



NORTH CASCADES CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Volume II

MAY 1958

Number 5

"To secure the support of the people and the government in the protection and preservation of scenic, scientific, wildlife, wilderness, and outdoor recreational resource values in the North Cascades....."

By Laws, Article I

<u>In this issue:</u>	<u>Page</u>
More on the Wilderness Bill	1
Scouts in the Wilderness	4
"Five Cities", a book review	5
Articles of interest in other publications	5
Miscellaneous	6
Rainbow Bridge	7

EXERPTS FROM "KEEP THE WILDERNESS WILD"

The Trustees for Conservation (251 Kearny Street, San Francisco 8, California) in cooperation with THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY have reprinted and circulated an article by Howard Zahnizer, editor of the Living Wilderness magazine, which originally appeared in the February 1958 issue of Outdoor America, published by the Izaak Walton League of America. Since the North Cascade Conservation Council went on record as supporting the Wilderness Bill (National Wilderness Preservation Act) on June 20, 1957, and since that same bill now urgently needs our work to become law, it then is imperative that we apply ourselves to the important task of letter writing if we are to preserve our wilderness, intact.

..."Fortunately for all Americans, the opportunity to test the challenge of the wilderness is still with us. But only a little more than two per cent of the total land area of the United States is still in its near primitive state. Most of this is found in the federal public lands: within the wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas of our national forests; in the undeveloped back country of our national parks; and in certain wildlife refuges and Indian reservations.

"The United States has never had an over-all national policy for the preservation of any of its wilderness as such, in spite of the fact that there is nothing in our history to indicate that we can be expected to leave by accident any extensive areas of wilderness. If we are to see wilderness preserved, we must preserve it deliberately.

"This is the aim of the National Wilderness Preservation Act - or Wilderness Bill - introduced in the 84th Congress to widespread acclaim, and reintroduced in the 85th Congress. The bill features seven points:

1. It recognizes what wilderness is and that its preservation is doomed unless deliberately provided for in basic legislation by our Congress.
2. It recognizes that areas of wilderness can serve various purposes and still maintain wilderness character.
3. It designates for preservation wild areas now existing within our national parks, national forests, wildlife refuges, and in other such federal areas where present uses of the lands can be served in keeping with wilderness preservation.
4. It provides that these areas shall continue under their present administration (National Park Service, Forest Service, etc.), with no change of jurisdiction, and with no alteration of basic purposes.
5. It provides that Congress shall charge administrators of such areas of wilderness with responsibility to manage them for any other purposes in such a way as to make sure that their wilderness character is preserved.
6. It safeguards existing private rights, and also insures the integration of a wilderness preservation program with the necessary development and exploitation of resources.
7. It establishes a council made up of the land administrators involved, together with a few citizens, to bring to a focus the various interests of our national wilderness preservation program and to serve the public as a source of information on wilderness. This council has no jurisdiction over lands or agencies."

A summary of objections to the Wilderness Bill with the author's (Howard Zahnizer) answers:

1. "It 'locks up' resources that are needed for economic reasons. NOT SO. It does not apply to areas now available for development. It does give added protection for areas now being preserved, and for every lock it provides a key that the future can use if needed.
2. "It would substitute special interest for multiple use. NO. It is itself a multiple use bill. It says that all the areas affected shall continue to serve the multiple uses they now serve but they shall likewise keep the wilderness character that they also now have. It provides for no special use or special users but assures wilderness for all who choose to use the areas without destroying them as wilderness.
3. "It would add vast acreages to lands set aside for preservation. NO. The areas involved are now being protected as park, refuge, or as wilderness in national forests. What will be added is more certain protection of wilderness values, and an orderly policy established in basic law by Congress. Any additions would be subject to Congressional scrutiny.
4. It would set up a special Council that would be a super-agency over existing bureaus and greatly complicate their administration of park, forest, and refuge lands. NOT TRUE! Our land administration will continue as at present. The Bill says so. The proposed Council takes the place of and makes unnecessary any super-agency; it is a meeting ground, and information center regarding the common wilderness interest in lands administered by the various agencies. Heads of the land managing bureaus make up a majority of this 9-man Council.
5. The Bill isn't needed; the Forest Service, the Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service are already doing a good job in preserving wilderness. THEY ARE INDEED. And the Bill will help them resist the great and growing pressures that constantly make it harder to preserve wilderness.
6. The Bill is still unnecessary. The areas it protects are just for a privileged few anyhow. THIS IS A SERIOUS MISUNDERSTANDING. Wilderness is for all-- for

anyone who chooses to use it without destroying it. Our wilderness areas are like our art galleries. They are not just for the few who happen to be in them at any one time.

7. You can't hope to pass a Wilderness Bill because of opposition from mining, timber, and other commercial interests. DON'T BE TOO SURE ABOUT THE OPPOSITION. There is no threat in the Wilderness Bill to any existing private right. No lands affected by it are now available for timber cutting. No grazing now going on will be affected. Provision is made for mining if the President finds this is to be in the national interest. These facts, plus the advantage to all of a clearly defined policy, should end most opposition."

Sponsors and Status:

"The Wilderness Bill in the Senate is S.1176 by Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon, and 10 other Senators in a bi-partisan coast-to-coast sponsorship: Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, Paul Douglas of Illinois, Karl Mundt of South Dakota, James Murray of Montana, Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, Frank Lausche of Ohio, Henry M. Jackson of Washington, Warren G. Magnuson of Washington, and Wayne Morse of Oregon.

"John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania and Lee Metcalf of Montana introduced companion measures in the House, as did five other Congressmen from California, Oregon, Illinois and Wisconsin." (In the House it is HR 500).

THE OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW BILL:

"A companion bill--not a substitute for it--is the pending bill to create a National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission (S 846 and HR 3592). This bill has passed the Senate and, at this writing, awaits action in the House of Representatives. All in all, it is a good bill and it deserves your support. When writing your Representative, urge him to support this bill. Here is what it will do:

1. Create a National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission.
2. Empower the Commission to estimate future needs of outdoor recreation in America in the light of present population trends and to inventory lands available to meet these needs.
3. Authorize the Commission to make recommendations for setting aside needed lands and for developing programs to guide Federal departments, States and private organizations.

The bill will not duplicate programs and studies now under way by other agencies."

WHAT WE CAN DO:

The Wilderness Bill is now in the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs. Letters from us will move it.

It is suggested that we write immediately to "members of the Committees and that we write our own Senators and Representatives to follow up with the Committees, too, to bring about enactment of this most important piece of conservation legislation in 40 years."

WRITE THOSE LETTERS TODAY! THIS IS URGENT.

* * * * *

SCOUTS IN THE WILDERNESS

By Mr. and Mrs. F. D. Mack of Sunnyside, Washington

We people in the Pacific Northwest are very fortunate in having mountains all around us. They are of much value and should be included in some way, in all sturdy people's recreation. This applies especially to our young people. During World War II, it was proven that our boys who were at home in the mountains were definitely more capable of taking care of themselves while on hazardous duties in the Pacific than boys who had never camped out and roamed around.

Also, our judges and persons connected with juvenile delinquents feel sure that boys brought up with an active interest in some place of "mountains" are too busy with their hobby to be seriously delinquent. Mountains are such a big hobby they never run out of places to go or things to do while in the mountains.

We have been ardent mountain people for a long time and several years ago, the Scout Master of Sunnyside, who was not an outdoor man but who knew it would be good for the boys, talked us into taking them out. At first they were so green--Mamma sent an open pail of milk for one boy to carry along a dusty trail! But soon, both parents and boys knew what they needed and the boys became very proficient--and completely sold on the mountains--enough so that nearly every one of them who went on our trips are still ardent mountain men and not one ever got into serious trouble.

A five year course stressing the outdoor phase of scouting contributed a very vital part to the building of character and citizenship. A planned annual hiking program of 12 monthly trips, all overnight, except in December, January and February, inspired the boys and leaders to the building up of an outstanding troop, well equipped and well organized for excellent team work.

The early spring and late fall trips were usually not made to the timber country but to such places as the big dams and Columbia River arrowhead hunts, etc. As the snow melted on the lower hills in spring, trips were planned to follow to the higher country. Weather was not allowed to interfere, which soon impressed beginners with the importance of good equipment. Teamwork was developed by the patrol system. Soon leaders were not needed to advise with details of camping.

The August trip was annually a 10-day affair in the high country and included the climb of a major peak. This required a first class rating in scouting, equipment, advancement and general scouting ability. The preparations for the August trip required the best cooperation among leaders, parents and scouts in the hard times of the '30's. Expenses were generally \$5.00 to \$7.00 apiece including transportation.

Pack horses were usually used to pack to the first main camp. From then on the troop was on its own and the trips covered 50 to 80 miles. This required real camping coordination. Supper was usually ready an hour after arriving at the new camp site. Cooking was done as a troop. Most trips were strenuous enough to occupy all of the time and energy, so there were no discipline problems.

We can remember taking a group of six of the seasoned hikers to a road end in late October and leaving them, on a very dark rainy night, for a 4-day hike on their own, without any misgivings. Needless to say, they were at the appointed place 40 miles away in good condition.

One of the finest of the 10-day trips was made in 1937 into the North Cascades wilderness. This started with a 3-day camp at Bridge Creek, with hikes and climbs; then backpacking up the Agnes, over Suiattle to Buck Creek Pass. Then, a hike to timberline on Glacier Peak, without beds, and a climb to the top next morning. Returning to Buck Creek Pass by evening, we found Mrs. Mack with an enormous stew ready in spite of a driving rain; supper was followed by a quick pack-up and a move of a couple of miles down into the timber where we spent a comfortable night, with good firewood and shelter.

The intangible values of wilderness cannot be measured in money but it is evident that the outdoor training for some 20 boys left an imprint of better citizenship and made 20 conservationists.

* * * * *

BOOK REVIEW

By John Warth, Seattle

Have you ever wondered how man in one short century could have gone through the greatest coniferous forest on earth, logging it or claiming it for future use; until today he must quarrel over even the remnants of forest in the heart of the Olympics and Cascades? If so, you will want to read George R. Leighton's FIVE CITIES.

The section of the book on Seattle and vicinity includes a vivid description of the greatest give-away in history. We read how the Northern Pacific Railroad was given an empire large as New England, yet laid claim to even more; how the Timber and Stone Act of 1878, ostensibly passed to aid the poor settler and prospector, granted 160 acres of timber to a person or associate; how the timber barons quickly blocked out their great holdings from these claims, many of them fraudulent.

The author tells the dramatic story of the establishment of our national forests. In protest, the Seattle Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution which sounds strangely similar to the arguments against Olympic Park and the Glacier Peak Wilderness.

Have you ever wondered how Rainier National Park could have been put through in this give-away era? Very simply. Privately owned ice and rock were exchanged acre for acre for prime timber outside the park. Similar exchanges were possible in the national forests. Finally a land commissioner removed 400,000 acres from Olympic National Forest, on the pretext that the land was more suitable for agriculture.

The prevailing philosophy of the times was honestly expressed by Mr. Ballinger, ex-mayor of Seattle and Secretary of Interior under Taft: "You chaps who are in favor of this conservation program are all wrong. You are hindering the development of the West...In my opinion, the proper course to take is to divide it up among the big corporations and the people who know how to make money out of it and let the people at large get the benefit out of the circulation of the money." Ballinger was fired. A new word "Ballingerism" was coined.

* * * * *

A FINE ISSUE

All who do not subscribe to the National Geographic Magazine should obtain the May, 1958, issue for a truly worthy display of the beauty to be found in our National Parks and Monuments illustrated by 48 color pages and 18 pages of black and white pictures. An exceptional article by Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service and a Trustee of the National Geographic Society, tells the story of the Park Service and highlights the beauty and history of the Parks. Mission 66 is also clearly defined. The editors are to be commended on such a fine magazine as this May issue.

* * * * *

Sunset Magazine Speaks Out

One page 3 of the May 1958 issue of Sunset Magazine are two paragraphs worth noting:

"The wilderness today is as fascinating to Westerners as ever--and high speed highways bring it much closer to hand. Now our problem is to preserve it. Much of

our high mountain and desert land will never support large populations. It can remain as wilderness for us to enjoy--if we don't spoil it by too much "developing"; if we don't alter it permanently by too many criss-crossing highways and public works located in areas of scenic value.

Today over 74 per cent of the Far West is still public land, and more than 93 million acres are set aside in national and state parks and in national forests --all available for recreation. The mountains, desert and ocean coastline are Western assets beyond price. No matter how built-up our metropolitan areas become, the wilderness will remain close at hand, a short drive from any Western city. We have it; our job is to treasure it and defend it."

* * * * *

A ROSY PICTURE

On page 109 of the recent May 17, 1958, issue of the Saturday Evening Post is a beautifully painted picture of two ducks enjoying domestic life on a "managed tree farm" while in the background a diesel locomotive pulls a trainload of logs across a wooden trestle spanning the water. The picture is, of course, part of a full-page advertisement of a well-known lumber company and is a very pretty representation of the "timber is a crop" philosophy. Yet there is a detected note of irony in the wording of the advertisement below the illustration. For instance, "The continuous cycles of harvest and reforestation are compatible with the preservation of all (in italics) forest resources." And, further on: "Today, properly managed timberlands are far more productive than the unmanaged wildlands (again in italics) of our forefathers."

With the public exposed to such advertisements for such a long period of time, we find it sometimes difficult to explain why we feel that there is a definite place for "The Wildlands in our Civilization"; or why a lover of the wilderness scene does not become overjoyed at seeing a second growth stand of timber as he does the virgin stand. We hope to let it be known that we sincerely believe it to be disastrous if all wildlands become "managed" and man loses contact with nature's balances from which we can profit so much more knowledge and enjoyment.

* * * * *

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS!

Dr. and Mrs. E. C. Taylor, Jr., Princeton, New Jersey; Richard R. Pooley, Portland, Oregon; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Crawford, Bothell, Wash.; Mr. and Mrs. Roy Anderson, Mt. Vernon, Wash.; Wilbur Knott, Spokane, Wash.; Pat Hubbard, Spokane, Wash.; Miss Mabel Gould, Spokane, Wash.; Alan Black, Seattle, Wash.; Mrs. H. P. Ellis, Vancouver, B.C.; Dr. and Mrs. Frederick Hillman, Everett, Wash.; Robert Sylvester, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Ballantine, Seattle, Wash.; Warren Spickard, M.D., Seattle, Wash.; Pio Panieri, Roslyn, Wash.; Mrs. Besty Swenson, Yakima, Wash.; and Mr. Robert G. Fischer, Mill Valley, California.

* * * * *

AN INTERESTING BOOK

Dr. William Wolman, Assistant Professor of Economics at the State College of Washington, has recently completed a book entitled THE DEVELOPMENT OF MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON which "represents the most comprehensive analysis of the Washington manufacturing economy which has been attempted to date." Especially interesting are the statements he makes concerning the lumbering industry in this State. The price is \$4.00.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

President: Patrick Goldsworthy, 6012 - 28th Ave. N.E., Seattle 15, Wash.
1st Vice President: Philip Zalesky, 2402½ Virginia St., Everett, Wash.
2nd Vice President: Miss Una Davies, 13641 S.W. Fielding Road, Oswego, Oregon
Recording Secretary: Miss Neva Karrick, 1906 - 8th Ave. W., Seattle 99, Wash.
Corresponding Secretary: Mrs. Pauline Dyer, 116 J St. N.E., Auburn, Wash.
Treasurer: Charles Hessey, Jr., Star Route, Naches, Wash.
Membership Chairman: John Anderson, 8206 - 30th Ave. N.E., Seattle 15, Wash.
Newsletter Editor: Mrs. Yvonne Prater, Route 1, Ellensburg, Wash.

* * * * *

RAINBOW BRIDGE, AGAIN

Mr. Jack Miller of Oakland, California, has informed the editor that things have "become muddled up as far as the protection of Rainbow Bridge is concerned" and a mimeographed letter addressed to Fred Packard of the National Parks Association from Paul Wiseman, President of the Seattle Mountaineers, would seem to confirm that surmise.

Mr. Miller found through correspondence with many Senators and Representatives that some thought Rainbow Bridge to be protected and others not.

A quote from Mr. Wiseman's letter to Fred Packard states: "Under the terms of Public Law 485, 84th Congress, this dam was authorized only if Rainbow Bridge National Monument receives 'adequate protective measures to preclude (its) impairment.' We are justified in demanding, in the name of the American people, not just 'minimal damage' or 'unnecessary disturbance' to Rainbow Bridge National Monument, but prevention of all damage and all disturbance of its contents. The law is clear and so is our responsibility. Either this protective project must be begun at once, or the construction of Glen Canyon Dam must be halted until the Bureau of Reclamation actually begins the construction of this protection."

"This challenge to the National Park System is of a significance equal to that of the Echo Park Dam proposal in Dinosaur National Monument. It must be met, and met immediately. A regional campaign to achieve complete protection for Rainbow Bridge National Monument has been initiated here. We feel sure that the National Parks Association will give assistance in obtaining nation-wide support for this tiny but unique unit of our national parks and monuments."

Your very truly,

THE MOUNTAINEERS
Paul W. Wiseman
President

It looks like there is much that we can do to protect Rainbow Bridge. Let's not be hoodwinked into feeling secure until we have definite evidence that Rainbow Bridge will be preserved, intact.

* * * * *