

About June 10, 1951

Dr. Raup,

You asked me today to comment on the contents of a letter which at the time you were in the process of writing to Mr. Theodore Storer. I welcomed the opportunity, as I always have, to offer constructive criticism. Your letter was devoted primarily to the answering of two main questions.

The first question concerned the Forest's policy in regard to the number of students which should be permitted to participate in its educational program. I personally thought that you did a very adequate job in the answering of this question. I used as a criterion for this opinion the fact that I was able to follow and understand your explanation. I have no doubt that Mr. Storer will be able to do as well as I if not better. This first question was more or less amenable to a precise response.

The second question demanded the inclusion in its answer of the research now being conducted at the Harvard Forest. It is here on your response to this question that I wish to comment, and offer criticism which might perhaps be quite severe, and destructive in nature.

rather than constructive. I feel very  
 deeply, however, in regard to the relationship  
 between you and me, and I sincerely believe  
 that if I cannot express my convictions  
 freely to you then my value to you is  
 practically null and void. I can see right  
 now that what I have to say is going to  
 be quite lengthy, but one might as well  
 get to the bases of the problem and  
 start from there. So please bear with me.

Dr. Raup, I think the fundamental reason  
 why I disagree with the way in which  
 you announced that second question was  
 not so much in what you said but in  
 what you did not say and the circumstances  
 under which you had to express yourself.  
 In my mind, at least, the circumstantial  
 aspects are the most influential in this  
 particular case. These circumstances, I believe,  
 evolved from the fact that you just didn't  
 have the time to sit down and express  
 yourself in your usual manner. You just  
 couldn't devote your best at that parti-  
 cular time. The fact that you were willing  
 to have Miss Carpenter prepare the letter for  
 your signature, providing Eric and I had  
 no criticism, bothers me. As you know  
 I take almost everything concerning the  
 Forest seriously, too seriously perhaps, and  
 I am ready to accept criticism for this this  
 attitude of mine. I hope one does not get the

impression that I am another one of those self-appointed guardians of the Harvard Forest. I see here a big job to do, and I want to become an integral part of the mechanism which is being designed to tackle it.

Dr. Raup, I don't know where the solution to this time factor lies. I think perhaps that it is a problem common to us all here at the Forest, the same way as the entire program is dependent to a large extent upon time - time to work itself to a stage of fruition. However, I wonder if there is anything that can be done now or in the near future that might alleviate somewhat this condition which exists?

When I read your response to the second question I was forced to ask myself what I had been doing at the Harvard Forest for the last five years. In the first place, I did not think it necessary that personalities be mentioned in regard to the individual so-called "current" research projects. The fact that they were, made it <sup>even</sup> more imperative that I ask myself what I had been doing here at the Harvard Forest. However, Dr. Raup, I am more or less forced to say that I hope Mr. Storer does not use those examples you cited pertaining to me in the approach that you employed in the answering of his questions as the sole criterion of the role that I have played and am playing at

the Forest. Matter of fact, the approach you used had a tendency to avoid, what I consider at least my main contributions to the Harvard Forest.

We realize of course that the term research is very difficult to define, particularly research in the natural sciences, and particularly research in what we conceive as silviculture here at the Harvard Forest. We also appreciate that we would be in a serious predicament if we were not able to outline in a rather clear and concise form the nature of our research. With the above in mind then, here is an approach which I believe you might have employed.

Perhaps you might have said that the Harvard Forest is first and foremost an educational institution and the primary role of its research program is to corroborate and help provide a basis for instruction. The educational program itself is now and probably always will be in a state of research, as it were, and could very logically be included in current research. Here then a paragraph might have been devoted to a description of our concept of silviculture and the manner in which we expected to expose our students to it.

Our research program could very well have been broken down into a phase which particularly revolves about our voluminous records and for want of a better term sometimes designated as "long term" research. Another phase would entail

The collection of observations of natural phenomena which ~~are~~ related to the distribution, growth, regeneration, and development of vegetation, particularly forest trees. A third phase might have incorporated the synthesis of these observations and ideas, while at fourth their implementation expressed by one form in the current woods operations.

Examples of "current research" could have been cited using these four phases as hooks on which to hang them. I would <sup>have</sup> liked very much for you to mention the work which has been done on the records during the past few years. Our new system based on co-department maps, the punch card method of classification of some six hundred titles to be used as a basis from which to work, etc., the present and future amalgamation of our photograph files with our written records, and the continuation and <sup>temporary or periodic</sup> completion of our series of stand maps. (over)

The examples of research pertaining to those natural phenomena could very well have included the influence of periglacial forest forms upon soil development of processes etc., the role of windthrow in the development of vegetation etc., the anti-related herbicides, mycology studies, tree roots, etc.

The phase involving the synthesis might have been demonstrated by our ideas concerning the alteration of the concept of the climate's <sup>processes</sup> glacial. The rational use of the land, even our concept of silviculture

might have been mentioned. In my mind we are laying the foundation for some very worthwhile publications which should reach fruition in the very near future.

In regard to our woods operations - here I believe you are trying some practical application of our ideas. Concomitant with these operations we are recording data - time costs, stand compositions, etc. which in many ways are much more inclusive than have ever been done in the Forest in the past. I should have mentioned earlier in the treatment of records as "long term" research, that we are judiciously trying to perpetuate those that had been started earlier. (The only exception I know of would involve some of the "so-called" permanent sample plots) Even though we realize that the Forest is in no real position to conduct research in utilization, we have the opportunity occasionally in our operations to experiment with a little bit with wood products - oak, popboards, red pine poles, etc..

Dr. Raup, I have tried in a few minutes to show you one approach to answering that second question. I wish now that you would reread what you wrote. A personal thing enters into what you said. I am not the least bit aggravated, just slightly disturbed. As long as I know that you know what I am doing at the Forest that is all that matters to me.

One phase of my work at the Forest which could not be evaluated in the form of current research is quite difficult for me to express. I'll try however, and you can see what you think of it. I have always tried to take off of your hands a host of minute responsibilities. Just little things which I feel contribute to the general welfare of the Harvard Forest period. By doing this, it has been my hope that you would have more time to spend on more important details. As you know by now, I like to accept responsibilities. Matter of fact, I sometimes envy some of the people who have been here in the past <sup>and</sup> who have been able to shirk many responsibilities and still live an existence which was on the surface, at least, on an even keel. I am not the least bit dissatisfied when I express some envy of Crue, who has been able to come here and remain unmolested by these more or less routine responsibilities, and pursue his work. Crue, however, is very willing to do other things, and it pleases me to find that he is participating in our research, particularly with the records. You know, Dr. Raup, I've never been able to do that, not even when I was a student here for my M.F. I'm not feeling sorry for myself now nor am I being a

martyr - because I like it that way.  
 It makes me feel more like a part of the  
 Harvard Forest - and whether I realize it  
 or not it has forced me to learn - until  
 one accumulates an awful lot of information  
 and experience pertaining to how this  
 Forest runs and is operated. I guess it  
 is my nature just to like to know what  
 is going on around me!

I wish there were some way that I  
 could help you share more of the weight.  
 I myself would like to have more time  
 to say for example - put more things on  
 paper. I think that this is of extreme  
 importance - publishing material - it is one  
 criterion which could be used by some  
 of our "critics" as a yardstick to evaluate  
 the present set up of the Harvard Forest.  
 I also have to establish myself in the field.  
 However, I honestly feel that the Forest  
 can profit more at this stage by allowing  
 you more time. So Dr. Raup, please  
 don't hesitate to ask me to help in  
 any shape or form.