Connor of the Red Cross in follow up of a talk that day, based on material I had prepared for him, reflecting the opinion shared by Chairman Joseph E. Davies of the Board and Charles Warren, member, that the Red Cross was in the best position to carry out the food package service in association with Red Cross societies abroad. Mr. O'Connor, in reply on August 24, suggested a conference, but no action developed, and nothing further came of this exchange of views.

The Red Cross was asked again to re-examine the whole proposal. The effective prisoner-of-war package service, administered by the Red Cross, would be terminated with the cessation of hostilities. In conversation with Maurice Pate, the director, we exchanged the thought that the Red Cross should continue a package service on behalf of civilians, in effect, carry out the World War I plan, as I have referred to above. Moreover the Red Cross package machinery installed in Philadelphia could be made available, otherwise it would be dismantled. We felt the hundreds of
Ringland: Red Cross chapters would be willing, no doubt, to carry forward in effect, their wartime service. Mr. Pate was sympathetic, for he had been a member of the American Relief Administra-
tion in the first World War. It developed in the end that Red Cross policy did not permit assumption of the task, a reflection of the views expressed by Norman Davis in his correspon-
dence with Herbert Hoover in 1939, when Mr. Hoover had urged the Red Cross to undertake general relief.1

Other Proposals and Determining Principles

From time to time, and later in the course of the year, specific proposals setting up a package service were presented to the Board for consideration. These came from interested sources outside the government—from officials of the relief agencies with whom the Board was in touch. The proposals did not meet the firm conclusion of the Board that it was essential to supplement the valiant work of general relief of the religious and ethnic voluntary groups by an organization that could meet the appeals that were coming to them for individual aid, and from other sources, too. It was thought essential to effect some form of collaboration; and that led, later to the acceptance of the principle that the organization to be established should be of a character to carry out services that no one of these voluntary agencies could undertake alone.

In June, following VE Day, Lincoln Clark (and I'll speak more of him later) of United Nations' Relief and Rehabilitation Agency, prepared a draft to show how a cooperative might be used as the foundation of a plan. But whatever form the organization should take, it would need, at the outset, means to provide service without delay if it was to assist at a critical time a public already subjected to commercial exploitation in their eagerness to help by person-to-person

1See correspondence between Hoover and Davis, op. cit. Appendix.
Army Surplus Rations

Our Board heard by chance—I want to emphasize that—in October of 1945 I think it was, that the Army was in process of making available to UNRRA—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency—its huge surplus of packaged rations. Immediate action was evidently imperative. I grabbed a taxi and rushed to the Pentagon and explained to the officers of the Supply Section of the Civil Affairs Division of the War Department what our Board had underway, and that some of the surplus should be reserved for American disposition before committing the whole to UNRRA. Following a number of discussions with the Board, the army declared a surplus of 2,800,000 "ten in one" ration packages. Each package provided food for ten men for one day.

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service

With the assurance of the army surplus packages, the Board requested the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service to bring together its member agencies into an organization, as speedily as possible, to effect a package service. The Council responded to this, and several representatives of the member agencies and advisers proceeded to work out the details with Miss Charlotte Owen, the executive director of the Council. They were Wallace Campbell, of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.; Eastburn Thompson, of the American Friends Service Committee; George Miles, of the Catholic War Relief Service; Lincoln Clark; and Alexander Hawes, a distinguished lawyer, provided the legal framework of organization. They finally, through their work, made possible the first meeting of the member agencies. This was on November 27, 1945, and it is considered to be the birthday of CARE.
The Organization of CARE

Initial Meeting and Personnel

Ingersoll: Were you at this meeting?

Ringland: Yes, I was at that meeting. The honorary president—I'm speaking now of the setup of the organization—the honorary president was Donald M. Nelson; Murray Lincoln, who was the President of the Nationwide Insurance Company and also of the Cooperative League, was elected president; and General William N. Haskell, executive director; Elmer Burland, deputy executive director; and Alexander V. Hawes, general counsel. General Haskell had behind him his vast experience as chief of the American Relief Administration Mission to Soviet Russia; and Burland had served on his staff.

Naming the Organization

It is of interest to remark how the name CARE came into being. It was due to the imagination of Lincoln Clark and Mrs. Clark, his wife. In fact, it is she who deserves the credit. She toyed around with the functions of the job to be done as a cooperative body, as it was, to send remittances to Europe; and out of that she suggested the initials C-A-R-E, Cooperative American Remittances to Europe. I've often thought that this very name has made it such a successful organization. For one thing, whenever written it would need to be in capital letters, and I know of no other organization, at least offhand, but must resort to lower case. Later CARE substituted "Relief" for "Remittances" and "Everywhere" for "Europe."
Problems of Pricing

Ringland: When the organization of CARE was set up, the War Assets Administration agreed to sell CARE, on February 15, 1946, the 2.8 million packages of ten-in-one which had, as I said, been declared surplus by the Army. But the War Assets Administration charge was $6.50 per package. And CARE was authorized to charge the purchaser not less than $12.50 nor more than $15 per package. If CARE failed to take over the whole 2.8 million packages, a matter of more than $18 million in value, before October 1, of '46, the rations which were not taken over would be excluded from the agreement. Later this precipitated a rather critical situation for CARE in relation to this contract. The War Assets Administration asked me if I would not obtain a recommendation of our Board--or rather our Committee, because it was then the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the State Department--to transfer a million or so of the packages, still in warehouse, over to UNRRA. I said I was cold to the suggestion and I thought our Committee would support a reduction in the cost of the packages to $10. And I concluded by saying, "CARE has too many elements of service in the public interest to be restricted at this time."

My position was fortified by a letter of August 15 to the War Assets Administration by Mr. Elmer Burland, a former colleague of mine in the American Relief Administration, the deputy executive director of CARE. He strongly urged, in his letter, that the CARE packages should be sold at a much lower price--comparable to the estimated price which UNRRA was paying for similar packages. He said at $4 as the charge by WAA, CARE could at $10 possibly sell the entire 2.8 million packages before October 1. He concluded by saying that at such a price it would be received by the American people as in full keeping with the spirit of the U.S. government in encouraging the maximum shipment of food packages to Europe in this critical pre-harvest period. Our Committee supported Mr. Burland and the proposed amendment to the WAA contract and the reduction of the cost from $6.50 to $4, with
Ringland: postponement of the date for completion of the sales to March 1 of '47. Burland's firm and unyielding stand in the first place, and in the face of possible liquidation, established the benchmark of CARE's success. As a result, and from that time on, aided by the extraordinary imaginative and promotional ability of Paul French, who became Executive Director, CARE sales jumped up, up, up, and up!

Expansion of Relief Measures

Ingersoll: You spoke of the great expansion of CARE's sales. Did this suggest any sort of relief other than food?

Ringland: It did, indeed. Demands first were for the sale of undesignated packages. Many people were happy to buy CARE packages and leave it to CARE to distribute to meet the situation in any particular country, or even to a country that might be designated. Exception was taken to this by some of the member agencies. They felt that this service was encroaching on their field, which was one of general relief rather than individual relief. The situation or, rather, difference in point of view—was further aggravated by the proposal to provide blankets, and medicines to hospitals, and technical books. This type of expansion was too much for some agencies which again felt there was a departure from the whole original concept of individual food packages in time of emergency. And since it was voted to include such expanded services, the church groups generally withdrew their membership—that is, the Catholic and Protestant groups. And the Christian Science group withdrew because of the medical aspect. The principal Jewish group, the Joint Distribution Committee, resigned more for other reasons; they were so organized, dating back to World War I, that they were quite self-sufficient.

Underlying the action of the groups that resigned, was the fear that CARE would potentially affect the resources which they needed to command to carry out their programs. In my opinion at
Arthur Ringland receiving CARE plaque from Senator Herbert Lehman, Harold Miner, President of CARE, in center. At the headquarters of the United Nations, May 14, 1958 - 12th Anniversary of CARE.

20th Anniversary of Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, July 10, 1966. Left to right-Arthur Ringland with Certificate of Appreciation for Distinguished Service, as former Executive Director; David Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development; and Charles P. Taft, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.
HANDLED WITH CARE — Mrs. Milton Meltzer, chairman of the Somerset Woman's Club garden party yesterday to honor Arthur C. Ringland, "the father of CARE," presents a silver bowl to the guest of honor (right). Looking on is Somerset Mayor Warren J. Vinton, host for the gathering. Ringland helped to organize the first CARE program for international relief.
this late date, I think their fears were not well founded, because CARE's great strength has come from the general lay public, from people who had never contributed to any overseas aid program, and, therefore, not affecting the constituencies of the church groups. The large membership organizations that did not have their own relief programs looked on CARE as a strong right arm to carry forward the programs which they were not prepared to carry out on their own.¹

CARE expanded its service beyond those that I mentioned, which precipitated the resignations, and added such things as seeds, plows, hand tools, mid-wife kits, and baby layettes—oh, I could go on, you know the catalogue of packages, or services, which have been of great self-help assistance, as well as meeting the elementary need for food.

"Father of CARE" (an explanation)

12th Anniversary of CARE
May 14, 1958

Ingersoll: I understand that on occasions you have been called "the father of CARE."

Ringland: This label was the result of a luncheon held by CARE to celebrate the twelfth anniversary of the delivery of CARE food packages. At that time I received a plaque, presented by former Governor and United States Senator Lehman.² The New York Times of that day, May 14, 1958,³ had an item


²See Appendix, Inscription on Plaque presented at CARE 12th Anniversary.

Ringland: which was headed "Father of CARE." And I've been embarrassed by that awesome designation ever since. Now, the fact is, there is more than one father, and moreover, Herbert Hoover was the godfather!

Murray Lincoln, who became president of CARE, said, in his book, "Vice President in Charge of Revolution":

There were a lot of people in on the beginning of CARE, as there must be with any cooperative. I suppose credit for the idea rightly belongs to Arthur Ringland, then of the President's War Relief Control Board. Ringland served with Herbert Hoover after World War I in a similar venture.... When the atomic bomb brought a quick and somewhat unexpected end to World War II, the U.S. government was left with immense stockpiles of army ten-in-one rations. Aware of these stockpiles, Mr. Ringland was inspired to set up an organization to purchase the surplus packages, each of which contained the equivalent of 30 good meals, and ship them to the hungry in Europe. He tossed the idea to Dr. Lincoln Clark, Cooperating Specialist for UNRRA...."1

As I said in my remarks2 at the time of the presentation of the plaque, the conception of this was the plan that Herbert Hoover initiated in the first World War and in which I personally participated when I was in Europe under his direction. Now, as to the CARE organization itself, there was more than one father. I could name at least three if that isn't scandalous. When we talked about it, we said, "Well, we've set up the institution of polyandry." But, to be

1Murray Lincoln, Vice President in Charge of Revolution, McGraw Hill, New York.

2See Appendix, Text of speeches at 12th Anniversary of CARE.
serious, I feel that those that I worked with are the ones who took the first steps, and I've always felt a pride in being counted one of them. They were Wally Campbell, Alec Hawes, Tommy Burland, Lincoln Clark, Eastburn Thompson, George Miles, and Charlotte Owen.

So much for the conception of CARE. But high credit for the phenomenal growth that followed was due to the pioneer work of General William Haskell, Elmer Burland, Murray Lincoln, and the extraordinary promotion of Paul French as executive director. French was succeeded by Richard Reuter, who later became special assistant to the President and director of Food For Peace. Frank Gaffio is the present able head.

I was surprised, Mrs. Ingersoll, when sometime later I was awarded a beautiful medallion which was presented to me in October 1958 by Mr. Robert S. Cramer, the vice president of Parent's Magazine. Parent's Magazine also similarly honored Dr. Harvey E. White, vice chairman of the Department of Physics of the University of California at Berkeley and Representative Carl Elliott of Alabama, Chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, at the same time, for "Outstanding Service to Children."1,2,3,4,5

Upon the conclusion of the active war in Europe, the President's War Relief Control Board recommended to the President that the war-time

1 Appendix, letter of October 2, 1958 to Ringland from Robert S. Cramer, Vice president, Parent's Magazine.


4 Appendix, page from January 1959 issue of Parent's Magazine, detailing the awards as noted above.

powers of regulation of war charities for foreign relief and the welfare of the Armed Forces with which the Board was charged by Executive Order No. 9205 of July 25, 1942, should be revoked.

The President accepted the Board's recommendation, and on May 14, 1946, he issued Executive Order No. 9723 terminating the Board's existence. The regulation of agencies outstanding at that time was, therefore, canceled by the Board.

The Period of Postwar Relief (1946--)

Liberation of the War-Bound Countries

The liberation of the war-bound countries after VE and VJ days opened up wider channels for a flow of food, clothing, medicines and hospital equipment from voluntary services. A flood of appeals for help followed particularly from war victims in Austria, Germany, Greece, and Italy, to the kinsfolk and friends in America. Help was also asked for refugees found everywhere as one of the great tragedies of war, and a continuing problem in the aftermath of peace.

The War Relief Control Board's recommendation to the President was made in recognition that war relief, especially foreign aid would continue in substantial volume for some time. It urged that some functions, such as the maintenance of a public record of the activities of organizations engaged in foreign relief, and the necessary liaison and facilitating service, should be continued. This led to the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.
Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid -
President Truman's Letter of May 14, 1946, to
Secretaries of State and Agriculture

Concurrently with the termination of the
activities of the President's War Relief Control
Board, President Truman, in a letter of May 14,
1946, to the Secretary of State and the Secretary
of Agriculture, said, in part:

"...during the present critical
period it appears desirable that pro-
vision be made for coordinating
relationships with voluntary relief
agencies.... It is my suggestion that
you...jointly appoint a new Committee
on Voluntary Foreign Aid, to be made up
of outstanding citizens, to tie together
the governmental and private programs
in the field of foreign relief and to
work with interested agencies and
groups."

On May 18, 1946, Secretary of State Acheson
with the concurrence of Secretary of Agriculture
Anderson invited Charles P. Taft to be chairman
of the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.¹ "Mr.
Acheson and I are of the opinion that the success
of the Committee depends upon the selection of a
chairman who not only is familiar with the problems
to be dealt with in the foreign relief field; but
who also has the necessary feeling for public
service which will impel him to devote the necessary
time and attention to the Committee's work."

Fortunately, Mr. Taft accepted and is still
chairman of the Committee now in its twenty-third
year. He had, it should be observed, served as
a member of the Committee's predecessor body,
the President's War Relief Control Board. Follow-
ing his acceptance, the composition of the
Committee was completed by the appointment jointly
by the Secretaries of State and Agriculture, of

¹Letter of May 18, 1946, from Dean Acheson,
Secretary of State to the Honorable Charles P.
Taft. Appendix.
Chester Davis of the Federal Reserve Board and William L. Batt, who had served as Chairman of the War Economics Board, to serve with the chairman without compensation.

On July 10, 1946, Mr. Taft informed the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture that he, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Batt had organized the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid in response to their joint invitation. He wrote of the increasing importance and necessity to continue aid to further, in follow-up of the work of the President's War Relief Control Board, the coordination of the programs of voluntary agencies in the foreign field and their relationship with governmental programs. "Voluntary programs have been and are now actively underway in Norway, Finland, Netherlands, Belgium, France, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Austria, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia, India, China and the Philippines. They are correlated in more or less effective measure with the public programs of the Army, UNRRA, the Red Cross and indigenous agencies of the beneficiary countries." 1

Mr. Taft concluded in his letter by outlining the terms of reference formulated by the Committee. 2 These, in brief, provided for liaison and consultation with appropriate public and private bodies, appraisal abroad of relief wants, evaluation of voluntary agency programs, and maintenance by the agencies of a public record of their operations and receipts and disbursements. Acting Secretary Acheson replied on August 20, 1946. "The terms of reference formulated by the Committee...seem to me to be appropriate to and consistent with the basic principles which the Committee was established to carry out." 3,4

1Letter of July 10, 1946, from Taft to Acheson. Appendix and attachment.

2Memorandum of October 28, 1946, regarding Committee functions.

3Letter of August 20, 1946, from Acheson to Taft. Appendix.

4Letter of August 22, 1946, from Taft to Acheson. Appendix.
Ringland: I should emphasize that these principles obtain to this day.

Subsequently, the Committee was enlarged with the appointment of William I. Myers, Chester Davis, Clarence Pickett, Lessing Rosenwald, Joseph P. Chamberlain, and Francis P. Matthews. In each respect, the personnel of the Committee was made up of outstanding citizens as requested by the President.

Function of the Committee and Invitation to Voluntary Foreign Agencies

At this time the Committee issued a circular letter—July 11, 1946—and advised agencies interested in voluntary foreign aid that Federal licensing was no longer required as a war measure. Other forms of Federal regulation would continue, however, such as certain export licenses required by the Department of Commerce, and allocations of food and fats in short supply by the Department of Agriculture. The Committee stated that pursuant to the President's directive, its purpose was "to guide the public, and agencies seeking support of the public, in the appropriate and productive use of voluntary contributions for foreign aid." With this in view, the Committee invited the cooperation of all agencies appealing to the public for support of projects of relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and welfare. Acceptance was subject to the obligation to record with the Committee for public inspection, financial statements, public audit, and current reports of operations. Sixty-one operating agencies, representative of church, civic, ethnic, labor and farm groups, previously licensed by the President's War Relief Control Board, accepted these obligations and were registered.

1Circular letter, July 11, 1946, from Charles P. Taft, Chairman, "To Boards of Directors and Executives of Agencies Engaged or Interested in Voluntary Foreign Aid." Appendix.
Evaluation of Relief Programs

Ingersoll: In all the efforts to accomplish wide-scale relief, were you ever aware of or involved in efforts to evaluate what was being done and changes that needed to be made?

Ringland: This question is pertinent because not too long after the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid (the successor to the President's War Relief Control Board) got underway, the Committee felt it was desirable to continue the periodic reviews of the President's War Relief Control Board of the programs and budgets of the agencies engaged in voluntary foreign relief or forms of voluntary aid. These reviews were considered of particular significance in relation to postwar conditions.

The Taft Memorandum to the Secretary of State

And in furthering the President's request to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture that "During the present critical period it appears desirable that provision be made for coordinating relationships with voluntary relief agencies," Mr. Taft, as chairman of the Committee, submitted a memorandum on the date of November 1, 1946, to the Secretary of State for transmission to certain diplomatic missions.¹ The Committee wanted from these missions information which would serve to meet its evaluation of the work of the voluntary agencies and the justification for their programs.

The Advisory Committee in its undertaking of its comprehensive appraisal and evaluation of the

¹Memorandum of November 1, 1946, from Charles P. Taft to Secretary of State. See Appendix.
American voluntary effort, country by country, needed in addition the current flow of information made available through departmental channels, and particularly special reports from the missions to countries which still import American voluntary resources of funds, supplies, and services.

Mr. Taft pointed out further in his memorandum that a guiding principle of the Committee was that voluntary aid should be complementary to the assistance provided by governments or indigenous agencies. And importantly, at some point it should be recognized that emergency programs supported by popular American voluntary resources should be terminated. "Needs exist in every country," he said, "as they do in our own. So the question is whether these needs cannot be met adequately by the appropriate government and its indigenous agencies rather than through further American popular voluntary support."

The Secretary of State, on December 19, 1946, wrote certain American diplomatic officers, enclosing a copy of Mr. Taft's memorandum regarding the desire of the Committee to obtain current information with respect to relief needs in certain countries. It was pointed out that to assist the Committee in evaluating relief needs abroad, reports from the field had been made available to it by the State Department. But it was noted that "the Advisory Committee now wishes to obtain, from the appropriate missions, pertinent information on which an appraisal can be made with a view to determining whether, and if so, to what extent, conditions now obtaining in certain countries require continuation of American voluntary emergency relief operations."

---

1 Letter of Secretary of State, December 19, 1946, "Review of Voluntary Foreign Aid."
Trends in Organization of Relief Programs

Ingersoll: Let's talk a bit about trends in organization of relief agencies during this period. It seems to me that, with CARE, there was a trend to try to combine efforts. Are there any other illustrations of this trying to combine efforts for relief to strengthen relationships with the host countries?

Ringland: Yes, there were several at that time to meet a critical situation. It is significant in this respect, that the most productive field operations have been in countries where the agencies, without impairing their independence, have formed alliances to meet common problems. In these countries they have maintained liaison with the diplomatic, military, and economic missions of our government and with the participating governments and the indigenous social welfare agencies.

Council of Relief Agencies Licensed to Operate in Germany (CRALOG)

The most outstanding example was the organization known as CRALOG, Council of Relief Agencies Licensed to Operate in Germany. This organization was brought together during a critical period, in February of 1946. Normally, the voluntary relief agencies work closely with the indigenous social welfare agencies. But in Germany at that time, under occupation of the Allies, it was essential to avoid any political or ethnic relations in the voluntary American work. And for that reason, the organization of CRALOG, which was made up of church groups in particular, and with sixteen other agencies registered with the President's War Relief Control Board, including CARE, and other lay and labor agencies--I can't offhand give the list of those, but it was a representative body. An agreement was worked out with the War Department, and that was extended into the British and French areas, but--because it apparently was not wanted--in the area under
Soviet control. Germany presented peculiar problems of civilian relief on the conclusion of World War I. It was felt unwise for German ethnic groups in the United States to carry on relief in Germany. Because of this a federation of lay labor and religious agencies without any ethnic affiliation was dictated. General Lucius Clay was our military commander at that time, and it was his personal interest as well as his official capacity that made the operation of CRALOG a signal success.

Sometime later, Elizabeth Reiss of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and Eileen Egan of the Catholic War Relief, were instrumental in preparing and publishing a history of CRALOG.\(^1\) They and others who served this organization thought they would like to cap the history by a foreword from Lucius Clay--General Clay. They asked me if I would bring this to the General's attention. I did so on July 23, 1964,\(^2\) and he wrote me a note on August 6,\(^3\) saying he hoped the attached foreword would serve its purpose and that he felt it a privilege to write it. The General, in his attachment, referred to the fact that the winter of 1945-46 in Germany was marked by extremely cold weather and short food supply. Although it was only a few months after the end of the war, there was a growing consciousness of the need for help from the United States.

The first shipment of CRALOG, which had been made possible by the fifteen members of this organization, of approximately 960 tons of food and clothing arrived in Bremen in April of 1946, the time of the greatest need. From then on General Clay emphasized that CRALOG aid arrived in Germany in increasing amounts, and by the end of  

\(^1\)"Transfigured Night" - The History of CRALOG.  
\(^3\)Letter of Clay to Ringland, August 6, 1964, with attachment that became the foreword to the published history of CRALOG. Appendix.
Ringland: 1948, when the German economy was beginning to function again, CRALOG had provided about fifteen million dollars of aid to the German people. He emphasized that not only did this help aid physically, it also helped psychologically. Indeed, the ready willingness of the American people to help a former enemy is still remembered in Germany. CRALOG did an outstanding job and evidenced once more the generosity and warmth of the American people. "We," he said, "who were serving in Germany were proud of its performance."[1] We felt that the foreword he wrote admirably met the purpose.[2]

Ingersoll: If CRALOG hadn't been organized I suppose there might have been a great many separate organizations, separate groups of kinsfolk, all trying to help Germany.

Ringland: Yes, there would have been a situation which--well, the War Department wouldn't tolerate it, really. Didn't I say at one time, in recording these remarks, that Assistant Secretary of War McCloy said that if the Army had anything to do with this relief, they wanted to deal through one group.

Ingersoll: Yes, you have made those remarks. Now, there were several other organizations that combined during this period, weren't there?

Licensed Agencies for Relief in Asia (LARA) and Korea (KAVA)

Ringland: Yes. The success of CRALOG stimulated similar coordinated action. In Asia, for example, there was set up LARA--Licensed Agencies for Relief in Asia; and also in Korea, KAVA--Korean Association of Voluntary Agencies. And in each of these cases, they did an outstanding job through their common interest and cooperation with the host government.

[1]Ibid.
The Christian Overseas Program and the Heifer Project Committee

Mrs. Ingersoll, there were a number of significant developments in the critical years, 1946-1948, under the auspices and facilities of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid.

There were two organizations that were registered for permanent operations, each fulfilling a need met by no other group: CROP, the Christian Overseas Program, and the Heifer Project Committee. CROP collected from farmers thousands of freight car loads of agricultural products which were allocated to the operating agencies in the field. The Heifer Project Committee shipped thousands of head of livestock to many countries, including bulls, milch cows, heifers, goats, swine, and chicks, as well as hatching eggs to improve production. These organizations proved to be singularly effective in supplementing contributions of money and gifts-in-kind for urban areas.

Some organizations, though temporary, raised millions in funds or in kind, such as the American Overseas Aid--United Nations Appeal for Children, sponsored during 1947 and 1948 by some 40 church, labor and ethnic registered agencies; the United National Clothing Collection; the Friendship Train for France and Italy, successfully initiated by the well-known journalist Drew Pearson and supported by the American voluntary agencies operating in those countries; and the Friendship Train for Germany sponsored by the Council of Relief Agencies Licensed to Operate in Germany (CHALOG). And this agency administered the proceeds of a silver collection for the relief of German children made possible by the exhibit of paintings in the art galleries of a number of cities through the facilities of the United States High Commission for Germany, the Army, and loans to the National Gallery of Art.
The Greek Relief Association and the Greek Government

Ringland: An interesting proposal was made of this character: that the Greek government make possible the loan and exhibit in this country of their classic sculptures. I had a number of talks with Spiro Skouras, head of the moving picture agency, and chairman of the Greek War Relief Association, registered with us, and his executive vice-president George Xanthaky. There was no doubt in our minds that such an exhibit would be a stupendous and popular success financially and, of course, educationally. The proposal never reached formal consideration by our Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, for we, like the Greek War Relief people and others, could not dismiss the fear of loss and an international tragedy. When the Greek government quietly let it be known that the proposal was impossible, that ended it. The decision was prudent and politic; and I wondered if the government had in mind the famed Elgin Marbles reposing in the British Museum, a casus belli with some even today.

The White House and Aid for Korea

Our war in Korea brought home governmental recognition of the needs of the civilian war victims. In 1951 and again in 1953, special periods were proclaimed by the President in support of voluntary collections, in response to joint resolutions of Congress. The proclamation of 1951 set aside the month of September for the collection of clothes through American Relief for Korea. Incidentally, on behalf of our Committee, I sat in the White House and shared in the drafting of the proclamation. The proclamation of 1953 set aside Aid for Korea Week in June for the collection of funds for the American Korean Foundation for the rehabilitation of the needs of war victims in the fields of health and education in cooperation with the Korean government. The costs of American Relief to Korea for the collection, processing, warehousing, and freight to
Ringland: seaports was met by the United Defense Fund through allocations from the Community Chests. The Army carried the ARK clothing without charge from the seaports to Korea for distribution for the civilian war victims. The cooperation of the United Defense Fund and the Army made possible ARK's appeal to the public.

The Wheat Loan to India

Ingersoll: I think you told me once that you had a hand in the question of the use of the interest on a wheat loan to India. Would you comment on that?

Ringland: The Wheat Loan to India, of about two hundred million dollars in 1951, as I recall it, had a provision that remitted the interest charges on the first five million, this interest to be devoted to payment of an exchange of Indians and Americans to develop training for social service in the Indian villages. This remission was made possible by the very effective representations made before the appropriate committees in Congress by two attractive ladies of CARE. And in whatever way we appropriately could, we supported their proposal and its successful conclusion. I cannot say to what extent the objectives that we had in mind at that time were carried out in the course of this provision for the support of the exchange of the students. Sometimes we felt that Indians, in particular the intellectuals, were more interested in acquiring a Ph.D. than in going into the villages and dirtying their hands, a task which quite a number of our young American men and women did not hesitate to undertake.

Ingersoll: Did these women go to the Hill to argue the case in some way?

Ringland: Yes, they carried it right up to the Hill. And, as I say, were quite successful. I think the congressman from Ohio who took a leading part in it was Mr. Bray.
The President's Benchmark

Ringland: The President, when he enjoined the Advisory Committee upon its establishment, "to tie together the governmental and private programs in the field of foreign relief," set up a benchmark that has been the point of reference in the relations of the government and the voluntary agencies throughout the postwar years and continuing to the present. This tying together has marked the most productive relief and rehabilitation operations of the registered voluntary agencies; for voluntary foreign aid is most productive when it complements public aid and that of the local agencies in the participating countries.

Serious Problems of the Committee and Voluntary Agencies

Ingersoll: Did not the President's injunction confront your Committee and the voluntary agencies with some serious problems?

Ringland: Indeed, yes. Let me give an example that was happily solved. Where a country supported a maritime service, voluntary relief supplies were carried without charge on a space-available basis. But few were served and the cost became an increasing curb on the resources that the voluntary groups could make available. It should be remembered that there was, in addition, the cost of movement to seaport. In consequence, Congress was asked to support an appropriation from the foreign aid appropriations in general that would permit reimbursement of these ocean transport costs.

1Letter of May 14, 1946, President Truman to Secretary of State and Secretary of Agriculture.
Reimbursement of Ocean Transport of Supplies

Ringland: When the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was marking up Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, which provided several hundred millions for the provision of food, medical supplies, clothing, fertilizers, pesticides, and seed for general assistance to war-devastated areas, I went up with Ed O'Connor of the Catholic Relief Services and we sent in our cards to talk with Senator Alexander Smith. Senator Smith was an intimate associate of Herbert Hoover's and well informed of all the relief activities of World War I. When he came out—I had not met him before—but when I established my identity as an old Hoover man, that was quite sufficient. Well, the upshot of our talk with the Senator was the provision he made for—as I recall it now—the first appropriation of five millions, to reimburse the voluntary agencies for their ocean transfer costs of supplies determined to be essential supplements to the supplies provided by the general relief assistance program. The action of the Eightieth Congress established a fruitful precedent, and that form of complementary assistance has been carried on ever since in greatly expanded amounts. I should refer here to the timely and comprehensive study by a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives

I regret, I cannot give off-hand the name of the Foreign Affairs Committee staff member who prepared this report, but I remember that he often came to our office and the meticulous manner in which he obtained information and the pertinent questions he asked to bring out the facts. This report covered a very wide field, even including specific programs—by countries—of the agencies. And it reflected, too, the philosophy that governed our Committee in its cooperation and the provision of its facilities to the voluntary agencies. I
Ringland: considered it an important epitome of the Committee's work, and most useful for reference. This was proven when the Marshall Plan was under consideration. The favorable report made possible appropriate representations to Congress, specifically "the subsidy for ocean freight has well justified itself in the subcommittee's view, and the Congress should give favorable consideration to extending it in relation to future relief and recovery legislation."\textsuperscript{1}

**Economic Cooperation Act of 1948**

And so it did, and this was reflected in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, authorizing the Administrator to provide reimbursement for ocean freight charges incurred by registered voluntary agencies for voluntary shipments to many countries. And this was supplemented by the authority given the Secretary of State to negotiate agreements with the governments of the ECA grant countries for the provision of duty-free entry of relief supplies and the defrayment of the inland transport costs from counterpart funds. The authority granted by the ECA Act was subsequently expanded to include not only Marshall Plan countries but others eligible for economic and technical assistance.

**Relationship between Administration of Relief and Government Departments**

Ingersoll: Would you comment, Mr. Ringland, on the relationships between the President's War Relief Board

\textsuperscript{1}Voluntary Foreign Aid - A Study by a Special Committee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, 1948.
Ingersoll: and the later Advisory Agency for Voluntary Relief, and the various departments of government, such as the Department of War, Department of State, Department of Agriculture. How about starting out with the relationship with the Department of War?

Ringland: As you've said, you've named a number of departments and you should include in there the Department of Commerce—I'm thinking of export licenses, for example. But as for the War Department, the board's relationships were quite close in the areas of military occupancy. I spoke, I believe, of CHALOG. And there were the voluntary relief programs in Japan, Okinawa and Korea. In all of these areas the facilities of the War Department were indispensable.

**War Department**

After the conclusion of hostilities, the War Department had the task of planning to create groups of technical and advisory personnel for eventual duties in military government in the occupied areas. In view of this, Major General Allan W. Gullian, the Provost Marshall General of the War Department, informed chairman Davies of the President's War Relief Control Board of his hope to recruit personnel from those agencies of the government having an interest in certain special fields that might be involved in future occupations. And that would be true of the War Relief Control Board and its support of voluntary agencies. He, that is General Gullian, to further cooperation with the War Department, referred to conversations the War Department had had with me. It was suggested that Mr. Davies should designate some person of the Board to establish and maintain liaison with the military government division of the Provost Marshall General's office. As an outcome, Mr. Davies pursuant to this suggestion of General Gullian had designated me as liaison officer.

Ingersoll: Did you act in this role to any extent?
Ringland: Yes, to a limited extent. I recall now a talk I was asked to give at Columbia University to the class of students then under instruction for service in military government; and, too, I visited the University of Virginia at Charlottesville. I suppose, though I can't be specific now, there must have been a number of occasions, one thing or another.

Commerce Department

Ingersoll: You mentioned the Commerce Department a few minutes ago. Can you give any personal views of the relationship between the Department of Commerce and the President's War Relief Control Board?

Ringland: No, I think that just followed regular procedure, where under certain conditions export licenses were required to move the voluntary goods.

Department of State

Ingersoll: What was the relationship between the President's War Relief Board and the Department of State?

Ringland: You should go back to the beginning and include the Committee on War Relief Agencies, which was set up at the request of Secretary Hull to President Roosevelt. This Committee and the President's Board, while acting with independent authority within their terms of reference, looked to the Department of State for housekeeping functions. The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, which succeeded the Board, likewise was carried under the umbrella of the Department of State.
Change of Status of Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid

Ingersoll: My understanding was that in 1949 voluntary foreign aid changed from the status of an interdepartmental agency between the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture to actually being an agency in the State Department. Is this correct?

Ringland: Yes. On November 22, 1949, the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, which had been maintaining interdepartmental liaison with the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture, was established in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs of the Department of State under the direction of an adviser, the adviser to serve also as ex officio Executive Director of the Advisory Committee. And that was my job until I retired.¹

I think that was done for simplicity's sake. Agriculture came into the picture in the initiation of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, more particularly in relation to the setup of the Committee personnel. I believe that was one reason why Chester Davis became a member.

Ingersoll: Was recruitment somehow, do you mean, done through the Department of Agriculture?

Ringland: Well, you're using a rather general term in "recruitment," because the Committee was very small, you know. Never more than five at that time of "outstanding citizens," as the President defined the type desired. I spoke of Chester Davis because of his background in agriculture. He was one of the governors of the Federal Reserve Board, too, a distinguished public servant.

Ingersoll: As you viewed it at the time, was there very much difference in the way the work was carried

¹Department of State, Departmental Announcement 213, November 22, 1949, Voluntary Foreign Aid Staff.
Ingersoll: on when it became more specifically a part of the State Department? You said this was done for simplicity.

Ringland: I should have made it clear that once the provision was made for the allocation of surplus food to the voluntary agencies, that brought Agriculture squarely into the most important part of the picture, really. It was they that controlled the provision for these foods and fats and milk and whatnot. And our staff worked very closely with them and in the final allocation to the voluntary agencies.

Control of Registered Voluntary Agencies

Ingersoll: Mr. Ringland, was there a trend to make arrangements, that had perhaps been generally understood in the past, more specific?

Ringland: You may have in mind the control that was exercised at various times through regulations governing registration of the voluntary relief agencies.

Ingersoll: Yes.

Ringland: Control in varying degrees was necessary from the very beginning of the work of the Committee on War Relief agencies, before we entered the War, but more particularly during the time of the President's War Relief Control Board because the Board operated under the war powers at that time, and it was necessary to license agencies. Registration was voluntary, as explained in the invitation of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, but obviously to be conducted under certain measures of control—that is, regulations. It became desirable, eventually, to formalize these regulations under adequate authority. And this was because of the continuing broadening of the registrant agencies' activities beyond earlier relief measures into the fields of rehabilitation. In consequence, revised regulations were published in the Federal Register,
Ringland: effective July 8, 1952.¹

The rules, and I believe they obtain today, govern the application for registration by non-governmental organizations carrying on non-profit activities in the United States for the purpose of engaging in voluntary aid overseas, including, but not limited to, projects and services of relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and welfare in the fields of health, education, agriculture, industry, immigration, and resettlement. The registration, as I said, was wholly voluntary, but it has enabled the Advisory Committee to facilitate the programs and projects of the registrants, through the exercise of its good offices and the provision of facilities authorized by the laws relating to voluntary foreign aid.

Ingersoll: Were you, yourself, involved in thinking through and formulating the arrangements that voluntary organizations should come under to have the help of the agency?

Ringland: It fell to my lot to prepare the drafts for publication. I drew on the experience of my associates and the regulations that had been in force earlier. But even so, it was necessary to work this out in greater detail. And so, under the circumstances, I think, as my patient and most efficient secretary, at that time, Mrs. Boe, will certify, she had to struggle with a great many drafts before I was satisfied to pass it on for the approval by the Committee and Assistant Secretary of State Thorp, and, finally, for publication in the Federal Register.

Following publication, a voluntary register was set up by authority of the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs "to foster the public interest in the field of voluntary foreign aid and the activities of non-governmental organizations which serve the public interest therein; to serve as a repository of information for public guidance; and to facilitate the programs

¹Registration of Agencies for Voluntary Foreign Aid, July 8, 1952. See Appendix.
Planning for the Future

Ingersoll: Some time ago you mentioned that even while we were at war with Germany, people were planning ahead, they were thinking about the kind of relief that could be given after hostilities were over. Were there any other trends at this time toward thinking toward the more distant future in terms of relief activities?

Ringland: This brings to mind a note I wrote Maurice Pate, then director of UNICEF, a close associate of mine of some years. I said to him that I had been asked to give thought to ways and means to carry out a plan of relief in the satellite countries, if and when an opportunity should call for this form of assistance. This was in August of 1953, when I was in touch with him. I said that perhaps history, in such case, will repeat itself, and we may have another ARA—that is Hoover's American Relief Administration. I added that when I had some clearer ideas than I had at present, I would want his criticism; but at this point it was my feeling that any plan, to be productive, must find its first level on a humanitarian basis. Again, assuming any wide scale of operations, there would need to be an organization that would command the resources of governments, or governmental agencies, and the auxiliary support of voluntary bodies.¹

Ingersoll: Did any of that planning actually progress?

¹Letter, August 4, 1953, to Maurice Pate from Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.
Emphasis on Services in Developing Countries

Ringland: No, I don't think, no, not in that sense. And I retired about that time. However, it is pertinent to remark that the work of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, though it became much less in Europe, as I pointed out before, because of economic recovery and the withdrawal of the voluntary groups, action was increasingly developed in the politically new countries of Asia, Africa, while in Latin America the Alliance for Progress stimulated cooperation. And so it can be said that the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid today plays an essential part in the structure of the Agency for International Development of the Department of State.

Ingersoll: I was talking to a man the other night who had been working, within the last year, for CARE. His feeling was that CARE, now, had to expand, had to go to the large foundations, for money, as it never has before. What would your feeling on something like this be, with the perspective of time that you have?

Ringland: That is an outcome of the course of events. In the immediate postwar years—and, in fact, for some years—the need in Europe for assistance was great, a need which CARE was meeting in its particular field, as well as many other voluntary agencies in the execution of their programs. But with the economic recovery of the once war-ravaged countries, personal relief was not felt to be necessary on the part of the kinsfolk here at home. As I said earlier, once the food in these countries cost less than it would by purchase of a draft here, that was the index for liquidation.

Then came the Marshall Plan, which capped the recovery of the European countries. And about the only thing left was the miserable and tragic condition of refugees, the human residue of modern war. And that has continued even to this day. But as for nationals, that period had passed. So the attention was then turned, as it is today, to the developing countries. Now there are few people in this country whose national
origin stems from these countries, so there are no numerically strong ethnic groups here that are interested in Asia, or Africa, or Latin America; therefore you haven't the same buying public to support CARE. In that respect your friend is right in the sense that CARE should turn, probably, to other means of support to carry out the very useful function of self-help. And, also, don't forget what they are doing with school lunch programs in Latin America, India and elsewhere. Some thirty million children, I believe, are being fed through the facilities of CARE, made possible by Food for Peace.

The whole picture has changed. The task is much more difficult, not only because of the lack of ethnic and sentimental support, but because of dealing in many places with illiterate people without a social conscience or organization, which has to be built up; whereas in Europe, after World War I, we had the foundations of social organizations only in need of rehabilitation. And that was so after World War II through the Marshall Plan. But in the developing countries, it's not a problem of rehabilitation, but of habilitation—a build-up to a more productive society.

UNICEF - United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund

I should like to digress at this point and relate something of the organization of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. I spoke of the conditions that obtained following the liberation of the war-bound countries in 1946, and President Truman's suggestion that a new committee on voluntary foreign aid be set up. This led to the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid to coordinate and facilitate American voluntary help.
Ringland: It was at this time that Herbert Hoover's unremitting attention to the problem of impending famine, following the liberation of Western Europe, was directed with the support of President Truman to meet the needs that were dictated as a result of factual findings in his historic around-the-world conference with the heads of 38 countries in 1946.

Throughout 1945, 1946, and 1947, Mr. Hoover, in many public addresses and meetings, emphasized the needs, and of children particularly, in the war-ravaged countries. Specifically, he urged the need for special feeding, in Europe alone, of some 20 million children. At a meeting in Washington of delegations from 30 countries of the United Nations, the Conference agreed with Mr. Hoover and passed a resolution, following his remarks, recommending that it be taken up officially with the United Nations. In his memoirs, Mr. Hoover wrote: "A small group of my former associates, including Arthur Ringland of the State Department, Congressman Christian Herter, and others undertook to push it along."

Mr. Hoover's influence, however, did push it along through his friends in the Canadian, British, Polish, Belgian, French, and other delegations of the United Nations. The United Nations Assembly, on December 11, 1946, passed the resolution he had initiated establishing the "United Nations Children's Emergency Fund." (UNICEF)

Mr. Hoover rightly felt that the success of this new UN organization depended upon some one of long field experience. As Mr. Hoover said in his memoirs, Maurice Pate fitted the qualifications perfectly.

Mrs. Ingersoll, you will note the quotation I have given about Chris Herter and myself pushing along the establishment of UNICEF. In seeking the appointment of a director, it was

---

Ringland: desirable for the State Department to give its informal support, mindful of the fact that the greater part of the finances would come from the United States. And so it was that Tyler Wood, Special Assistant to the Secretary, Dallas Dort, and I of the State Department, and Miss Katherine Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau and a member of the American Delegation to the UN, met to talk over informally possible appointees.

Before the meeting, I did my homework. I was determined that Maurice Pate should be the director, not only as an American, but because of his field experience in the Commission for the Relief of Belgium and the American Relief Administration in World War I under Mr. Hoover's supervision, and his remarkably successful administration of the American Red Cross Prisoners of War Package Service during World War II. To put it in common parlance, he was a natural. At one meeting, I presented my memorandum, a sort of curriculum vitae, on behalf of Maurice Pate. Miss Lenroot spoke in behalf of an eminent Canadian pediatrician, well-known in her work in the children's service. But we concluded to recommend Pate.

Later, at a lunch in the Cosmos Club, I had a little old school tie fun, for my guests were two Princeton men—Wood and Dort, and Pate, too, was Princeton. I had to be content that I was a half-baked Yale man.

I had also been in touch with Hallam Tuck, also of Princeton and a close friend, on the appointment of Maurice Pate. He was, too, an old CRB and ARA man, and an intimate associate of Herbert Hoover.1 I wrote him on December 20, 1946.2 The Rajchman referred to in that letter, served as the influential chairman of the official UN Committee organizing the Children's Fund. In my letter to Tuck, I spoke of my talk of Pate with

1Letter of October 18, 1946, from Arthur Ringland to Hallam Tuck. See Appendix.

2Letter of December 20, 1946, to Hallam Tuck from Ringland. See Appendix.
associates in the State Department, and particularly with Colonel Wood, and, too, with Chris Herter, then in Congress. Herter wired Senator Austin, the head of our American UN delegation, and also handed a note to Senator Vandenberg with the suggestion that they talk to Senator Vandenberg with the suggestion that they talk to Secretary General Lie.

Here I would like to put in the Appendix Maurice Pate's letter of January 2, 1947, to Mr. Hoover—"Dear Chief." The letter outlines La Guardia's talk with President Truman on the appointment of the American delegate to the Children's Fund; the organizational work of the Fund; the problem of funding for relief in Germany, Italy, Greece, Japan and Korea, and aid for the Children's Fund.¹

A few days later on January 8, 1947, Pate was appointed by Secretary General Lie of the UN as director of UNICEF. He immediately wrote Mr. Hoover and, in part, said: "Actually, the Children's Fund of the UN is to stand on its own feet and we are to receive and disburse our own funds. The plan on which I am now working jointly with Arthur Ringland and Chris Herter (later Secretary of State) calls for a program of $450,000,000...of which $1,000,000 is to come from the United States Government."²,³

When Maurice took office he asked me whether he should accept the salary. I said he should, despite his independent means, because his successor might be embarrassed by such a precedent. I believe Maurice did so; and, no doubt, boosted his charitable gifts.

Mrs. Ingersoll, before closing this talk about UNICEF, I would like to refer to Maurice Pate's correspondence with Mr. Hoover and with

¹Letter of January 2, 1947, from Maurice Pate to Mr. Hoover. See Appendix.


³Letter of January 24, 1947, from Hallam Tuck to Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.
Ringland: me in 1959 in view of the attack of the DAR on UNICEF. It is desirable to make this extraordinary performance by a national patriotic organization a matter of record.

I should like you to read first the wording of the resolution of the DAR, and then to read Mr. Pate's letter of 24 April, 1959, to Mr. Hoover—"Dear Chief." 1 You will agree that Maurice was very tolerant when he said to me that the "good ladies of the DAR have simply no idea how far they were off base." 2 It was the duty of the responsible officers of the DAR, in my judgment, to obtain the facts from UNICEF or the State Department before permitting or publicizing such abysmal ignorance as reflected in the resolution.

Some damage was done, of course. In my neighborhood, Mrs. Milton Meltzer led the Trick or Treat collection and did a grand job; but even so there were protests from the unthinking, or those prejudiced against UN, overlooking its humanitarian services. Nevertheless, in 1967, the Trick or Treat campaign brought in $2,924,000, the highest amount yet from this traditional Halloween activity.

The telephone rang in our house in Chevy Chase. It was Maurice; he was at the airport. "I am coming out for supper." So he joined us—me and Dorothy, and my daughter Suzi. It was a gay occasion. I wanted to kid him about the profile of him that appeared in the New Yorker. But immediately we sat down he told us of his engagement to Martha Lucas and that he would go afterwards to the home of her mother, living near-by in Chevy Chase, and seek her blessing. His fiancee was a woman of outstanding academic distinction, and had served for some years as Associate Dean of Radcliffe.

1 Resolution and letter of April 24, 1959, to Mr. Hoover from Maurice Pate. See Appendix.

2 Letter of April 29, 1959, Maurice Pate to Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.
Martha and Maurice were married for but a few years, yet it was a happy time, a sharing of common interests. While walking with Martha, Maurice collapsed on the sidewalk in New York in 1965. It was a fatal heart attack. I have had an elbow contact, more or less, with a number of men and women I have admired for their selfless service in the public interest. Maurice Pate was one of them.

UNICEF was accorded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1965. The grant of the award was stimulated most effectively by Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, Jr., President of the United States Committee for UNICEF. And I did what I could at a meeting of the ARA (American Relief Association) and talks with Admiral Lewis Straus, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who was, as a friend of Pate's, most willing to help.

As the Washington Post stated in an editorial of October 28: "Americans have ample reason to share the pride of the Fund and the entire United Nations Organization in the award... Furthermore Maurice Pate, UNICEF's founder and executive director until his death early in the year was an American who gained his first experience in the field working for Herbert Hoover's Belgian Relief Commission at the time of World War I."

I would like to add this word from Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni, in her letter of 19 November,

---

Ringland: 1965, in response to mine\(^1\) commenting on the award: "The selection of UNICEF for the highest of honors is a wonderful memorial to Maurice."\(^2\)

Published Reports

Ingersoll: Were there comprehensive reports that cover the President's War Relief Control Board, and later perhaps the activities of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid?

Ringland: Three reports were published, which up to the time of my retirement in 1952, covered the waterfront. These were first, the report to the President by the President's War Relief Control Board in March 1946, *Voluntary War Relief During World War II*; second, a study by the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in 1948, *Voluntary Foreign Aid: The Nature and Scope of Postwar Private American Assistance Abroad, with Special Reference to Europe*; and third, "The Organization of Voluntary Foreign Aid, 1939-1953," published in the State Department's *Bulletin* of March 15, 1954.

---

\(^1\)Telegram of October 26, 1965, from Arthur Ringland to Mrs. Guido Pantaleoni. See Appendix.

\(^2\)Letter of November 19, 1965, from Mrs. Pantaleoni to Arthur Ringland. See Appendix.

\(^3\)Eightieth Congress, Second Session.
Voluntary War Relief During World War II

Ingersoll: Yes, you wrote the last item and it has been the point of departure for this interview. How was the report on the President's War Relief Control Board (Voluntary War Relief During World War II) prepared and how was it received?

Ringland: It was prepared by the staff, largely under the able direction of James Brunot, who was then the executive. Of course, all of us worked on it. And it was then submitted to the Board for approval, and subsequently published and submitted to the President.

Following its publication and submittal to the President, Chairman Davies received a complimentary letter from President Truman, written on board the U.S.S. Williamsburg on August 22, 1946.1 The President said, and I'm only referring to part of his letter, "I can only say that you and your colleagues, Messrs. Taft and Warren," (he's addressing Chairman Davies as "My dear Joe,") "have earned the gratitude of the nation for the splendid work accomplished during the momentous five years through which the Board functioned. The final report is a significant historical document. In thanking you and your colleagues for your able leadership, I desire also to express appreciation of the unselfish and public spirit of support given to the work of the Board by tens of thousands of patriotic men and women who work as volunteers in all parts of the country."

I think that last quotation is well said, because it's a reflection of the willingness and the ability of the citizens to meet a situation in the public interest when the need arises.

1Letter of August 22, 1946, from President Truman to Honorable Joseph E. Davies. Appendix.
A Guide to Technical Assistance
Services of United States Voluntary
Agencies Abroad 1941-51

Ingersoll: I've noticed in your article on the organization of voluntary foreign aid that one of the important things that the Advisory Committee was responsible for getting out was a guide to technical assistance services of the United States voluntary agencies abroad. I understand this was quite a comprehensive, important document. Would you just comment, Mr. Ringland, on the genesis of this whole project?

Ringland: That project developed in the exchange of ideas in our staff, I think in 1950—I'm referring to the staff of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid—when there was a feeling that some interesting work had been done or was underway in many remote places, let us say, for example, behind monastic walls of the churches, in the underdeveloped countries.

Ingersoll: Was this your own feeling, your own beginning of the project?

Ringland: I had entertained for some time a curiosity. And in our staff talks I said, "Well, how about Father Mendel—or Brother Mendel and his work in genetics in Moravia?"

Ingersoll: Yes. That's something that wasn't known about for a long time after it was worked on, was it?

Ringland: No, it wasn't. So I cited that as a possible example of something stimulating that might have gone on or be in process, behind monastic walls, and that the inquiry might be very useful to this committee in appraisal of services in the broad voluntary field, in directions of which we were then quite ignorant. As a result of our talks and the approval of the Committee, the appraisal was assigned to Miss Florence Black of our staff, who did a most constructive job, which was reflected in 1951 by the completion and publication by the Committee of A Guide to Technical Assistance Services of United States Voluntary Agencies
RIngland: Abroad, 1941-51. This publication revealed that there were some 2,500 projects in the fields of education, health, agriculture, social service, and industry, the greater number sponsored by churches and missionary societies, in the rural areas of Africa, Latin America, the Near and the Far East. There followed an exhaustive study undertaken after the publication by a working team of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, with the cooperation of representatives of private, governmental, and intergovernmental agencies. In its final summary the study recommended that a committee on technical assistance cooperation be established within the framework of this Council as a continuing representative committee. This was done and it carries on now as an important function, and I believe maintains a contract with AID.

There remained the need to compile the technical assistance activities of American business firms and corporations, private foundations and educational institutions. Such complete information of the American non-governmental operating interests in the underdeveloped areas would serve as a policy guidance for the appraisal of further endeavors, whether public or private. It was with this in view that Chairman Taft of our Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid made a formal proposal that such a study be undertaken—as I now recall it, with the cooperation of the Department of Commerce. But Mr. Taft said in a statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Technical Assistance on February, 1955, that this was something yet to be done.

Report on the Organization of Voluntary Foreign Aid

At the time of my retirement, the State Department asked me if I would prepare a report covering the work of the voluntary agencies from the time of the inception of the first activity,
Ringland: when Poland was invaded in 1939. This resulted in the publication, as I said previously, of "The Organization of Voluntary Foreign Aid."^1

I might add that when it was completed, and this was only made possible by close collaboration with the registered agencies in obtaining statistical information, it seemed desirable to have—according to the editors of the Department of State—a box signed by Secretary of State Dulles. So, since I was drafting the report, I drafted the wording of the box. And it was sent to Mr. Dulles, who at that time was in Berlin. I had no idea that he would take the time, considering where he was, to even read this box. But he did, and he signed it. The only change he made in it was the first few words of one paragraph, opening, where he said "in this connection." Then, when it was still in draft form I wanted to have the agencies in New York look it over to see if they had any comment. Dr. Wyn Fairfield, the able representative of the Church World Service, I think it was, who suggested that I not use the word "humanism." He said that might be misunderstood. Now Mr. Dulles took no exception to that, and he was well known as being one of the elders of the church.

However, I was happy to do it, and I substituted the word "humanitarianism," which was quite satisfactory. I was using it just in relation to ordinary human contacts, you know. But, as I said, I was happy to make the change, because I had a high regard for my associates in both the Protestant and Catholic church for I'd worked with them for years on voluntary foreign aid.

---

Conclusion

Ringland: The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid was transferred from the State Department in July of 1953 to the newly organized Foreign Operations Administration (now the Administration for International Development), in furtherance of the President's plan centralizing foreign assistance and related economic responsibilities. This transfer completed the operations responsibilities of the Department.¹

At the time of the transfer Secretary Dulles addressed a letter of July 1, 1953, to Charles P. Taft, Chairman of the Committee, expressing his thanks for the Committee's services during the seven years of collaboration with the Department of State. This Committee of honorary advisers, he noted, was appointed by the Secretary of State in 1946 at the request of the President to correlate the programs of private and voluntary agencies in the field of foreign aid with those of the Government. No one could foresee, Mr. Dulles added, that the need for this form of service would continue for so many years following the end of the active war. It is in recognition of this fact, the Secretary concluded, that the reorganization provides for the Committee to take its place with other agencies that have been brought together in the Foreign Operations Administration to further American humanitarian services overseas.

The service has continued now for some 15 years, I should emphasize, as an effective administration of the free-will offerings of the American people for overseas relief. It is exercised through the close-knit collaboration of their representatives, the lay and church voluntary agencies as registrants with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, and as members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.

¹Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, Committee Document, Register of Voluntary Agencies, March 17, 1955.
Ringland: In 1966 the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid celebrated the 20th Anniversary under Mr. Taft's chairmanship. If there is included membership with this Committee's predecessor bodies, the President's Committee on War Relief Agencies during the period of American neutrality following the invasion of Poland in 1939, and the President's War Relief Control Board during our active participation in World War II, Mr. Taft's service would total 27 years. In that time, he has been the principal guiding counsel in the collection and program expenditures of the registered voluntary agencies of some one billion five hundred million in funds and goods for overseas relief. And to this volume there should be added the provision of surplus foods and subsidies for transportation by the government to the value of seventy-six millions, as well as that of the United Nations and related organizations of thirty-nine millions for refugee assistance. It should be understood in evaluation of the voluntary aid of the American people that the resources cited here are exclusive of the American Red Cross, which has an independent charter from Congress and does not include parcel post and the money remittances of individuals.

The great volume of free-will offerings, while an impressive expression of the compassion of the American people, reflects more than quantity. As Secretary Dulles said, the intelligent giving and planned distribution of these resources is an example of constructive philanthropy of continuing volume.¹

From the outset of World War II in 1939 and until today--now nearly 30 years--measures of control, regulation, and supervision have governed the activities of the agencies engaged in voluntary foreign relief. And these agencies have been glad to note their registration with the government in their solicitation for public support--the fact of requirement of public audit of accounts and approval of field projects, for

Ringland: example, has instilled confidence in the integrity of their operations.

At the anniversary Mr. Taft was awarded a certificate of appreciation for "distinguished service" by David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID). William H. McCahon, my successor as Executive Director of Mr. Taft's Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid, and I, too, were similarly honored.

The Committee's services and its registered voluntary agencies will carry on in furtherance of American humanitarianism, the world being what it is, for how long, I wonder?
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EPILOGUE
RETIREMENT ACTIVITIES

Introduction

Ingersoll: Would you give us some background, Mr. Ringland, on the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, which I understand is one of your important current concerns?

Ringland: When I retired from the State Department in 1952, I had this choice: To do nothing and when done rest, or to be some sort of gadfly in the fields of conservation of natural and human resources. Fortunately for family peace, I became active in association with these groups: as an adviser of President Kennedy's American Food for Peace Council, a trustee of the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, an Honorary Associate of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, a member of the Board of Directors of the Citizens' Committee for Natural Resources, and a member of the Executive Committee for Natural Resources, and a member of the Executive Committee of the National Roadside Committee. These associations continued, save for the National Roadside Committee, which concluded its major activities following the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1958 in the 85th Congress, which included provision for billboard control.

American Food for Peace Council

President Kennedy, on May 7, 1961, announced the appointment of the American Food for Peace
Ringland: Council to provide leadership and advice for the United States Food for Peace program and for the world-wide freedom from hunger campaign of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, launched in July of 1960.

The Council was composed of many distinguished citizens. I happened to be appointed as adviser because of my service in Europe with Herbert Hoover in the American Relief Administration.1

American Freedom from Hunger Foundation

Subsequently, Food for Peace Director and Special Assistant to President Kennedy, George McGovern, took the initiative at the President's request in establishing the American Freedom from Hunger Foundation, and the President invited forty-nine representative citizens to serve as trustees. Former President Truman was made Honorary Chairman. At the first meeting of the Foundation, in January 1962, trustees and officers were elected and an executive committee was set up. Among the trustees were Eleanor Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Governor Lehman, and Charles P. Taft. I was elected secretary and, later, historian.

Promotion of Production in Food Deficient Countries

The Foundation is a voluntary, non-profit, non-political and non-sectarian body and all officers serve without compensation. It is not a

Ringland: Relief organization, though the title might suggest this, and it does not operate in the field. Some fifty national organizations are affiliated and assist the Foundation, through information and education, to focus public interest on the problem of world hunger, and enhance the project work overseas of the Food and Agriculture Organization, our Government and non-governmental agencies. It takes its place with similar national citizens' committees set up in most of the member countries of FAO.

President Kennedy proclaimed National Freedom from Hunger Week, March 17-23, 1963. And this was followed by the United States as host of the World Food Congress in Washington, June 4-18, 1963. The Foundation had the pressing responsibility for the success of the Congress and provided financial assistance to permit many of the delegates from the food-deficient countries to travel from their homes.

Concern for Malnutrition in the United States

Ingersoll: The purpose of the Foundation, as I understand it, is to participate in the world campaign of FAO against hunger. What is the relationship between this purpose and malnutrition in this country?

Ringland: In the Washington Post of Friday, April 14, 1967, announcement was made that Secretary of Agriculture Freeman had ordered a team of representatives to Mississippi to determine the extent of the food shortage problem among the poor in the Delta region. This item engaged my immediate interest. At a recent meeting of the executive committee of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation, the Reverend McKenna, a trustee, spoke of his recent investigation in Mississippi where he found a deplorable condition of malnutrition in a rural area, presumably among the colored people.
In my thinking, his remarks related to a statement I had made at a meeting of the Trustees a short time previously. I had said that the Foundation, in its campaign to assist in overcoming world hunger, should recognize that the United States is a part of the world, too, and include a substantial number of people who are suffering from malnutrition here. I referred specifically to the school lunch program and the obstacles confronting it in rural areas and certain urban centers, with the suggestion that the Foundation establish liaison with the Department of Agriculture.

After the close of the Executive Committee where Reverend McKenna spoke, he talked informally with Mrs. Orville Freeman, a member of the Committee and a Trustee. It seems quite possible that Secretary Freeman's action was the outcome of this talk with Reverend McKenna, though I had no opportunity to confirm this. Senator Clark announced in a statement that he and Senator Robert Kennedy "saw and talked to men, women, and children, living in conditions that can only be described as deplorable."

It is timely at this point to refer to Senator McGovern, former Director of Food for Peace, and his trojan work to focus attention on the problem of world hunger. On 24 August 1967, I wrote the Senator commenting on his T.V. talk and the inclusion of the United States in this problem. The enactment of S-2138, I said, authorizing a survey would be a welcome and essential step, especially in relation to pre-school and school children.1, 2

On April 22, 1968, Senator McGovern addressed the Senate in respect to a report by the Citizen's Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States, demonstrating anew that millions of infants, school-schildren, and adults in this affluent nation are undernourished. He said that five national groups of church women reported that

---


The school lunch program is reaching only one-third of the six million children who need free or low-cost lunches.

The senator announced that he proposed to introduce a resolution "to face up to the problem of want for basic necessities in our country, and develop a strategy to end the paradox of want and starvation in the most affluent society in the history of mankind." A number of senators immediately requested that their sponsorship be recorded. On April 24, 1968, Senator McGovern wrote me and sent me the text from the Congressional Record containing an announcement of the hunger resolution. Subsequently, the Senate Select Committee on Malnutrition and Human Needs was organized under his chairmanship.¹,²

The hearings during January and February 1969, of the 91st Congress, and which are continuing, have attracted wide attention and general acceptance of the gravity of the problem of malnutrition as revealed by the testimony of experts and field studies in several states. A sour note was injected, however, when the Rules Committee on February 6 reduced the appropriation for the Committee's work from $250,000 by $100,000. This was branded by the Evening Star of Washington as "Mindless Economy."³ Senator McGovern called attention to the forty percent increase in senators¹ pay and the irony of cutting the Committee's appropriation by forty percent. He was given firm support by his colleagues, notably Senator Hollings of South Carolina. The Senate, in an action said to be without precedent, repudiated the action of the Rules Committee and restored the appropriation.

¹Letter of April 24, 1968, from McGovern to Ringland. See Appendix.

²Memorandum of April 29, 1968, to Leonard Wolf, Executive Director of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation from Ringland. See Appendix.

On February 20, 1969, the trustees of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation adopted a resolution in support of the Senate Select Committee on Malnutrition and Human Needs, recognizing that the war must be fought on two fronts, at home and abroad.¹

The trustees of the Foundation, in its resolution of May 21, 1968, recognized "pockets of poverty at home and in developing nations abroad." The President and Executive Committee were empowered "to develop and pursue programs which will encourage and invite the cooperation of all private organizations in the United States that are concerned with Freedom from Hunger."²

This resolution is bearing fruit. The report of Canada's success, on behalf of its Freedom From Hunger Campaign, in raising funds through projects known as Walks for Development, led Executive Director Wolf of our Foundation to undertake similar action at home.

Just what are "Walks for Development"?

I understand such projects originated in England in support of their Freedom From Hunger Campaign, and, as I have said, were taken up in Canada. A project involves the organization in a community, principally of young people, to demonstrate their concern by walking over a pre-determined route—normally thirty miles through city and suburban streets. Sponsors, individuals, schools, business firms, and civic groups, supported by the press, pay the walkers so much a mile for every mile hiked.³

In September of last year and in January and February of 1969, eight communities were organized

¹ Resolution of February 20, 1969, of the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.
and expressed their concern so generously that over $116,000 was made available for domestic and overseas projects. Within the compass of a community's influence, the walks have reflected the resident people's appreciation and understanding of the Freedom from Hunger Campaign as a whole, and specifically by generously providing funds for domestic projects selected by them, and for overseas projects recommended by our Foundation.

May I cite two examples? One was an education in nutrition project on an Indian reservation in North Dakota. Another was, through the Food and Agriculture Organization, the establishment in Liberia of an agricultural extension training center.

Through the expansion of Walks for Development, now projected in many communities, there is bright promise that the objectives of the Foundation to contribute to the assuagement of the evils of malnutrition and hunger will be achieved. The singular merit of a Walk for Development, and it is singular, is the local community focus on these objectives and on specific projects to further them.

The National Roadside Committee

The public interest was well served by the Committee of some fifty or more citizens from across the country affiliated with a variety of organizations deeply concerned with the regulation of outdoor advertising on the 41,000 miles of the Federal Interstate Highway System. The Executive Committee members represented the American Planning and Civic Association, American Nature Association, American Automobile Association, American Association of Nurserymen, Audubon Society

---

1 Walk for Development, Domestic and Overseas Project Report.
of D.C., the National Capital Garden Club League, and the National Roadside Council. I served on the Executive Committee as a member-at-large of the Garden Club League.

The Chairman of the National Committee and the Executive Committee was Mrs. Vance Hood, a well-known civic leader of New Jersey. Richard W. Westwood, the Executive of the American Nature Association was secretary. They were a most effective team and had the strong backing of the Executive Committee. A cartoon by the famous Herb Block, which appeared in the Washington Post May 31, 1957, tells the story. 1 An editorial and cartoon of November 10, 1957, indicates how the fight was presented by the Portland Sunday Telegram. 2 And, in the Washington Post again, on March 27, 1958, Herb Block indicates how the issue continues. 3

My particular interest was to promote the immediate environment of the Federal Highway System through the development of conservation measures. A memorandum to the Executive Committee entitled "The Control of Billboards on Rural Lands Flanking the Federal Highway System" outlined these measures through taking advantage of the Soil Bank Act of 1956. 4

Subsequently, the Executive Committee, at its meeting of October 2, 1957, assigned the follow-up responsibilities to me and to undertake exploratory talks with the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture to effect their collaboration.

Ingersoll: I suggest that at this point you explain the provisions of the Soil Bank Act of 1956.


The Act provides for payments to farmers who contract to divert general cropland to soil, water, forestry, and wildlife conservation practices, including trees or shrub plantings for shelterbreaks, windbreaks and wildlife habitats. You can readily see how such measures, if established on the flanks of the Federal Highway System, would measurably enhance year after year the aesthetic and economic values profitable to the farmer and the nation.

In August--this was in 1957--Congressman Blatnik of Minnesota proposed a gigantic reforestation program by the planting of trees to flank the thousands of miles under the recently enacted Federal Highway Act of 1956. He pointed out that, in addition to the scenic, economic, and conservation benefits of his proposal, it would be an excellent means to provide employment for young men during summer vacations, to work near their home communities, and that they need not live in camps as in the old CCC days.

With this in view, I consulted Jerry Sonosky, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Blatnik. In follow-up, I wrote him on November 26, 1957, suggesting that the purpose of the Congressman could be effected now by cooperation between the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture because of Agriculture's announced policy to encourage farmers to establish conservation practices under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act.1

Previously, I had talked with John Jones, Administrative Assistant to Senator Neuberger in reference to S. 963, a bill to control advertising, and left with him a proposed amendment to provide for conservation practices.2 Senator Neuberger wrote me on October 2, 1957, his comment.3

---

1Letter of November 26, 1957, Ringland to Sonosky. Appendix.

2Copy of memorandum to Mr. John Jones, August 14, 1947. See Appendix.

3Letter of October 2, 1957, from Senator Neuberger to Ringland. See Appendix.
In the meanwhile, talks were carried on with officials of the Bureau of Public Roads. Deputy Commissioner F.C. Turner responded on November 4, 1957,\(^1\) encouragingly to my memorandum of October 14, 1957,\(^2\) in which it was suggested that the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture collaborate in furthering the conservation provisions of the Soil Bank Act in areas adjacent to the right-of-way of the Federal Highway System. Our Committee wrote Mr. Turner on November 18, 1957, expressing gratification that the Bureau of Roads considered the suggested collaboration merited serious consideration and study. At the Executive Committee meeting of January 8, 1958, I reported that the Secretary of Commerce had given approval for the Bureau of Public Roads officials to discuss with the Department of Agriculture use of the conservation provisions of the Soil Bank Act of 1956.

Several bills had been introduced in the Senate and the House to contest billboard advertising. To spell out in some detail the conservation aspects that should be included in any legislative enactment, I drafted an amendment to Congressman Hale's bill 965.\(^3\)

Admiral Phillips of our Executive Committee reported that the amendment affirmed the conservation reserve provisions of the Soil Bank Act would apply to lands adjacent to the new Interstate Highway System, but requiring that to qualify for such conservation reserve privileges, the owner of such land must also comply with the standards for regulation of signs as set up by the Secretary of Commerce. He felt that this was a reasonable and just provision since the Federal Government underwrites both the Soil Bank and Highway programs.

---

\(^1\) Letter of November 4, 1957, Turner to Ringland.

\(^2\) Memorandum, Ringland to Turner, October 14, 1957.

\(^3\) Proposed addition of Section 5 to H.R. 9637 as proposed to Congressman Hale.
It also would be an incentive to the land owners who otherwise might be tempted by billboard rentals on his land. Admiral Phillips felt that this matter was so far-reaching that it was worth the cooperation and support of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

To take advantage of the Soil Bank Act, cooperation between the Department of Commerce and Agriculture, which I had recommended and which had the hearty support of our Committee, did not develop as expected. The Bureau of Public Roads was receptive (note Deputy Commissioner Turner's letter of November, 1957, cited above) and cleared the idea with the Secretary of Commerce and then proceeded to talk with Agriculture. Subsequently, the Bureau telephoned me that Agriculture could not see it but for reasons that seemed hazy to me. Whether the Forest Service was consulted was a question. In any event, in my opinion, that "someone" in Agriculture was lacking in imagination.

The development of further sentiment in support of action by the Congress to control billboard advertising was, of course, the primary task of the National Committee. At the October meeting of the Executive Committee, it was suggested that the place of concentration should be Baltimore, where Congressman Fallon lived. He had successfully blocked any hearings in the House, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Committee on Public Works. Happily, I was able to help, through two old friends in Baltimore: John E. Semmes, a prominent lawyer and trustee of the prestigious Baltimore Sun, and John M. Nelson, Jr., a member of the Board of Natural Resources of the State of Maryland, and a classmate in the Yale Forest School. Semmes and I served together as student assistants in the early days of the Forest Service. They moved effectively, in response to my letters of January 31, 1958.1 The hearings were held by Congressman Fallon and, in the final House action, Congressman

---

Fallon voted in support of control. His support in the House was of the greatest value.

The sentiment for control of roadside billboard advertising was widespread, though it lacked some union and farm support because of labor and rental factors. And our Committee, with assured backing, took an active part in the hearings of March 10 and 11, 1958, before the Senate Roads Subcommittee.

In April, 1958, the 85th Congress upheld a billboard control provision, introduced in the Senate by Senators Neuberger and Kuchel, in legislation to amend and supplement the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Following its passage, our Chairman, Mrs. Vance Hood, wrote Secretary of Commerce Weeks on April 8 about collaboration in connection with outdoor advertising standards and naming of a subcommittee.1

A complete report on this truly historic action was issued by Mrs. Hood and Secretary Richard Westwood. Most importantly, they pointed out, was the fact that there was established a National Policy that safe and pleasurable travel in the Interstate Highway System required control of outdoor advertising; and, too, to protect the public investment in the system. And, of course, to effect this was the provision that advertising within 660 feet of the edge of the right-of-way and visible from the main travelled way of all portions of the Interstate System acquired subsequent to July 1, 1956, should be regulated according to standards promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce. But this time limitation would, in effect, protect only new mileage. Important, too, was the provision that conservation considerations, such as reforestation, soil erosion control, etc., may govern the treatment of highway environment. Again, the Secretary of Commerce was authorized to enter into agreements with the states that shall

---

1 Letter of April 10, 1958, from Mrs. Vance Hood to Secretary Weeks.
Ringland: include provisions for advertising control, but may include provisions for preservation of natural beauty, prevention of erosion, landscaping, reforestation, development of scenic attractions and sites of historical significance. Our Committee was unanimous that this provision should be included. Agreements prior to July 1, 1961, should increase the Federal share of ninety percent by one-half percent of the total project cost as an incentive.

Great credit must go, said the Vance and Westwood report, to Senators Neuberger, Gore, and Kuchel and to Congressmen Fallon, Blatnik, and Davis of Tennessee and Hale of Maine for their leadership in bringing the billboard control provisions to a victorious decision. They were aided by many of their colleagues in both Houses of Congress.

The report concluded that it was impossible to list all of the organizations and individuals who contributed to success. Motor clubs, garden clubs, conservation organizations, architects, civic groups, roadside councils, and a variety of other private groups did a yeoman job. Countless individuals expressed themselves by letter and telegram to their senators and congressmen. The results of this grass roots expression were reflected in the vote. Members of Congress state that rarely has there been such an upsurge of sentiment.¹

This was the legislative status of the control of billboard advertising on the Federal Highway System in 1958. Since then, in view of weaknesses in such control, there has been a running controversy with the billboard advertising industry.

In 1965, a Highway Beautification Act was enacted which provided, among other things, for junk-yard screening and removal and for scenic enhancement along highways.

But, as I have said, the billboard control provisions, beautification measures, and standards set up by the Bureau of Public Roads have generated continuing controversy, fostered in succeeding congresses by the advertising industry's unrelenting opposition. The New York Times editorial of June 9, 1967, almost ten years after the original highway legislation of 1958, reflects this opposition. And the industry has contested on legal grounds as well as in other ways. A pertinent decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts may be cited. The Court held that billboard interests, in planning their displays so that the motorist is forced to read them "are not asserting a natural right—they are seizing for private benefit an opportunity created for a quite different purpose by the expenditure of public money in the construction of public ways."

Our Committee's interest, after the passage of the enabling legislation of 1958, was directed to assisting the states to meet the Federal standards for the control of advertising. These standards would need to be incorporated in laws of the states that seek to qualify for the additional Federal payment of one half of one percent of the present ninety percent contributed for the cost of construction. While a Federal battle was won, the war in most of the states was yet to be fought, though it should be noted that Maryland and Virginia promptly passed the necessary legislation. In Wyoming, however, it was understood that the Legislature zoned rural routes as falling within the same category as commercial and industrial zones where there is wide freedom from control. In Montgomery County, Maryland, the County Council has strictly limited the character and size of outdoor advertising in commercial areas.

Mrs. Lyndon Johnson deserves the greatest credit in bringing the issue of roadside beautification to public attention.

Through our National Committee, though it ceased to function in 1958, I believe its work

---

Ray Marsh, an old colleague of early Forest Service days, proposed to me in 1964 to become an active member and director of this influential organization—an organization of distinguished members in the field of conservation. I was gratified to receive a formal letter of invitation from Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, the Chairman, and I was happy to accept.¹

The principal objectives of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources provide in its articles of incorporation: to advance conservation, restoration, and sound management of natural resources in the public interest, through (1) working for legislation to achieve these ends; (2) working with civic-minded people to further public understanding of major conservation issues, and encourage the expression of public opinion to legislators; (3) working to supplement the educational activities of all other conservation groups, organizations, and individuals of like mind; and (4) striving to attain these goals through other authorized means. The Committee serves these objectives as a non-profit and non-political organization and the Executive Committee takes an active and continuing part in relation to conservation legislation before Congress.

In this respect, it performs a singularly effective service under the chairmanship of Dr. Gabrielson, so well-known and respected for his achievements.

¹Letter of April 8, 1964, from Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Chairman, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
The compass of the Committee's activities, in furthering legislation on the Hill that serves the public interest in natural resources, is full circle at each session of the Congress. I am listing here some measures that have been included in the legislative program of the Committee to illustrate the wide range:

National Wildlife Refuge System
Endangered Species
Estuarine Areas
Strip Mining
Use Permits in National Forests
Wilderness Bills
Grand Canyon
North Cascades National Park
Wild and Scenic Rivers
Pollution Control
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
Land and Water Conservation Fund
Highway Beautification

An example of the Committee's service in seeking constructive legislation is reflected in three exhibits: One, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the Lower Colorado Basin Project; another, a letter to conservationists on the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; and a third, urging rejection of the provisions in H.R. 17134, weakening the Department of Transportation Act now protecting parks and recreation areas, wildlife refuges, and historic sites, and drastically curtailing highway beautification and junk yard billboard control. This bill was approved by the House of Representatives on July 3, but the Senate voted its own version containing none of the House anti-conservation provisions.

---

1Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the Lower Colorado Basin Project.

2Letter of July, 1966, from Ira Gabrielson, Chairman.

Ingersoll: Your retirement has been almost as busy as the years preceding. Hasn't it?

Ringland: I have tried to keep a continuing interest in conservation of the natural and human resources by maintaining association with some of the active organizations in these fields. But sometimes, with the memory of field work behind me, it is trying to sit on the bank of the stream, throwing in an occasional stone, instead of being in the swim!

The changing scene—economic, social, and political—has developed the necessity of a hard look at the quality of our environment. A moving factor, and a most encouraging one, is the public's awareness of influences so evident that he who runs may read. In response, Congress, the Federal agencies, the States, and other political units are taking constructive action of great promise, building on the foundations laid down by such pioneers of imagination and action as Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, and Herbert Hoover.
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