

The Private Forestry Movement in Massachusetts

WILLIAM A. KING



We turn to the natural world about us when the creations of men fail, and we don't have to pay an admission or even a green fee to draw fresh strength and inspiration from the fields and the woods and their inhabitants. To conserve these sources of refreshment for the future seems to me a particularly worth while objective.

— William Pickman Wharton

IN THIS CHAPTER I will examine the evolution of the private forestry movement in Massachusetts from the perspective of the associations and organizations that, sometimes to great effect and sometimes faltering along the way, have given the movement momentum and vitality. That movement has contributed many remarkable personalities to historic developments in national conservation, state government, and education. Like the forests themselves, the private forestry movement is dynamic, vital, and ever changing. Its history invites us to question causes and effects and ask why these people and their enterprises behaved as they did and what we can learn from them that may help to guide the footsteps of those who will assume future leadership of private forestry in Massachusetts and beyond her borders.

Although the private forestry movement in Massachusetts first took concrete form in the late nineteenth century, Massachusetts had long offered fertile ground for such enterprises. Shortly after the Revolution, General Benjamin Lincoln, having vanquished (with the help of others) the British, cast his martial eyes upon a landscape where "timber trees were greatly reduced and quite gone in many parts."¹ The

worthy general thereupon set out to promote the planting of acorns. By the mid-1800s, private nurseries, capitalizing on reforestation projects, also provided shade trees for village streets and parks. An example, described by Robert McCullough in *The Landscape of Community*,² was Jacob Manning's nursery in Reading, Massachusetts, which is said to have served "wealthy patrons." In 1876 and 1878, the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture offered prizes for improved arboriculture, which spawned reforestation experiments.³ Charles W. Eliot, son of the former president of Harvard University and a landscape architect of international reputation, was the driving force that led to the creation by the Massachusetts legislature, in 1892, of the Trustees of Reservations, a quasi-public although privately supported organization that to this day preserves and manages areas of extraordinary natural beauty for the benefit of the people. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, the stage was set for the formation of New England's first private forestry associations.

THE BIRTH PANGS OF THE PRIVATE FORESTRY MOVEMENT

Shortly after the midpoint of the nineteenth century, Alexis de Tocqueville, an acute observer of the democratic process in America, wrote:

If men living in democratic countries had no right and no inclination to associate for political purposes, their independence would be in great jeopardy, but they might long preserve their wealth and their cultivation; whereas if they never acquired the habit of forming associations in ordinary life, civilization itself would be endangered. . . . An association may be formed for the purpose of discussion, but everybody's mind is preoccupied with the thought of impending action. An association is an army; talk is needed to count numbers and build up courage, but after that they march against the enemy. Its members regard legal measures as possible means, but they are never the only possible means of success.⁴

As the advent of the twentieth century approached, thoughtless exploitation, uncontrolled fires, and expanding urbanization had put

much of America's forestland seemingly on the brink of ruin. Such a condition was ripe for attack by the democratic process of association.

Responding to the broad perception that a crisis in the management of the nation's forests was at hand, democratic processes of association went to work in Massachusetts and far beyond. The early Massachusetts forestry organizations emerged in the context of a larger drama being played out on a national scale. In 1875, Dr. John A. Warder, a physician and horticulturist from Cincinnati, had summoned concerned men and women from across the United States to a meeting in Chicago, where the American Forestry Association was chartered. The subsequent emergence of the American Forestry Association as a political force of considerable consequence lends credence to de Tocqueville's thesis of the processes of democracy being carried out through the formation of voluntary associations. Under the leadership of Dr. Bernhard E. Fernow as its general secretary, the association "became a potent agency, not only in education but in politics. . . . Dr. Fernow was an able, strong-willed German forester, who organized his campaigns with the thoroughness and determination of a Bismarck. The ground swell of conservation began to show practical results."⁵ (For a more detailed profile of Dr. Fernow, see Robert S. Bond's "Professional Forestry, Forestry Education, and Research" in this volume.) Among the initiatives spawned by the association was the formation by the National Academy of Sciences of a National Forest Commission to report on the future of the great forest reserves being created in the American West, the forerunners of the national parks and forests. As waves of settlers staked out claims to the western lands of the United States, the creation of these preserves was becoming imperiled by mounting political opposition to what many settlers perceived as locking up the nation's natural resources. The National Forest Commission was chaired by Harvard's eminent dendrologist and the founder of the famed Arnold Arboretum, Dr. Charles Sprague Sargent. Its secretary was Gifford Pinchot.

In "Massachusetts' Contributions to National Forest Conservation" (in this volume), the historian Stephen Fox recounts Sargent's sense of hurt and betrayal as Pinchot, as he ascended to positions of power, became a leading apostle of a more utilitarian forestry than that espoused by Sargent and others. Pinchot and President Theodore Roosevelt were joining forces to forge an unparalleled partnership in

conservation. While Pinchot had his detractors in the man Fox calls the “growling and irascible” Sargent and in John Muir, among others, he was virtually deified by a cache of adoring young foresters who became his disciples. Colonel Greeley, the author of *Forests and Men* (1951), was one of these, writing euphorically of Pinchot’s appointment as secretary to the National Forest Commission:

At this point the young “Lion of Judah” enters the story of America’s forests. He brought into it a fervor of religious intensity and a magnetic personal leadership that have rarely been equaled in the American drama. For the next fourteen years the astonishing vigor in the planning and execution of successive moves for national conservation largely expressed the zeal and energy of Gifford Pinchot.

Greeley continues:

Ancient astrologers foretold world-shaking events from the proximity of heavenly bodies. But who could predict the consequences of the simultaneous presence in Washington of two very dynamic and forest-minded men — Theodore Roosevelt in the White House and Gifford Pinchot in the Bureau of Forestry?

Both were men of great idealism and men of action. . . . They made a great team as crusaders of conservation, and they put over one of the most effective selling jobs in our history.

My first glimpse of “T.R.” was at the meeting of the American Forestry Association in Washington, in 1905. This meeting sounded the bugles for legislation which transformed the reserves into national forests and transferred them from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. As a young recruit in the Bureau of Forestry, I was thrilled when the President threw down his manuscript and strode across the stage. With shaking fists and flashing teeth he thundered “I am against the man who skins the land.”⁶

While Roosevelt, Pinchot, and their colleagues were leading the great American crusade for forest conservation, their direct influence on the private forestry movement in Massachusetts is, at best, a matter of speculation. Dr. Char Miller, Professor of History at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, and a leading authority on the life of Gifford

Pinchot, has found among the Pinchot Papers in the National Archives the text of an address Pinchot gave on November 30, 1895 at a meeting in Boston of a remarkable association called the Saturday Club, whose membership was drawn from the leading luminaries of that time in letters, law, philosophy, and progressive intellectual thought, including Charles W. Eliot, Oliver Wendell Holmes, William James, Frederick Law Olmsted, and Charles Eliot Norton. Pinchot's talk was curiously prophetic of the philosophy of forest management so vigorously advocated fifty years later by Harris Reynolds and his colleagues as discussed later in this chapter. After describing at length his enthusiasm for the practices that he had observed in the management of the ancient Sihlwald Forest in Zurich, Switzerland (which later became the inspiration for Reynolds), and extolling the virtues of wise utilization of the American forest's timber resource, Pinchot offered his prescription for "the Metropolitan Reservations which have recently been added to the park area of Boston — the Blue Hills, Middlesex Fells, Stony Brook, and Beaver Brook — with a total of something over 6,000 acres," concluding with this proclamation:

... for the value of the forest as a public pleasure ground, for the well being of the trees upon the reservation, and for the enormous value of an example of true forestry in New England, I believe the application of forest management to the Boston Reservations would be wholly feasible, widely useful, and altogether appropriate.

Unfortunately, only nine of the thirty-six illustrious members of the Saturday Club are recorded as having been in attendance at Pinchot's talk and, of these, only Charles Eliot would seem likely to have had any profound interest in the subject of forest management. One searches in vain for evidence that Pinchot's admonitions found any fertile ground in the forestry practices that were evolving in Massachusetts with the dawning of the twentieth century.

Ironically, at the turn of the century, notwithstanding the far-reaching changes in national forest policy led by the titanic figures described above, scarcely an acre of forestland — federal, state, or private — was under systematic management. A notable exception was George W. Vanderbilt's famed Biltmore estate in North Carolina. Dr. Carl Alwin Schenck, a German born and educated forester, came to

America in 1895 to take over the estate's management from Gifford Pinchot and started the Biltmore Forest School. The Biltmore School was the first forestry school in the United States. Although it was subsequently eclipsed by the forestry schools at Cornell, the University of Minnesota, and Yale, among others, it was notable for its "hands-on" innovative methods of instruction. To the citizens of New England, however, the vast carpets of green that once characterized the New England forests had been stripped of their best timber, their rivers were polluted, and they appeared to be nearly devoid of wildlife. Stephen Fox relates the exasperation voiced by Henry David Thoreau when viewing his beloved Concord stripped of its pine forests by the "heedless practices of local farmers."

True to De Tocqueville's observations concerning the natural proclivity of Americans to form voluntary associations, it was in response to this bleak scene that the first private-citizen forestry organizations in New England, serving the interests of both private landowners and the town forests, were organized. In order of founding, they were:

Connecticut Forestry Association	1895
Massachusetts Forestry Association	1898
Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests	1901
Forestry Association of Vermont	1904

THE WOODS LOOKED MORE RAGGED

The Massachusetts Forestry Association fulfilled the vision of its nine founders, led by Joseph S. Nowell and Allen Chamberlain, both of Winchester. While commuting home from their offices in Boston on a dreary December afternoon in 1897, Nowell and Chamberlain observed from their train window that "the woods they saw along the right of way looked more ragged than they had only a few years before . . . and the street shade trees seemed no better."⁷ The nine "men of good will" (James H. Bowditch, Myron S. Dudley, D. Blakely Hoar, Warren H. Manning, Jacob U. Pierce, Walter C. Wright, and the renowned landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted) framed a charter for a new association "to introduce judicious methods in dealing with forest and woodlands; to arouse and educate a public interest in this subject; to promote the afforestation of unproductive lands; to encourage the planting and care of shade trees."⁸



THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL

Figure 1. The “woods looked more ragged” because they were growing on spent timberlands and abandoned farmland. A driving force behind the new private forestry movement was the need to place these lands under professional management. Cartoon from the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Forestry Association, Bulletin 138, issued in 1923.

The Massachusetts Forestry Association was renamed the Massachusetts Forest and Park Association in 1933 and is referred to throughout this chapter simply as the MFPA. To make the organizational nomenclature more confusing, the Massachusetts Land League, organized in 1970 and discussed later in this chapter, was renamed the Massachusetts Forestry Association in 1985. Finally, not content with one name change, the MFPA became the Environmental Lobby of Massachusetts and then the Environmental League of Massachusetts (ELM). Here is a genealogical chronology to guide us through this labyrinth. In this chart, time marches from top to bottom, and approximately simultaneous events appear on about the same line.

1890			
1900	1898	Massachusetts Forestry Association	
1910			
1920			
1930	1933	Massachusetts Forest and Park Association (MFPA)	
1940			1944
1950			New England Forestry Foundation (NEFF)
1960			
1970			1970
1980	1981	Environmental Lobby of Massachusetts (ELM)	Massachusetts Land League
1990			1985
2000	1993	Environmental League of Massachusetts (ELM)	Massachusetts Forestry Association (MFA)

The circumstances of the MFPA's founding and its early history offer up some intriguing questions. In the roster of names of the MFPA's nine founding fathers, we look in vain for the redoubtable Charles Sprague Sargent and ponder the question: Why was Dr. Sargent not among them? We can surmise that while Sargent's passion for the planting and cultivation of all sorts of trees and his love of forest and

wilderness aesthetics would have been compatible with the founders' purposes, he was, first and foremost, a scientist, deeply committed to science for its own sake and thus not drawn to the MFPA's embrace of scenic and cultural values to the exclusion of science. Further, Sargent's energies were largely devoted to the national arena until, embittered by the consequences of the arguments with Pinchot and his camp over their advocacy of using science to further the aims of industry and utilitarian forestry, he withdrew into the seclusion offered by his beloved Arnold Arboretum.

Why did science seem to play only a minor role in the MFPA's affairs? The birth and early flowering of the MFPA coincided with the emergence of professional forestry as an academic discipline. Professor Bond describes the early recognition of forestry education at Harvard University through the work, initially, of Sargent and Alexander Agassiz and subsequently Richard T. Fisher, J. G. Jack, and Austin Cary. None of these learned gentlemen appears among the MFPA's early leadership, and the concerns of the MFPA seem to have had little or nothing to do with formal forestry education. Allen Chamberlain, for example, was a journalist and writer who contributed numerous articles to the publications of New England conservation organizations.⁹ It seems a reasonable inference that the private forestry movement in Massachusetts had its roots in the literary and cultural activities that were blossoming at the time, fueled by an ethic among the educated and wealthy elite to dedicate themselves to public service.

However this may be, the leaders of the MFPA certainly were not above the political fray, as we will see when we look at their achievements and those of their successors.

THE EARLY DAYS OF THE MFPA

Led by Nowell as its first president and Chamberlain as its first secretary, the embryonic MFPA embarked on an extraordinary number of initiatives, chronicled in Richard Applegate's *Massachusetts Forest and Park Association: A History, 1898-1973*. In its first year, believing that legislation could prove to be an invaluable tool for managing environmental issues, the MFPA "went to Beacon Hill to fight commercialization of Mt. Greylock, the state's highest mountain."¹⁰ It seems ironic that, nearly a century later, this battle still goes

on as evidenced by a recently publicized plan, trumpeted by the state and blessed by former Governor William Weld, to create an extensive development at the foot of the mountain.

A curious catalyst for one of the MFPA's early efforts was one Leopold Touvelot, a Medford naturalist of French extraction, who conceived the notion that the cocoons of French gypsy moths could be used to produce a substitute for silk; to this end he imported in 1869 a handful of gypsy moth caterpillars, creatures that, Touvelot observed, voraciously consumed every shred of the large helpings of greenery that he fed to his captive charges. To Touvelot's horror, fearing that if gypsy moths were allowed to multiply in the wild, they would cause massive destruction, the caterpillars escaped. The naturalist's entreaties to the Department of Agriculture, alerting it of the peril, fell on deaf ears, and the moths promptly became, and to this day remain, a scourge of increasingly epidemic proportions. In an effort to attack the destruction wrought by these creatures, the office of moth warden was created. Partially in response to the need for finding further ways to control the gypsy moth infestation, the MFPA in 1902 began the lobbying that resulted in legislation establishing the office of the state forester and a state forest nursery.¹¹ In 1906, encouraged by the success of its earlier lobbying efforts, the MFPA established a Committee on Legislation to advance the association's interests in the Massachusetts legislature and the governor's office.

In addition to its forays into political activism, the MFPA planted shade trees, mostly European lindens, on Beacon Street. These have withstood the ravages of wind, disease, and time to stand as a monument to the enduring beauty of what today is becoming known as the "urban forest."

THE ADVENT OF HARRIS REYNOLDS

In 1911, Harris Reynolds succeeded Allen Chamberlain as executive secretary of the MFPA. After graduating from West Virginia University in 1909 with the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering, Reynolds attended Harvard University, where in 1911 he earned a degree in landscape architecture. Harris barely had time to practice either of the professions for which he trained when he assumed the leadership of

the MFPA, a position that he would hold with great distinction until his sudden death in 1953.

During his long tenure as its executive secretary, Harris Reynolds' name became virtually synonymous with the MFPA. An exemplary apostle of de Tocqueville's assertion that the work of democracy is most effectively carried out through voluntary associations, Reynolds held to his conviction that a private, citizen-driven organization is the most powerful mechanism, and, when necessary, weapon, that can be brought to bear on forest-related conservation issues. Testimony to the wisdom of this belief is borne out by the MFPA's achievements under Reynolds' guidance and direction:

- The MFPA played an important role in convincing Congress to pass the Weeks Act in 1917, which, among other things, established the White Mountain and Green Mountain National Forests, containing nearly 900,000 acres of forested lands.
- In 1914 the MFPA secured from the Massachusetts General Court \$90,000 for the acquisition of state forests.
- In 1920, Reynolds caused the MFPA to bring before the General Court an initiative petition, the first ever, for the purchase of 250,000 acres for the Massachusetts state forest system. It had 31,000 signatures, and 100,000 acres were purchased.
- Reynolds became known as the father of town forests; there were 127 in Massachusetts by 1953.¹²
- Under Reynolds, the MFPA promoted the establishment of the state forest fire warden system.
- The MFPA sponsored and secured passage of a law requiring each town to elect a tree warden.
- Reynolds led the MFPA's battles against the destructive effects of insects and disease.
- The MFPA continued to develop and implement the organization's recommendations for town conservation land-use plans, commencing with MFPA-prepared plans for Wayland and Groton (1951 and 1952, respectively), with the assistance of a planner and a forester.

These plans called for identifying and inventorying natural resources within each town and suggested public actions for their protection.

- The MFPA organized a conference of experts to consider ways to obtain and use scientific information about natural resources, resulting in the creation of the Massachusetts Conference on Land Economic Survey and a new topographic survey of the state.
- The MFPA facilitated passage of legislation intended to prevent the discharge of industrial effluents into the state's streams and rivers.
- The MFPA published *Forest and Park News* and, in cooperation with the Harvard Forest, numerous forestry bulletins.
- Reynolds reorganized the Massachusetts Conservation Council, Massachusetts' citizen clearinghouse.
- Reynolds served on various state committees and headed three major national committees.

Throughout Harris Reynolds' long tenure as secretary of the MFPA, the association engaged in a host of environmental initiatives both within the state and beyond its borders. In 1920, the MFPA joined a battle to prevent the flooding of 8,000 acres of Yellowstone National Park. The following year the association worked to create a Roosevelt Sequoia National Park, secure additional land purchases for national parks, oppose transfer of the national forests from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, and encourage federal appropriations for the control of blister rust. Closer to home, the association proposed a forestry center for New England. Over the ensuing decades, Reynolds led the MFPA in such diverse efforts as forest-fire prevention, highway beautification, a plan, defeated in Congress, to establish an Everglades National Park, legislative approval of a topographic resurvey of Massachusetts, additions to the state forests, and, sadly, unsuccessful battles against Dutch elm disease.

The MFPA's roll of achievements under Harris Reynolds' leadership is eloquent testimony to his belief that the power of government can work to great effect when properly harnessed so as to make possible goals identified and advocated by associations of enlightened citizens. However, to this conviction there was one very notable exception: Reynolds, particularly in his later years, harbored an abiding skepticism

about the ability of government, federal or state, to effect positive change in the hands-on management of privately owned forested lands and the promotion of New England's private forest economy.

Reynolds was a prolific correspondent. Shortly before his death in 1953, he wrote the following clear statement of his convictions on this subject:

For more than half a century in this country, we have followed the theory that forest management was a function of government. This has meant government subsidies to [these] small owners and the virtual socialization of the forestry profession. . . . Ten years ago the Massachusetts Forest and Park Association reached the conclusion that all of its efforts through public subsidies since its organization in 1898 had failed to bring the woodlot under management. The countryside was still pock marked with clear-cut forest lands, constituting a fire menace and an eyesore in the landscape.

Reynolds' solution to the failure of government agencies to bring the smaller woodlots under management was the formation of the New England Forestry Foundation, discussed later in this chapter.

Harris Reynolds is affectionately remembered by his son Clinton Reynolds, currently a member of the foundation's corporation, as a colorful and forceful personality. Reynolds' attachment to his pipe was a trademark. Much to his wife's annoyance, the pipe was always "in his mouth," even while he was swimming. Clint Reynolds recalls that in 1929 and 1930 his father was engaged in building houses along Pinehurst Road in Belmont. The family had just assembled for lunch when one of the boys observed smoke rising from a nearby house lot where their father had been at work. By the time the Belmont Fire Department arrived at the scene, Harris Reynolds and his sons had extinguished the blaze, the cause of which would remain forever a mystery, since Reynolds assured the firemen that he could not have been at fault as he had "banged out" his pipe. Reynolds' vision of the mass destruction that might have ensued from this incident inspired him to demonstrate yet another of his talents, that for poetry, in an epic entitled "The Careless Smoker":

A fool there was and his pipe he lit
 (Even as you and I)
On a forest trail where the leaves were fit
To become ablaze from the smallest bit
Of spark — and the fool he furnished it.
 The day was windy and dry.

The forest was burned to its very roots,
 Even beneath the ground.
With the flowers, the birds and the poor dumb brutes,
Old Hoary oaks, and the tender shoots
Which might have made logs but for such galoots
 Allowed to wander around.

The lumber jack has now passed on
 His pay-day comes no more
And the screech-owls haunt the camp at dawn
Where the cook's tin pan woke the men of brawn
But the mill is silent, the trees are gone,
 The soil and the forest floor.

A deadly sight are those hills of rocks
 Which once were beds of green
No hope for the human, no food for the flocks
The floods must be held by expensive locks
And the harbor is silted to the docks,
 The ships no more are seen.

But the fool smokes on in the forest still
 Leaves camp-fires burning too
While the patient public pays the bill
And the nation's wealth is destroyed for nil.
If the law doesn't get him, Old Satan will
 When his smoking days are through.

Richard Applegate's history of the MFPA and other written accounts of its earlier activities resonate with the dramatic successes of Harris Reynolds. Less has been written about Reynolds' quiet but remarkably influential sometime comrade-in-arms, William Pickman Wharton of Groton, who was elected to the MFPA's executive commit-

tee in 1911. Remembered today by some Groton old-timers as Billy Wharton and by others as Mr. Wharton, this self-effacing gentleman, a modest man of both great wealth and great influence, often could be seen walking Groton's fields and woods dressed in the simple attire of a local farmer. Wharton served as president of the MFPA from 1936 to 1960 and was an original incorporator in 1944 of the New England Forestry Foundation. A listing of Wharton's memberships and offices found in the fiftieth-year account of the Harvard class of 1903 provides eloquent testimony of his eclectic interests. Here is an excerpt:

Memberships: National, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire Audubon Societies; American and Massachusetts Forestry Associations; Society of American Foresters; National Parks Association; Wilderness Society; American Ornithologists Union; Friends of the Land; Northeastern Bird Banding Association; Society for Protection of New Hampshire Forests.

Offices Held: Selectman of Groton, 1921–1924; currently, chairman, Town Forest Committee, and member, Planning Board; secretary and vice-president, National Audubon Society, 1912–1941; secretary, American Bison Society, 1910–1914; president, National Parks Association, since 1938; Massachusetts Forest & Park Association, since 1936; chairman, Massachusetts Conservation Council, 1942–1949, Massachusetts State Forestry Committee, since 1943.

A contemporary and friend of President Franklin D. Roosevelt at Groton and Harvard, Wharton was an adviser to Mr. Roosevelt on a range of matters, including forestry policies and the establishment of national parks. Stephen Fox's chapter in this book provides a thoughtful insight into this remarkable figure in American conservation.

THE NEW ENGLAND FORESTRY FOUNDATION

By the early 1900s, many of the farm fields and pastures that had dominated the Massachusetts landscape had been abandoned. Land, in many cases acquired by municipalities through tax foreclosures, could be bought for as little as a dollar per acre. The landowners who began to replace the farmers were diverse. Some were essentially absentee city dwellers who lived and worked far from the properties they purchased, while others were local individuals who often acquired property

through inheritance or picked it up as “tax land.” Bolt mills, charcoal kilns and other utilizers of wood created local markets for logs and provided an incentive for timber speculators to own large tracts of woodland, hoping to make fast profits from the demand generated by the local markets. For the most part, these people knew nothing of forestry practice or forest stewardship.

The abandoned farms were yielding to stands of pine, much of which was becoming marketable. Portable sawmills sprang up, resulting in extensive clearcuts. Because of a widespread lack of enlightened professional management, the woods that grew on this land generally contained very poor quality timber. Woodland owners needed expert advice and management assistance if they were to enhance and retain the quality of their forests. Once again, it was Harris Reynolds who brought his enormous talent and energy to attacking this problem: he identified a critical need for an enterprise that would offer to the owners of private forestlands a complete range of services, from timber cruising (inspecting land for possible lumber yield) to marking timber to be cut for both thinning and harvesting to overseeing cutting to securing the best markets for the harvest. Reynolds envisioned that this new enterprise would educate landowners by demonstrating that, with proper management, the timber resources of their forestlands could be renewed and sustained virtually in perpetuity. In today’s parlance, this concept would be called sustainable forestry.

The inspiration for Reynolds’ vision for wise management of the Massachusetts forests dated back to August 1913 when he honeymooned in Europe with his new bride, Alice Hecker, who was of German descent. Combining romance with scholarly investigation, Reynolds managed to conduct a study of European community forests, concentrating on some of the most famous German and Swiss city forests and the Black Forest. The honeymooning party was actually a threesome: the resourceful William Wharton went along to help with the study and to indulge his passion for observing birds and their habitats. The establishment of the town forest movement in this country is believed to have been the direct result of their forest studies on this trip. Reynolds’ detailed notes on one of the forests they visited, the Sihlwald (extolled, as previously noted, by Pinchot in his 1895 Boston lecture), describe the organizational structure for the management of what in 1913 was a 1,000-year-old forest situated within the city of Zurich:

Forest warden

Assistant

3 clerks

8 forest maids

120 workmen the year round. Double in the winter.

1 mill foreman

Regarding the responsibilities of the eight forest maids, Massachusetts Extension Forester David Kittredge tells us that “women were, and to a large extent still are, used for planting purposes in European forests. They are considered superior planters.”

Drawing on the experience gained in his travels abroad and the application of his learning to the management of community forests, Harris was ready to take the next step. M. Richard Applegate recounts in *New England Forestry Foundation: A History*:

On July 12, 1944, while war still raged over much of the world, the New England Forestry Foundation was incorporated in Boston to start and carry on a new kind of war — the battle to enhance and make better use of the forests of New England. The problem was to reach and to help the many, many individual owners. It was to educate them by doing what they couldn't do for themselves. It was to prove that forestry makes economic sense, and that an owner is willing to pay for a complete forestry service that can handle all of the details, from recommendation, to financial arrangement, to formal supervision of logging. This the government cannot and should not do.¹³

If Harris Reynolds' initiative is characterized as a war, the New England Forestry Foundation was his weapon of choice. Characteristically, Reynolds sought recruits to extol the virtues of his proposal. Many of the initial responses were far from encouraging.

In the light of Reynolds' disdain for the role of government in private forest management, one can only imagine his reaction to the following response from Perry H. Merrill, Vermont's state forester and one of New England's most influential forestry leaders.

December 31, 1943

My reaction to your foundation proposal is adverse at the present.

Perhaps with more information, I might be convinced of its value.

Your proposition is nothing more than the establishment of another land holding organization, which is quasi-public instead of public. Why not let the towns, county or state own or manage the lands? I see no greater inducement to the individual to give their lands to the foundation than to a public corporation. The tendency would be to donate cut-over or burned over land for which little can be done regardless of who holds it.

I doubt if you would get enough acreage to help the forestry situation. Suppose you got 50,000 acres; that would be only a drop in the bucket.

(Quite contrary to Merrill's comment, Harris Reynolds, as noted above, was not seeking to create "another land owning organization"; he was a passionate advocate for sound forestry management practice.)

From C. Edward Behre, assistant to the chief, United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, he received the following:

February 7, 1944

I have your letter of January 20 and have discussed your proposal for a Forestry Foundation with several people here. It is my feeling that the scheme is quite impractical and is unlikely to affect more than a small segment of the private forest land problem. Because there would be no incentive for income, the tendency would be for management to be inefficient, both from the standpoint of forest practice and business administration. . . . There would be a tendency to sell stumpage too cheaply, thus undermining ordinary private owners or giving an undue advantage to the processors. This holds untold possibilities for playing favorites and diverting the income to the pockets of some self-seeking clique.

It seems to me that if the land cannot be held privately, it would be better for it to be in public ownership rather than in a foundation which might be dominated by a small group of generous contributors.

I also have difficulty in understanding why technical aid provided to small owners by the foundation foresters is any less obnoxious than "subsidies from the public till."

From Harold O. Cook, Director of Forestry, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Conservation, came the following:

March 24, 1944

I have been thinking over the plan of your Forestry Foundation, and have come to the conclusion that the most valuable part of your program is liable to be overshadowed by the forest land acquisition and management portion of the project.

However, the Massachusetts commissioner of conservation, Raymond J. Kenney, in an encouraging letter dated April 21, 1944, appeared to share Harris Reynolds' vision. Addressing the challenge posed by the creation of the foundation, Mr. Kenney, with extraordinary foresight, wrote:

I read with interest in the *Forest and Park News* of April of the progress being made in the formation of the New England Forestry Foundation. I believe that this organization can be made an important factor in the development of forestry in Massachusetts and New England to supplement the present activities of the State and Federal agencies.

As you know, one of our important problems with respect to forestry in this State is the matter of non-resident ownership, and I believe that an agency which can take over the management of forest lands owned by non-residents will be an important factor in meeting our problems.

No doubt there are many people, residents and non-residents alike, who would hesitate to relinquish title to their property but who would be glad to enter into an arrangement whereby their forest lands would be put under sound management practices. I have in mind an arrangement similar to that which is in common practice with respect to the management of business real estate today or even in the management of personal property in the nature of stocks, bonds and similar securities.

I feel that once the Foundation gets under way, it will be found that many owners will want not only competent forestry advice but the actual management of their property, involving the harvesting of mature timber, stand improvement work or replanting where necessary, and that they will be ready and willing to pay a reasonable fee for such a service. I feel that such an arrangement would make it possible to extend over a wider area the services and resources of the Foundation than would be possible if it became largely a land-holding corporation.

Realizing that good forestry and good wildlife management work hand in hand, I should hope that the Foundation would also employ a competent wildlife consultant, and undoubtedly many owners would desire that management plans for their lands involve wildlife management wherever possible as well as forest management.

In short, I believe that there is a great possibility for the future of a well-organized forestry foundation in this and adjoining states, and compliment the Massachusetts Forest and Park Association for initiating the project.

Certainly Harris Reynolds must have smiled at these remarks from James J. (Jack) Storrow in a letter dated September 25, 1947:

As I probably told you before, when you first started the Foundation I thought it was a rather crazy and entirely impractical idea, and just barely worth a trial. Since then I have been perfectly amazed at its splendid success, and I think you have something that ought to be developed throughout the country, because this success shows that not only have you managed it well, but that it fills a great and widespread need.

Mr. Storrow, the scion of a distinguished Boston family, soon became a staunch friend of the foundation, serving as its vice president from 1951 to 1970. A lover of the sea and the forest, Jack Storrow devoted his life to the causes of conservation and to helping others less fortunate than himself.

And so it came about that Harris Reynolds, together with his colleagues in the MFPA, founded the New England Forestry Foundation, which, as its name implies, embraces all New England. Central to Reynolds' vision for his beloved foundation was his belief that its high calling would be to educate New England's private woodlot owners through applied forestry management and that, accordingly, it would enjoy to the full the status of a charitable enterprise. The NEFF indeed was created as a charitable, nonprofit corporation under Massachusetts law.

THE NEFF FORESTERS

The plan, devised and put into operation by the MFPA and the NEFF, called for the creation of forest management centers (described below), each under the direction of a trained consulting forester. J. Milton (Milt) Attridge, a graduate of the University of Maine, became the foundation's first truly successful full-time forester, joining the foundation in 1946 and serving as its chief forester from 1954 to 1967. In 1967 he became a member of the foundation's corporation. Attridge, who is now a vigorous man of 85, recalled his early years for Applegate:

Many young growing stands were liquidated that way [clearcutting immature trees] to give the owner hardly enough profit to make it worthwhile at all. There were no provisions for leaving growing stock or seed trees then. Over the years we've managed to change that a good deal.

Under Attridge's leadership, the NEFF built up a cadre of professional consulting foresters, at one time numbering 22, who demonstrated through their work for landowners the enlightened forestry practices that the NEFF's founders envisioned. Each NEFF forester was (and is) responsible for a geographically defined area called a "center," the size of the center being largely determined by the distance involved in adequately serving the needs of the landowner/clients under the particular forester's care. For example, a center was established to provide consulting forestry to landowners in New Hampshire's lakes region, another covers the Merrimack valley from southern New Hampshire into eastern Massachusetts, and so on. Today there are 11 centers and 1 subcenter, under the direction of 14 full-time consulting foresters, located in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts. The foundation also has a small but growing client base in Connecticut. Through these centers, nearly 1,500 landowners, accounting for approximately 350,000 acres, are served by these foresters.

"ISLANDS OF PEACE"

Since its incorporation in 1944, the NEFF has accepted gifts of over 100 properties, many of them designated by the donors as memorial forests — currently more than 18,000 acres of woodlands. In addition,

the foundation currently holds conservation easements on approximately 3,000 additional acres. M. Richard Applegate, in his twenty-fifth anniversary history of the NEFF (1944–69), waxed eloquent on the subject of the memorial forests. A forest is

. . . a memorial that keeps on growing, a delight to the eye, a haven for birds and small animals, a place of peace for the wandering lover of nature, an escape from exhaust fumes, blaring horns, neon signs, and rock-and-roll transistor radios. It is a memorial which . . . keeps on giving . . . which looks eternally young . . . and which our own young or their young might never see if these islands of peace are not put aside by thoughtful donors.¹⁴

It should be added that while rock-and-roll is seldom encountered in the foundation's forests, these same "islands of peace" resonate to the sounds of the ax, the saw, and the skidder, as virtually all of them have been and continue to be actively managed for timber production.

The foundation's first donation of a memorial forest in Massachusetts was received in 1952 as a bequest from Dennis E. Hartnett. Known as the Hartnett-Manhan Memorial Forest, this property, 148 acres along the Manhan River in western Massachusetts, is of "considerable historical interest, since it contains an abandoned lead mine which may have provided bullets for the Revolutionary War, and where Patriot Ethan Allen apparently was once occupied as a lead miner."¹⁵

Of the total number of forested properties owned today by the foundation, 41, comprising more than 5,400 acres, are situated in Massachusetts. John T. Hemenway, the foundation's secretary-treasurer following the death of Harris Reynolds in 1953 and currently the foundation's honorary director, deserves much of the credit for NEFF's success, largely through his tireless dedication to attracting donations of forests to the foundation. The management of all these properties has been, and continues to be, a major responsibility of the foresters who formerly were employed by and now are affiliated with the foundation.

THE HIKING CLUBS

As Robert McCullough notes in *The Landscape of Community*, New England's hiking community has played an important role in forest



Recreation and Nature Study Are Assets of the Forests

Figure 2. The concept of forests as sites for recreation, education, and nature appreciation (“islands of peace”) led to a reconstituted Massachusetts Forest and Park Association and to the system of memorial forests currently maintained by the New England Forestry Foundation. Vignette from Harris Reynolds’s 1925 monograph *Town Forests: Their Recreational and Economic Value and How to Establish and Maintain Them*.

protection by expanding the base of political support for responsible long-range forest policy and by forging close associations with forestry groups. Among the earliest hiking clubs in Massachusetts were the following:

Cyrus Tracy's Exploring Circle in Lynn	circa 1850
The Alpine Club in Williamstown	1863
The White Mountain Club of Portland, Maine	1873
The Appalachian Mountain Club	1876 ¹⁶

The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) survived and prospered, and currently boasts over 75,000 members throughout the Northeast. Throughout its 122 years, the AMC has been based in Boston; for much of that time it has occupied its present headquarters at 5 Joy Street on Beacon Hill where, in addition to offices and meeting rooms, there is an extensive library that contains a wealth of material relating to the mountains and forests of New England. The club also has established a splendid visitors' center at Pinkham Notch in Gorham, New Hampshire, which serves as the headquarters for the club's famed chain of huts in the White Mountains, and where numerous workshops and field trips on conservation, forestry, and ecology are conducted.

Over the years the AMC has acquired substantial wooded properties, including its 1,800-acre Cardigan Reservation in Alexandria, New Hampshire, but so far the club has not engaged in active forest management, preferring to focus its resources upon public forest protection, research, outdoor recreation, and education.

The AMC's leaders, however, often have played important roles in Massachusetts forestry. For many, participation in the AMC has been a catalyst for increased awareness of and appreciation for the private forestry movement in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England. Allen Chamberlain, cofounder of the MFPA, joined the AMC in 1897, became its president in 1906, and contributed numerous articles to *Appalachia*, the club's historic journal of mountaineering and care for the land. Thomas D. Cabot, an ardent white-water canoist and AMC president in the 1930s, served for many years as a member of the corporation of the NEFF and during his long lifetime acquired hundreds of acres of land that have been a model of exemplary forestry practices, portions of which have been donated by Mr. Cabot to the NEFF. In the early 1960s, John Hitchcock of Princeton, Massachusetts,

served as president of the AMC, subsequently as president of the MFPA, and as a director and generous contributor of land to the Massachusetts Audubon Society. C. Francis Belcher, the AMC's executive director from 1956 to 1975, in his *Logging Railroads of the White Mountains*, wrote a fascinating account of how, at the turn of the century, wood-burning locomotives were utilized to haul millions of board feet of timber from New Hampshire's forests to feed the mills downstream on the Pemigewasset and Merrimack rivers. This practice resulted in disastrous forest fires ignited by sparks from the engines' smokestacks, which helped precipitate the passage of the Weeks Act in 1917, establishing New Hampshire's White Mountain National Forest. I myself served on the AMC's board of directors (its "council") from 1962 to 1975 and as its president in 1973 and 1974; in 1997 I was elected to a seventh one-year term as president of the NEFF.

THE WOODTICKS — A "NOTORIOUS AGGREGATION"

Much has been written by and about Benton MacKaye. MacKaye, from Shirley Center, Massachusetts, was a man of strong intellect and personality. Long associated with the initial concepts of the Appalachian Trail and the Wilderness Society, MacKaye, "ever the theorist . . . fused forestry, conservation, wilderness advocacy, and planning into a life-long quest for habitable communities."¹⁷ MacKaye loved loosely organized assemblages, which he termed "notorious aggregations." One such notorious aggregation, the Woodticks, which traditionally convened on Mount Monadnock (from 1937 to the early 1950s), brought together among other notables MacKaye, Allen Chamberlain, Harris Reynolds, William Wharton, and one Elmer D. Fletcher (Flooche), whose work with the U.S. Forest Service had been instrumental in the establishment of the White Mountain National Forest. Massachusetts State Forester Harold O. Cook frequently joined the Woodticks, as did a number of New Hampshire foresters. In this manner MacKaye assembled many of New England's most prominent figures for the purpose of brainstorming and formulating forest policies. (One ponders what de Tocqueville would have thought of such an informal democratic association. No doubt he would have made an exemplary Woodtick.) It has been said of MacKaye that he was more a dreamer than a doer. Be that as it may, some of his dreams are with us today in very tangible form.

MACKAYE'S TWO CATEGORIES OF OPEN SPACE:
INDUSTRIAL AND CULTURAL

In describing the creation by Massachusetts Governor Alvan T. Fuller in 1928 of the Committee on Needs and Uses of Open Spaces, McCullough notes that Benton MacKaye, retained as a consultant to the committee, began his report on his work by “distinguishing two categories of open spaces: industrial and cultural. Forests grown for timber or for protecting watersheds embodied the former; lands utilized primarily for recreation, the latter.” State and town forests, MacKaye observed, exemplified both types. From there, he moved to the crux of his proposal: a system of cultural areas shaped as belts or open ways designed to mitigate the expansion of urban environments and offer escape from civilization.”¹⁸

It is interesting to note that MacKaye used the term “cultural” to refer to the human reshaping and stewardship of the landscape, as in “horticulture,” rather than in either of word’s two more common contexts: cultural differences (as in Polish versus Russian culture) or in reference to the fine arts (painting, sculpture, classical music). Prior to the advent of the 1960s, the term “cultural” as used by MacKaye could be said to define many of the initiatives undertaken by the MFPA and the singular men who led these efforts: namely, the establishment of national and state parks and forests; the beautification of parks and roadsides; the protection of choice landscapes; field ornithology; floodplain zoning; the regulation of inland and tidal waters; controlling pests and diseases; and, by no means of least importance, the acquisition and preservation of forestlands.

MacKaye’s use of the term “cultural” in this context has not gained general acceptance, but most of the activities, apart from those relating to forestry or forest management, in which Chamberlain, Reynolds, Wharton, and their colleagues engaged now are encompassed by the term “conservation.” William Wharton is reported to have said in 1970, “I’ve never found anything more interesting in my ninety years than my work in conservation.” In the winter 1995–96 issue of *The Woodland Steward*, Bob Ricard wrote of the era prior to the 1960s as “The First Generation: The Early Conservation Movement.”¹⁹

By contrast, forestry, or forest management, as practiced by the NEFF, appears often to have been viewed in the rather narrow context

of what MacKaye would have termed industrial timber production. For example, a report dated January 1956 for a prospective client of the foundation describes the goal of the NEFF as follows:

The sole purpose of the Foundation is to grow more and better timber in New England and to bring all of our forest lands into full production. There is no business opportunity in New England today that equals the possibilities in forest management. Every forest acre has the power to produce a certain amount of wood and the art of the forester is to capture that power in the form of commercial timber. For the first time, the forester has been given the authority to determine WHAT, WHEN AND HOW trees shall be harvested. Forest management is beginning to be accepted as an integral part of the forest economy.

It thus appears that, as the first half of the twentieth century drew to a close, forestry and conservation were proceeding along somewhat parallel but increasingly separate and divergent paths, a course that eventually would prove potentially perilous to the NEFF's ability to fully honor Harris Reynolds' high ideals for the foundation's overriding charitable purpose as educator of the private woodlot owner.

COMING OF AGE

The passing of Chamberlain, Reynolds, Wharton, MacKaye, and their contemporaries raised the question of whether the private forestry movement and the organizations that fueled its achievements would survive without their leadership. In the 1960s, changes were in the wind that would profoundly affect the fate of the MFPA and the NEFF and lead to the formation in 1970 of the Massachusetts Land League. The publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 aroused environmentally concerned citizens in Massachusetts, New England, and across America. The commitment of Houghton Mifflin to publishing *Silent Spring*, at a time when Carson's assault upon the use of pesticides had brought down upon her a firestorm of criticism from powerful forces in industry and government, can be credited to the steadfast support of the publisher's distinguished editor and renowned conservationist, Paul Brooks of Lincoln, Massachusetts. Outrage over the massive defoliation of Vietnam and Cambodia by United States

military incursions; the publication of Carson's book; the advent of Earth Day in 1970; the sprawl of urban and suburban development; concern that revaluation of land and rising tax burdens, driven in part by state-mandated 100 percent valuation, would lead to the liquidation of family land holdings; and the abandonment of family farms — all these factors contributed in the 1960s and '70s to "a second wave of strong citizen participation in environmental matters and spawned a variety of new forest conservation organizations in the region."²⁰ The environmental movement was in full sway; the venerable bulwarks of the private forestry movement in Massachusetts, the MFPA and the NEFF, could not but be affected by this new wave of environmental activism.

THE RESPONSE OF THE MFPA TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

The MFPA's Annual Report for 1962 noted that only a small part of the Association's budget was devoted to lobbying; nevertheless it characterized the MFPA as a "legislative watchdog" on matters relating to conservation. "By 1960 it was becoming obvious that the interests of the Association were gradually turning toward [acting as] a basic lever of conservation legislation for protection of the natural resources of the Commonwealth."²¹ The position of executive director of the MFPA, created in 1963, was initially filled by John Hemenway, who continued as the secretary-treasurer of the NEFF. But Hemenway found it difficult to do justice to both positions, and within a year he recommended Benjamin W. Nason for the MFPA job.

Nason, a former NEFF forester in New Hampshire, had just received his law degree from Suffolk University in Boston. Richard Applegate's history of the MFPA notes, "Armed with a lawyer as well as a man fully acquainted with forestry problems, the Association finally went all the way toward becoming the Legislative Arm of Conservation in Massachusetts."²² By the time Nason assumed the office of executive director, the MFPA had become essentially a lobbying organization, a conversion brought about, at least in part, because the MFPA was the only citizen conservation group that legally could devote a substantial portion of its resources to lobbying. Reflecting this change in its focus, the name of the MFPA was changed in 1981 to the Environmental Lobby



Figure 3. A gathering of the informal association called the “wood ticks” at Wapack Lodge on Mount Monadnock, New Hampshire, May 25 and 26, 1946, included many New England and Massachusetts forestry leaders. Left to right (front row): White Mountain National Forest activist Elmer (Floche) Fletcher, regional planner Benton MacKaye, New Hampshire state forester John Foster, MFA secretary Harris Reynolds, the University of New Hampshire’s Karl Woodward; (back row): Connecticut state forester Austin Hawes, New Hampshire extension forester Kenneth Barraclough, MFA executive committee member William Wharton, and forester Lawrence Rathbun of the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests. Courtesy of Dartmouth College Archives.

of Massachusetts and subsequently, in 1993, to the Environmental League of Massachusetts (ELM). In order to become a lobbying organization, ELM had abandoned its 501(c)(3) public charitable corporation status. The transition from the MFPA to ELM is captured in a recently recorded interview with Alexandra Dawson, now retired as professor and supervisor of the interns at Antioch College in Keene, New Hampshire, as follows:

My first experience with them was in the late sixties and then I started working for Conservation Law Foundation in the early

seventies so I saw more of them. They were part of the environmental group that all hung out at 3 Joy Street. There was a group feel. It was very evident that most of these groups didn't have the staff or the tax status to do lobbying and I think that's what finally drew them to ELM. The people who ran around it were very interested in legislative work and it was there in Boston.

Ms. Dawson's reference to her "group feel" experience at the Conservation Law Foundation is explained by the fact that, in 1975 and 1976, the Appalachian Mountain Club, headquartered at 5 Joy Street in Boston as noted above, completed the purchase of the adjoining properties at 3 and 4 Joy Street. The space thus acquired by the AMC was leased to the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) for its headquarters at 3 Joy Street and, next door, to the New England regional chapter of the Sierra Club, thereby creating a consolidated environmental command post. This project was brought to fruition through the leadership of then AMC president Ruby Horwood, the first (and until now only) woman to serve as president of that venerable organization and my immediate successor in that office. Being right in the midst of this command post, the CLF, at 3 Joy Street, became an ideal place to "hang out."

Under the direction of Nason and his successor, Michael Ventresca, the ELM was active in a broad spectrum of legislative efforts, including the following:

- Abolition of the Mount Greylock Tramway Authority and the Mount Greylock Reservation Commission and transfer of responsibility for the 8,800-acre Mount Greylock reservation to the Department of Natural Resources

- Funding for water pollution control

- Appropriations for land acquisition and recreational development

- Establishment of the Cape Cod National Seashore

- Enactment of the Massachusetts Wilderness Act

- Protection of inland wetlands

- Protection of the Appalachian Trail in Massachusetts

- Regulation of billboards

- Adoption of an Environmental Bill of Rights

- Enaction of a Farmland Assessment Act

- Enaction of a Massachusetts Clean Waters Act

- Provision for reviewing power-plant siting

It is evident from a tally of ELM's legislative efforts that, swept up in the many currents of the environmental movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the organization had become diverted from its historic focus on behalf of private forests and forestry. As a consequence, the organization's prominence in private forestry in Massachusetts was greatly diminished. Dr. Robert Bond, currently president of the MFA, writing in *The Woodland Steward*, quotes former longtime Massachusetts Chief Forester Harold O. Cook's opinion that "the Massachusetts Forestry Association, established at the turn of the century, became the Massachusetts Forest and Park Association (MFPA) in 1932. . . . The original MFA provided the leadership for forest conservation in the Commonwealth early in this century. When ELM was created, a void was left for advocacy exclusively for forest stewardship in the state."²³

THE ELM IN THE 1980S:

ATTEMPTS AT COALITION BUILDING

In the late 1970s, ELM was experiencing frequent changeovers in staffing, erosion of its membership, and difficulty in using its limited financial resources to best advantage. To remedy these difficulties ELM recruited Kelly McClintock as its director. McClintock, who had been managing the affairs of the Conservation Law Foundation, set about stabilizing ELM, increasing professional salaries and achieving greater staff continuity.

On picking up the reins of ELM, Kelly McClintock soon formed the opinion that, in the era of environmental activism that characterized the 1980s, the Massachusetts legislature was besieged by the lobbying efforts of too many organizations, each promoting its own single-issue agenda, with disappointing results as a consequence. McClintock observed that many such organizations, each known for having a broad, well-defined and well-focused agenda, were scatter-shooting a succession of narrowly-focused environmental lobbying efforts at the legislature with, at best, a confusing result. McClintock's response to the problem harkens back to the observations of de Tocqueville with respect to the power of voluntary association; he organized coalitions to present fewer and more broadly defined agendas for legislative approval. This approach, in McClintock's view, worked well as long as each participating coalition maintained its identity of purpose and

worked from a broad based agenda, a strategy that in time broke down as coalition members appeared to lose their former focus. In a recent interview, McClintock mused on the initial success of these efforts and the problems that later ensued:

Agenda building was a focus of ELM. The eighties were as active environmentally as an era could be. The problem was there were, perhaps, too many agendas. Legislatures don't have to pay attention to any of them as single issues and ELM wanted to boil down priorities and present a solid front to the legislature of Massachusetts. To do this, ELM and other members of the coalition had to devise elaborate ways of stepping on the fewest toes. For several years this agenda building worked, but for it to work all the organizations had to have broad agendas. Groups such as the Defenders of Wildlife had to address land protection, for example. The problems arose when organizations began to lose their initial focus and funding sources that were interested in specific issues were more hesitant to donate money. Subsequently organizations began to retrench and refocus on specifics and the coalition became smaller and smaller.

Although Kelly McClintock's work at the ELM during the 1980s appears to have done little to fill the void in forest advocacy referred to by Harold Cook and Professor Bond, his experience with both the successes and failures of coalition building raises questions about how funding and other supportive resources may be affected by the "partnering" approach to forestry-related activities currently coming into vogue and discussed later in this chapter.

THE INITIAL RESPONSE OF THE NEFF TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

As the old MFPA was converting itself into ELM, the lobbying arm of the Massachusetts environmental movement, it and the NEFF began to drift apart. The NEFF went on doing pretty much what it always had done: managing the woodlands of its clients and its own memorial forests in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England and adding to its inventory of memorial and other forest properties. The NEFF con-

tinued to pride itself on the accomplishments of its cadre of consulting foresters and principally identified itself with them.

Although the NEFF attracted a band of enthusiastic and devoted supporters, not all accounts of the foundation's doings are particularly flattering, partly owing to current perception of some of the techniques that were employed at that time in the practice of forestry. In light of today's concerns for the environment and for health in the workplace, the following rather graphic description by a parent of the activities of two boys employed in the 1970s by the foundation to do summer work, utilizing a substance that at the time was approved by the state, provides a startling contrast to the methods now being employed in the woods by the foundation's foresters.

When two of my offspring were in high school, they worked for a summer for [the foundation]. I have never forgiven myself for letting them do that. [Their supervisor] had them outdoors in minimal clothing spraying, what's called frilling the trees that you don't like. You chop around the bark and spray them with this stuff, it was clearly toxic material and I'm sure there were things all over the cans about wearing protective clothing but it was ninety degrees and they were out there practically naked. My son said it dried all over you and looked like blood, it was reddish. He was going around and here came this lady through the woods, she was horrified, and he spoke to her, saying "Lady, lady, it's all right," but she turned and raced off in the other direction.

So that was very bad, I don't know whether it's going to end up taking their lives at a relatively early age, but I have ever since then felt that the problem at that time was a profuse attitude of "Oh I use that all the time and I'm not sick." The idea that toxicity is measured by your keeling over on the spot was about the level of sophistication that was employed by the forestry community at that time and I think that remains quite unforgivable.

Throughout the 1960s, '70s and '80s, the NEFF was primarily known for its professional foresters and their hands-on work in the field. It maintained a low profile and as a 501(c)(3) public charity [nonprofit entity], attracted relatively little attention. In 1984, Hugh Putnam, a NEFF forester from Vermont, was given the title of executive director and succeeded John Hemenway as the foundation's chief of

staff. For the next decade, in the public eye, the NEFF, apart from its highly respected cadre of professional consulting foresters, was rarely identified with forestry-related environmental initiatives.

INTO THE VOID

It has been said that nature abhors a vacuum. The same is true of human institutions. With the ELM scattering its legislative shots across a broad spectrum of environmental causes, the NEFF lingering in relative obscurity as an environmental organization, and no other then-existing private forestry organization assuming a position of leadership in Massachusetts, others were moving aggressively in the arena of activities relating to forests and forestry in Massachusetts and beyond.

To our north, the venerable Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests (SPNHF), a powerful and respected presence with a reputation extending far beyond New Hampshire's borders, was aggressively pursuing forestland protection, public education, and the role of a private organization in affecting forestry and conservation policies at the state and local levels. In no small measure the SPNHF's success has been attributable to its historically close working relationship with state forestry and New Hampshire's political leaders, including, for many years, its governors. On Massachusetts' southern border, the Connecticut Forest and Park Association successfully retained its identity with forests and parks while serving as the principal lobbying arm for the Connecticut environmental community.

Here in Massachusetts, according to Keith Ross, longtime forester and conservationist and currently vice president and director of land protection for the NEFF, with the influence of the private organizations waning, the state forester assumed greater importance. Gilbert Bliss, the Massachusetts director of forests and parks in the Department of Environmental Management, with his colleagues Jack Lambert, Tom Quink and Ken Beaujean, among others, were achieving remarkable success in working with the Massachusetts legislature in the 1980s. Gil Bliss takes particular satisfaction in two legislative achievements: updating the Forest Classification Act (Chapter 61) and the Forest Cutting Practices Act, both in 1981. Bliss recalls, with respect to the latter, that the environmental movement was spawning a plethora of initiatives for wetland restrictions. Individual towns were adopting their own wet-

lands bylaws, potentially creating a crazy-quilt of inconsistent and conflicting wetlands regulations. This led to state legislation bringing wetlands protection under the jurisdiction of what is now the Department of Environmental Protection. Bliss and his colleagues, with the full cooperation of then House Chairman Dick Moore, were able to make the Cutting Practices Act dovetail effectively with the wetlands protection restrictions, preserving the ability to engage in timber harvesting in a manner compatible with the wetlands ordinances. Other legislative initiatives addressed the treatment of wood-using businesses as mature industries, provision for registration of foresters to avoid victimizing consumers of forestry services, and a variety of activities in urban forestry. Bliss recalls the decades of the 1960s and 1970s as periods of exceptional rapport with state legislators, including Senator Robert Wetmore, then chairman of the state Senate Committee on Labor and Industries. Bliss's prescription for success in the legislative arena was bringing factions together in "big forum discussions" and conducting MFPA-based studies as a basis for formulating public policies.

The Commonwealth's prominence in forestry and forest conservation was reinforced when Governor Francis Sargent, as part of a reorganization of state agencies under state cabinet members, in 1971 appointed Charles H. W. Foster of Needham as the Commonwealth's first secretary of environmental affairs. Holder of a Ph.D. in geography and environmental engineering from Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Foster had previously served as Massachusetts commissioner of natural resources, president of The Nature Conservancy in Washington, D.C., and president of the New England Natural Resources Center in Boston. Charles Foster later became dean of the Yale School of Forestry (now the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies), and currently is an adjunct professor at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government.

On the private forestry front, a new venture was coming to the forefront, helping to fill the void in regard to forests and forestry activities. In 1970, Bob Russell, a retired urban planner who owned a tree farm in Princeton, Massachusetts, and his wife, Betty, recognized the need for an educational organization to advocate the care and stewardship of land in Massachusetts and became the founder of the Massachusetts Land League. This organization's name was changed to the Massachusetts Forestry Association in 1970, so once again there was

an MFA in Massachusetts. Greg Cox, executive director of the MFA, wrote in “MFA: 25 Years and Still Growing” in *The Woodland Steward*:

With the help of Worcester County Regional Extension Specialist Fred Giebel, Russell put together a workshop for landowners on ways to productively manage their property. From that meeting came the Massachusetts Land League.

The Land League was organized to provide information and services to help landowners manage and keep their land as privately-owned open space. . . . Although the League promoted a variety of productive land uses, encouraging better woodland management was a primary goal from the outset. Bob’s ownership of woodlands made him aware of the possibilities that many landowners overlooked. With woodlands covering more than 60% of Massachusetts, if the League wanted to keep as much land undeveloped and productive as possible, it had to reach woodland owners.²⁴

In a recent interview conducted by Robert Bond, Russell offered the following reflections:

The Audubon societies and like-minded organizations prefer to sit on the land as is. My intent has been to promote growing trees as a crop. In this way you can produce a financially rewarding harvest and create an environment that gets people into the woods and fields. MFA, while focusing on trees, is a very broad kind of thing, looks at land as a total entity. The MFA was designed for an audience that needed a home.

Greg Cox, in *The Woodland Steward*, profiles the MFA from 1986 to 1995 as follows:

Although slow to be realized, the 1985 plan for MFA to expand its membership and its influence has been a success. From just 191 members in 1985, membership rose to more than 800 by 1990, and over 1,000 members now. During the same time, MFA has become an important part of forestry in Massachusetts, helping sponsor and revitalize the Tree Farm Program and the educational program, Project Learning Tree.

MFA has also been involved in all the major issues facing

woodland owners here during the last ten years: acid rain, Chapter 61, Quabbin deer management, the Generic Environmental Impact Report, global warming, endangered species, private property rights, revisions to the Forest Cutting Practices Act, forester licensing, ecosystem management, and so on. Because MFA represents a sizable group of private woodland owners, and their lands represent the bulk of the state's forest, MFA's concerns are increasingly important to policy discussions.

Just as the Land League first began with a workshop for landowners, every year MFA sponsors workshops on topics of interest. Recent workshops have covered everything from having a careful timber harvest to estate planning and protecting vernal pools. For those who want to see good woodland management in action, MFA holds Woods Walks around the state each year, showing off how different woodlands are cared for. With MFA's help, in 1995 the Tree Farm Program revived its annual Field Day, a very successful event it hopes to repeat each year around the state.

As MFA has grown, it has also expanded the land conservation role which Bob Russell envisioned for the Land League at the very beginning. MFA has helped landowners make arrangements which will allow them to protect their land from future development while continuing responsible forest management. This has resulted in nearly 1,000 acres being conserved as forests, including a 90-acre section of old growth forest in the Berkshires.²⁵

When asked to distinguish their perceptions of the distinction between the MFA and the NEFF, both Russell and Bond responded that the NEFF generally has been thought to be a New England regional, rather than a Massachusetts, organization focused primarily on forest management; in addition the NEFF, until recently, has not been perceived as engaged to any significant extent in the work of conservation, education, or public policy.

RECENT CHANGES IN THE NEFF

In 1992, the New England Forestry Foundation organized a group comprising people from both within and outside its ranks, dubbed the "By '98 Committee," for the purpose of reexamining every aspect of the

organization's mission, structure, and programs. The new mission statement contained in the By '98 Committee's final report reads:

MISSION STATEMENT

The New England Forestry Foundation's mission is to counter the deterioration of New England's unique forest resources due to fragmentation and the lack of management by promoting forest land stewardship, responsible forestry practices and multigenerational forest land planning.

This mission embraces:

- Demonstration of the multiple benefits — ecological, aesthetic, recreational and economic — of forestland stewardship
- Practicing and teaching new forestry concepts
- Provision of a balanced and credible perspective on public policy issues affecting forest land conservation
- Delivery of a full range of forestland stewardship services
- Preservation, through sustainable yield forestry, of a working landscape that supports New England's economic welfare and quality of life

The By '98 Committee's final report was presented to the NEFF Board of Directors in December 1992. In retracing the history of the foundation and determining the course of action for the NEFF's future, the directors considered the early history and origins of the foundation.

When Harris Reynolds launched the foundation as a charitable enterprise in 1944, the foundation's consulting foresters were seen as pioneers, teacher-educators who fulfilled the charitable mission of the foundation by enlightening and educating the landowner through their hands-on work. These foresters were more "cultural" than "industrial," by Benton MacKaye's criteria. Over time, the number of consulting foresters multiplied in Massachusetts and elsewhere in New England, and the profession of consulting forestry in general and the work of the NEFF foresters in particular were increasingly perceived as less unique, less charitable in nature, and more akin to a profession, practiced primarily for profit, with education subordinated to a primarily commercial purpose. Were Benton MacKaye with us today, one can surmise

that he would classify the NEFF as “industrial.” Although the NEFF foresters continued to promote the notion that they were “educating by doing what others only preach,” by the early 1990s the foundation was encountering, in Massachusetts and elsewhere, confusion on the part of donors, grant makers, and the public over the foundation’s 501(c)(3) charitable purpose, and a perception that the foundation was not “aboard” in the environmental movement that had been sweeping Massachusetts and New England. Also, the NEFF foresters were confronted with a dilemma: they were expected through their work as consulting foresters to generate the revenues necessary to keep the foundation going and at the same time to fulfill its stated educational purposes.

As a consequence of these deliberations, the foundation board, in 1993, approved and implemented a major reorganization of the enterprise. A for-profit business corporation was organized with the name “New England Forestry Consultants, Inc. (NEFCo); the foundation holds a portion of NEFCo’s outstanding capital stock but itself remains a 501(c)(3) charitable corporation. Following completion of this reorganization, the former foundation foresters have become employees of NEFCo and the proceeds derived from their services are income to NEFCo. After paying all its expenses and setting aside a prudent amount for reserves, NEFCo’s remaining net earnings are available for bonuses and other compensation adjustments for the foresters; none of these monies are distributed to the foundation. For its part, the foundation, which derives its income from dues, donations, grants, proceeds from timber harvests on its own properties, and the earnings from a modest endowment, makes grants to the NEFCo centers to support the work of the foresters in the area of education and forest policy. The foundation has undertaken to clarify and redefine its work, focusing its resources on land protection, education, and regional public policy in Massachusetts and across New England, and thereby has begun to move into the mainstream of the environmental movement, sharing in principle many of the announced objectives of the MFA described above.

GROWTH OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVISM

While the MFA under Bob and Betty Russell’s stewardship had been staking out its claim as an advocate for the land in general and the forest

in particular, and the NEFF had continued in its traditional ways, the environmental movement in Massachusetts and across New England was bringing a multitude of new faces to front and center. Two of the country's most powerful and well-funded activist organizations, the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society, had established beachheads here and, in the 1960s and 1970s, were staking out positions of prominence in the environmental movement. At the same time the Massachusetts Audubon Society had expanded its efforts into a broad spectrum of environmental initiatives and was experiencing dramatic growth in membership and endowment. The highly respected Trustees of Reservations was aggressively adding to its impressive treasure trove of magnificent properties throughout Massachusetts. New fledgling organizations began to spring up in Massachusetts and elsewhere, among them the avowedly radical RESTORE: The North Woods based in Concord, Massachusetts. As the NEFF, following its reorganization, has undertaken to raise its profile and “come to the table” with the host of stakeholders in the environmental community, this venerable and now re-energizing organization necessarily has encountered some harsh and divisive voices. Powerful advocates for wilderness preservation both nationally and regionally are locked in verbal — and in some places physical — combat with loggers, the timber products and paper industries, property rights advocates, government officials, and a host of other interest groups. The traditional civility that historically has characterized dialogue among disputants here in New England is beginning to yield to a strident rhetoric among polarized factions.

The MFA and the NEFF — organizations committed to both the preservation of the New England forests and the active management of these forests for timber production and other uses — have sought to stake out a middle ground. Many of the NEFF (now NEFCo) foresters, rightfully proud of their traditional standards of caring for all aspects of the woods wherein they work, are concerned that the forces of protectionism, driven by activist organizations that are thought to be the standard-bearers for locking up the forests as wilderness, will inevitably undermine their profession and their way of life. New terms such as “ecosystem-based management” and “ecoregionalism” are being advanced as necessary corollaries to the traditional forestry profession. There is concern on the part of many of these traditional allies from the forestry profession, the mills, and the timber products industries that

the MFA and the NEFF will yield the middle ground to the entreaties of what are perceived as the environmental extremists. From the other direction, as centrist organizations, we are buffeted by criticisms that we are vulnerable to being co-opted by the sinister forces of the industry and property rights people.

These concerns recently came to the front and center when the NEFF, in October, 1995, applied for and was admitted to membership in the Northern Forest Alliance, a coalition of more than thirty environmental organizations concerned with the future of the 26,000,000 acres of forest, extending across New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, known as the "northern forest," or the "great north woods." Currently, two officers of the NEFF, myself being one, serve on the Steering Committee (the policy making arm) of the Alliance. Demands that the NEFF withdraw from the Alliance have come from representatives of the timber products industry, the logging industry, and the timberland owners associations of two states; from the NEFCo foresters; and from some mill owners, among others, all asserting that the NEFF has allied itself with those who seek to lock up the northern forest as wilderness and therefore has abandoned its historic commitment to active forest management. Notwithstanding these criticisms, the NEFF has continued its membership in the Alliance, arguing that a centrist organization having expertise in sustainable forest management is essential to the deliberations of the Alliance in formulating its agenda for the future of this extraordinary forest resource.

What will be the future challenges for the private forestry movement and the enterprises that support it? What opportunities will there be for those organizations that seek to provide forums for rational debate and enlightened discussion of issues? Charles Thompson (recently appointed the NEFF's Managing Director), in "The Next 50 Years — Anything's Possible" (*The Woodland Steward*), speaks to these issues and raises some provocative questions about the future:

What about the period from 1970 to 1995? In the course of his article on the growth of MFA, Greg Cox mentions a number of important forest issues, including taxation, regulation of cutting practices, and global environmental problems. But perhaps the most significant forestry occurrence since 1970 has been the perceived separation of forestry from "environmentalism." Although

forest conservationists were the pioneer environmental activists in the U.S., traditional, centrist groups such as MFA came to be viewed with increasing suspicion by an environmental movement that favored forest preservation over forest conservation. The good news is that recently the quality of dialogue within our region — among those with varying priorities — has begun to improve. At the national level, polarization seems to be at least as severe as it has ever been.

Who in 1945 would have predicted these events and trends? Not many. What's in store for the next 50 years? If you have confidence in your predictions, you're delusional or a genius. I can do no more than ask a few questions: will the climate change, the oceans rise and the forests change in response? How will the tug of war over property rights and public rights sort itself out? Will the chestnut be successfully restored? What dread pathogens will whisk away which species? How will the need to protect water quality play out in the woods? Will forest taxes be so high that only the very wealthy are able to own land? Will 10 acres be a big woodlot? Will the metric system really take hold, so that a 10 acre woodlot is really a 4.5 hectare woodlot? Will there be space colonies? Will paper be made from trees? Will lumber be a curious oddity? Will other renewable resources, especially fisheries, rebound? Will we be able to afford the luxury of individual transportation? If so, with what fuel? And so on.

What do YOU think? Send us your predictions and we'll bury a time capsule.²⁶

Let us place a copy of this book in Charlie Thompson's time capsule. When the time capsule is opened 50 years from now, all the answers will be known.

SOME LINGERING QUESTIONS ABOUT LEADERSHIP AND PARTNERSHIP

In the course of writing this narrative of the private forestry movement in Massachusetts, some tantalizing questions have arisen, the possible answers to which provide fertile ground for study and speculation.

The story of the private forestry movement in Massachusetts reveals that an impressive, even overwhelming, array of initiatives burst upon the scene at the turn of the century and, in myriad ways, have continued to the present time. A small number of enormously energetic, talented, dedicated men, with acute powers of observation and the ability to change the course of events, emerged and led the way.

When asked why all this had not occurred earlier in the nation's history, one of the authors of this book suggested that earlier people simply had to work so hard to make ends meet that there was no luxury of time for such endeavors. This theory presupposes the emergence at the end of the nineteenth century of a "leisure class" of well-educated, thoughtful individuals for whom the requisite devotion of time and energy had become possible. If this theory is valid, it might be supposed that a similar burgeoning of creativity was taking place in the arts and sciences, recreation, and other activities. This offers a topic for further investigation and discussion.

Men such as Chamberlain, Reynolds, Wharton, and MacKaye often are referred to as "giants" in the private forestry movement in Massachusetts. In the early days, they seem to have been coming or going through every door that we pass through. Some today lament that we no longer find such "giants" in our midst. During authors' workshops for this book, this concern provoked the following observations.

These individuals were not "giants" at all. Referring to them as such is a distortion, creating "bigger-than-life" images of a relatively small number of ordinary individuals who happened to be on the scene when events called upon them to become actively involved.

The work of the environmental movement and the role of private forests and forestry in relation to it have become usurped by large, complex, well-financed organizations characterized more by bureaucratic layers of management than by individual genius. The identity of the individual becomes subordinated to that of the enterprise that he or she serves, and the modern form of leadership is exercised collectively rather than individually.

If collective leadership is the order of the day in the world of forests and forestry, is there a place for ordinary mortals from


diverse places and backgrounds? The affirmative evidence is heartening. In a world previously dominated by men (whether of the “giant” variety or otherwise), the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests has chosen Jane Difley, formerly executive director of the Vermont Natural Resources Council and past president of the Society of American Foresters, to succeed Paul Bofinger as president/forester. The Appalachian Mountain Club recently has elected the second woman president in its 120-year history. Youth groups from the inner city are learning the rudiments of forestry through Boston’s innovative Eagle Eye Institute. Men and women from business and the professions, many of whom have spent their working lives in urban surroundings, volunteer countless hours and give generously of their resources in support of the NEFF, the SPNHF, the MFA, and a host of other organizations that work or are concerned with forests and forestry. One can envision that when Charlie Thompson’s time capsule is opened, the private forestry movement will have wholeheartedly embraced the strengths that can come from such diversity.

Historically, it has not been unusual for those working as staff or volunteers with each environmental or natural resource organization to boast of its unique qualities and capabilities while failing to give adequate recognition to the merits of some of its peer enterprises. But this is changing. Recent experience appears to demonstrate that, to an increasing degree, the preservation of significant amounts of privately owned wooded acreages and application of the methodology of ecosystem-based management both require the combined efforts and resources of multiple organizations and interested individuals as well.

Recently, a major forestland protection project, covering over 250 acres, was successfully completed in New Boston, New Hampshire. In this project, the SPNHF, the NEFF, New Hampshire Audubon, the local watershed association and several adjoining property owners collaborated to achieve the desired result. The days seem to be passing when the better “pitch master” makes the deal. It is becoming more difficult, if not impossible, for a single organization to go it alone. The people who staff the private forestry organizations such as the SPNHF, MFA, and NEFF bring different backgrounds, training, talents, and skills to

their work, all of which contribute to a successful result. It also has been suggested that this willingness to work together can be attributed to increasing numbers of women in positions of responsibility in the environmental community. Bearing in mind Kelly McClintock's experience with the erosion of financial support for organizations joined in coalitions, the question arises of whether "partnering" poses such a risk for the future of these enterprises as they outgrow a measure of historic parochialism and acknowledge the values each brings to the table.

Perhaps these observations, and others found in this chapter, can help illuminate the way for future thoughtful dialogue and direction in the ever-evolving drama of the private forestry movement.

 NOTES

1. Bob Ricard, "Paving the Way, Sustaining the Future: New England's Forest Conservation Organizations," *The Woodland Steward* 25, no. 6 (Winter 1995-96): 4.
2. Robert McCullough, *The Landscape of Community Hanover*, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1995), p. 118.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
4. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, edited by J. P. Mayer and Max Lerner and translated by George Lawrence (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 178.
5. William B. Greeley, *Forests and Men* (New York: Doubleday, 1951), p. 57.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
7. M. Richard Applegate, *Massachusetts Forest and Park Association: A History 1898-1973* (Massachusetts Forest and Park Association, 1974), p. 3.
8. Applegate, *Massachusetts Forest and Park Association: A History*, p. 3.
9. McCullough, *Landscape of Community*, p. 119.
10. Applegate, *Massachusetts Forest and Park Association: A History*, p. 3.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
12. A detailed account of Reynolds's contributions to the town forest movement is found in McCullough, *Landscape of Community* (see note 2).
13. M. Richard Applegate, *New England Forestry Foundation: A History* (New England Forestry Foundation, Inc., 1969, 1975, 1982), p. 12.
14. M. Richard Applegate, *New England Forestry Foundation 1944-1969 25th Anniversary* (New England Forestry Foundation, 19TK), p. 19.
15. Applegate, *New England Forestry Foundation: A History*, pp. 23, 24.
16. McCullough, *Landscape of Community*, p. 238.

17. Ibid., p. 277.
18. Ibid., p. 289.
19. Ricard, "Paving the Way," p. 4.
20. Ibid., p. 5.
21. M. Richard Applegate, *Massachusetts Forest and Park Association: A History*, p. 50.
22. Ibid., p. 53.
23. Robert Bond (MFA president), quoting former Chief Forester Harold O. Cook in "President's Notes," *The Woodland Steward* 25, no. 6 (Winter 1995-96): 3.
24. Greg Cox (MFA executive director), "MFA: 25 Years and Still Growing," *The Woodland Steward* 25, no. 6 (Winter 1995-96): 18, 19.
25. Ibid., 20, 23.
26. Charles Thompson, "The Next 50 Years: Anything is Possible," *The Woodland Steward* 25, no. 6 (Winter 1995-96): 21.

