

of nuclear weapons and there are plenty of hay barns and other hiding places in both countries.

The second assumption is that there are, nevertheless, at least two areas where the hard self-interest of the United States and the Soviet Union coincide, and where practical measures can be taken to serve those interests. The first area concerns the "fourth country problem," a phrase coined by the British.

It is by no means fanciful to envisage a future in which a tin-pot dictator could threaten both East and West. For there are no longer any real atomic secrets, and it is fatally easy to turn out nuclear weapons, once the necessary installations are built. Surely, it is argued, it is as much to the interest of the Soviet Union as of the United States or Britain that no future Mussolini or Peron should achieve the means to threaten the great powers with total ruin.

Preventing the emergence of a "fourth country" is obviously politically difficult, since it involves national sovereignties. But it is at least technically feasible. Even a very limited global inspection system would detect the building of new nuclear installations some sort of freeze on nuclear production, at a given cut-off date, with inspection under United Nations auspices, is one approach being considered.

Another area of mutual interest is some form of mutual insurance against surprise attack. In this area, the Soviets have already shown some willingness to negotiate seriously—their proposal for limited ground inspection is considered more than a propaganda gesture.

Various ways of making one last try on disarmament have been discussed by the Stassen group—a secret approach through regular diplomatic channels, the dispatch of a Presidential emissary to Moscow, or a major new initiative by the President himself, like his "atoms for peace" proposal.

In view of Gromyko's speech, and Nikita Krushchev's scornful remarks about Western disarmament plans, the last try seems very likely to come to nothing. But the President, being the kind of man he is, will probably decide to make it all the same. And in view of the bleak alternatives, no doubt it is worth making.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, in connection with the great interest being shown in Senate bill 4013, a bill which I introduced on June 7, 1956, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, I should like to call special attention to a study made by Dr. James P. Gilligan entitled "The Development of Policy and Administration of Forest Service Primitive and Wilderness Areas in the United States." The publication of this doctoral thesis was noted in the Spring-Summer, 1955, issue of *The Living Wilderness*, in a news item entitled "Wilderness in a Democracy."

I ask unanimous consent that this news item be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS IN A DEMOCRACY

"Disagreement among wilderness proponents is a highly important deterrent to wilderness preservation in this country," warns Dr. James P. Gilligan, assistant professor of forestry at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College. "If there were well-defined purposes and plans for a national

wilderness system which could generate common support, the wilderness movement," he says, "might well be irrepressible."

In a paper entitled "The Contradiction of Wilderness Preservation in a Democracy," presented October 26, 1954, at the convention of the Society of American Foresters in Milwaukee, Wis., and later printed in the proceedings of the convention, Dr. Gilligan included these comments and reported that—
"There is every indication that wilderness areas of the future will consist of a series of small land units devoid of economic potentials."

Considering "the shifting tides of emotion and economic changes so characteristic of our dynamic democracy," he concluded that apparently we have "too much total acreage now called wilderness for probable future use, but not enough large areas which promise to preserve wilderness conditions for any length of time."

Thus, he pointed out, "the democracy of providing access to every parcel of our public lands may triumph, but," he asked, "will future generations appreciate this particular brand of wisdom?"

A former ranger-naturalist for the National Park Service and a former assistant refuge manager for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Dr. Gilligan took his Ph. D. degree, as well as his earlier B. S. F. and M. F. degrees, at the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources. In preparation for his doctoral thesis, submitted in 1953, entitled, "The Development of Policy and Administration of Forest Service Primitive and Wilderness Areas in the United States," he collected extensive information regarding wilderness preservation, "by personal interview, questionnaires, and correspondence with wilderness administrators and users; by examination of various Federal files; and by investigation of many areas."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, in the same issue of *The Living Wilderness*, Spring-Summer 1955, an editorial entitled "Wilderness and Democracy" comments on the significance of the study by Dr. James P. Gilligan, and also on the paper, derived from the study, which Dr. Gilligan had presented to the annual convention of the Society of American Foresters. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS AND DEMOCRACY

After an intensive doctoral study at the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources, a study that included careful field observations in the wilderness areas of the West, James P. Gilligan has summarized his observations and reflections in a significant paper presented at the 1954 annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters and published in the convention's proceedings. With the thought-provoking title, "The Contradiction of Wilderness Preservation in a Democracy," this paper not only reports what Dr. Gilligan has learned in the course of his field investigations regarding the practical obstacles in the way of wilderness preservation. It also analyzes our programs for wilderness preservation on public lands and subjects to matter-of-fact scrutiny the policy pronouncements that include the endorsement of wilderness preservation as a tenet of our national conservation righteousness. It boldly challenges these pronouncements with a recitation of practices, and it suggests some soul-searching questions regarding the very validity of our endeavor to preserve wilderness in the public interest. This paper appears in

full elsewhere in this issue of *The Living Wilderness*, and it well deserves the careful attention of our readers.

Dr. Gilligan's analysis of our practical problems in fitting wilderness preservation into our national forest and national park administration programs should make it possible to face these problems more intelligently and thus more effectively. His criticisms should inspire us who uphold wilderness preservation to think out our plans and purposes more clearly and to seek more earnestly the certainty and unity among wilderness proponents which he sees as a requisite for the congressional action that is "necessary to retain wilderness areas for future generations." His discussion of an apparent contradiction between democracy and wilderness preservation should help us to clarify their actual consistency and identify as paradox whatever he has mistaken for contradiction.

For most assuredly, despite its inherent difficulties, wilderness preservation is a thoroughly sound objective for a democracy. It is, indeed, the difficulty that gives it meaning. Just as the threatened encroachments of roads and mechanized vehicles are what give meaning to the setting up of special primitive areas from which mechanical travel is excluded, so also do the increasing pressures of a democratic population give meaning to the preservation of areas of wilderness. It is the common interest that all men and women share in the perpetuation of the opportunity for wilderness experience that makes it possible, through public ownership and administration in the public interest, to preserve wilderness, to set aside specially dedicated areas and protect them in the public interest, modifying as need be our multiple-purpose programs for this special purpose.

Nearly a century ago, Henry Thoreau, at the very beginning of our wilderness preservation movement, related its purposes to those of democratic government. "Why," he asked, "why should not we, who have renounced the king's authority, have our national preserves, in which the bear and panther, and some even of the hunter race, may still exist, and not be 'civilized off the face of the earth'—our forests, not to hold the king's game merely, but to hold and preserve the king himself also, the lord of creation—not for idle sport or food, but for inspiration and our own true recreation? or shall we, like the villains, grub them all up, poaching on our own national domains?"

Democracy? Yes. Wilderness? Yes. Paradox? Perhaps. But surely not contradiction.

We can make of Dr. Gilligan's prophecy an aid in averting the doom it foresees. We should take special care to correct any implication of inconsistency between wilderness preservation and the democracy through which it must be realized.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the shorter paper by Dr. James P. Gilligan, as referred to in the news item and the editorial, is one of great practical interest to all who are concerned with the preservation of the wilderness resources that are within our Federal ownership or control.

Dr. Gilligan's comments are especially searching on the hazards that now exist to the preservation of large areas of wilderness in our national forests and national parks. What he has to say, based on extensive field investigations, points up emphatically the need for the enactment of S. 4013, the proposed National Wilderness Preservation Act.

His paper was published in full in the Spring-Summer, 1955, issue of *The Living*

Wilderness, under the title "Wilderness in a Democracy." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS IN A DEMOCRACY
(By James P. Gilligan)

The preservation of a system of large, unique wilderness regions in this country does not seem to fit into the shifting tides of emotion and economic change so characteristic of our dynamic democracy. This is most evident in the operations of the two Federal agencies that claim to be retaining wilderness areas. There are several basic factors concerning our national parks and forests which promise eventually to obliterate the remaining extensive wilderness regions of the country. Certainly the laws and administrative regulations governing the National Park Service and the Forest Service, which are necessary to prevent encroachment on wilderness conditions, give every sign of being inadequate. Just as important are two principles guiding the administration of our public lands. First, is the idea that Federal agencies must encourage economic activity everywhere, and second, that recreational use of public lands should not be restricted to a limited number. Even though the consideration of minority wishes has long been an admirable trait of our governing groups, it is obvious in land use decisions that there is a steady trend favoring mass use over high quality benefits to fewer individuals. This fact, when combined with the irresistible emphasis on dollar rather than social values of our free enterprise economy, points out the tremendous barrier that wilderness preservation confronts. Perhaps it is not reasonable for Federal agencies to move against the tide and retain extensive areas in undeveloped condition.

The multiple use method of land management provides a good illustration of the difficulties inherent in preserving wilderness areas for any length of time in the United States. Since the Forest Service has long been the apostle of multiple use and has had from its inception a deep concern for minorities, it might be well to examine the successes of wilderness preservation within the national forest system. The decentralized administration and multiple use management of the national forests are generally considered a fine example of democratic agreement between individuals and Government. In many instances what is good for the local economy also results in direct and indirect national benefit. However, sometimes this method of land management may directly contradict certain kinds of national welfare potential from public lands, such as the preservation of a system of large wilderness areas. This conclusion is substantiated by a number of facts relating to existing land units which have been promiscuously labeled as wildernesses within the national forests.

Those interested in national forest wilderness preservation are easily lulled into complacency by the soothing and oft-quoted figures of 13 million acres of land reserved in 77 wilderness, wild, and primitive areas throughout the West.

If we examine more closely the conditions in only 28 of the areas over 100,000 acres in size (comprising about 11 million acres), and also consider their probable future, we may be rudely awakened. In these larger areas, where the best possibilities for wilderness preservation exist, conditions are not too dissimilar from millions of acres of other national forest lands where multiple use is practiced.

For example, there are nearly 200 miles of road open to public travel in nine of the

so-called wilderness or primitive areas. There are about 145,000 acres of privately owned timber, agriculture, summer home, resort, and mineral lands inside 15 of the areas, in addition to 400 to 500 mining claims of unknown acreage within 20 areas. Many of these sites contain resort or summer home developments along the best wilderness travel routes—a matter of critical importance. About 60 of the mining claims and patents are being worked for minerals, but only a few are important commercial producers. Also, some units are being explored for possible oil leasing. There are 24 air landing strips in 6 areas, 17 of which are under Forest Service jurisdiction. About half of the Forest Service fields and most of the private fields are open to public use. There is talk now of improving several wilderness landing strips for use by larger twin-engine aircraft. A number of prepared helicopter landing zones are planned within 3 areas, and the use of helicopters in wilderness regions for surveying, snow measurement, and fire fighting is increasing. In some areas aircraft are regularly used in fish and game management work and to drop supplies to camping groups. There are roughly a total of 140,000 sheep and 25,000 cattle grazing seasonally within all but 2 of the larger units classified as wilderness or primitive areas. Grazing, without question, has drastically altered natural conditions in many areas.

Another wilderness anomaly is the profusion of fencing, cabins, and corrals prominently located in many areas and considered necessary for stock management and fire protection. Timbered zones within wilderness areas that now can be logged are being removed from wilderness classification as rapidly as feasible. Over 2 million wilderness acres are now considered to be commercial timberland. This acreage contains approximately 17 billion board feet of timber, which is nearly 2 percent of total private and public western sawtimber. Nearly 90 dams and water control structures have been built for irrigation, meadow reclamation, and stream-flow maintenance within these areas. They are mostly small constructions but nevertheless, represent infringements on wilderness conditions. In the last 5 years the Bureau of Reclamation has proposed large dams affecting 16 wilderness reserves. Under present laws it would be difficult to prevent these structures were they to be vigorously promoted.

This then, is the situation on only one-third of the area in the national forest wilderness system. The remaining areas are smaller units which, despite their limited size, have a similar record of wilderness invasions.

Obviously, multiple use is a common practice within wilderness regions, as well as on other national forest lands. The Forest Service, in its attempts to placate everyone interested in national forest lands, including minority groups, finds itself in the awkward and contradictory position of setting aside wilderness units and at the same time advocating multiple use as a basic policy. This program has worked admirably so long as vast regions existed for which there was no special interest or into which temporarily, it was too expensive to build roads. As our natural resources have shrunk in volume and more people are invading the last frontiers, it becomes increasingly difficult to satisfy minority demands for wilderness areas.

The complexity of establishing large wilderness areas where roads, timber utilization, public landing fields, and other contrivances of civilization are prohibited, is demonstrated by the fact that only 7 of the 28 large wildernesses have been formally classified under the restrictive U-1 Forest Service regulations in the past 14 years. The boundaries of these seven were so modified as to exclude most existing developments or

potential logging sites, and the boundaries for some areas so configured to follow road penetrations, that the integrity of these wilderness units has been severely damaged.

Many of the developments and uses now prevailing in national forest wilderness areas have resulted from activities existing before the establishment of the wilderness area system and from circumstances beyond direct control of the Forest Service. The effectiveness of the present wilderness policy and its supporting laws and regulations is, therefore, of great importance in evaluating the national forest wilderness area system. Reviewing the real strength of the policy offers even more disappointment than the list of physical structures and uses inconsistent with wilderness preservation within many national forests. Primarily, of course, we should remember that Congressional recognition of national forest purposes has emphasized watershed and timber values. It is well recognized that the Forest Service has been powerless to prevent establishment of mining claims and road construction thereto within wilderness regions. The construction of resorts and summer homes on many of these mining claims is particularly detrimental to wilderness preservation. Permission for the Bureau of Reclamation to build dams and roads into wilderness areas may be granted by the Secretary of the Interior, even without consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture or the Forest Service. The Forest Service usually gives careful consideration to requests for power transmission lines, TV relay towers, and tunnels and canals for power or irrigation purposes within designated wilderness units. The widely accepted regulatory power of the states over game populations within national forests further depletes the jurisdiction of the Forest Service over components of its wilderness areas. Pressure to open more wilderness regions to auto or plane travel in order to control game populations will increase. This furnishes as great a threat to wilderness preservation as dam building, timber utilization, or mining claims do now within certain wilderness units.

Perhaps concern over these areas would not be so great if the present policy and regulations established by the Forest Service to assure wilderness preservation were more effective. Certainly the policy is undermined by lack of complete authority, but inconsistent application of regulatory measures on a national scale provides further proof of the improbability of preserving a system of large wilderness areas within the national forests.

For example, the public is allowed to use Federal landing fields in Idaho, but in Montana this is prohibited. Motorboats are operated on lakes well within wilderness boundaries in some areas; in others it is clearly understood that this is not a permissible wilderness use. In some areas commercial tent camps occupying choice wilderness sites may be located throughout the summer season on public lands; in others this is prohibited. The use of jeeps, trucks, and aircraft for fish and game management is prohibited in some areas and allowed in others. Jeeps and trucks are still violating wilderness boundaries, sometimes because boundaries are not sufficiently well marked, but more often because this action receives little more than a reprimand. The legality of regulations prohibiting motorized entry into wilderness areas has never been tested, and the prosecution of such violations requires more effort than is considered worthwhile. For some wildernesses long-range plans have been made to remove cabin and resort developments. In others, these constructions seem to be hopelessly entrenched. In one area in New Mexico a new cabin has been erected at a favorite crossroads in the heart of the wilderness to facilitate administration. The acquisition of private lands within wilder-

ness areas, which is of critical importance, has proceeded at snail's pace. Even in the 1930's when land values were relatively low and money available, there was little exertion to consolidate wilderness units. Actually during this period 83,500 acres of non-Federal land were added to the wilderness system by boundary changes or in the establishment of new areas, while only 2,278 acres were eliminated.

These various deviations within the broad policy of preserving a system of wilderness areas seem to be the result of adjustments to regional or local requirements, in conformance with multiple use management.

Several other factors weigh heavily against holding a system of really unique national forest wilderness areas.

First, there is a national trend of wilderness boundary modification which, since 1940, has eliminated more than half a million acres of land from 33 different units. Most of these deletions have been for commonplace reasons such as removing zones for timber harvest, motorized recreation development, inter-city road construction, or areas where mining or tourist facilities have already been established on private lands. These deletions have largely been offset by the addition of high, rocky zones to each area where there is little possibility of development demands or timber harvest. It places a peculiar emphasis on maintaining a large national acreage figure for the wilderness system, while at the same time gradually removing areas needed in multiple use management. This policy does not appear to make a very serious effort to define or retain the purposes and values of the wilderness system.

The real significance of large, undeveloped regions in the system of national forest wilderness areas has been distorted by the designation of a jumble of small areas ranging in size from 5,000 to 98,000 acres. These areas average about 46,000 acres, which would cover an area only 6 by 12 miles—hardly adequate for an authentic wilderness experience. Although officially called "wild areas," they are commonly referred to as wilderness, and, therefore, only serve to confuse rather than clarify understanding of the purpose of wilderness reservations.

Actually, there is no comparison between an undeveloped area of only 46,000 acres and one which is several hundred thousand acres or larger. The argumentation over preserving many small areas throughout the country sidetracks the more important issue of holding a limited number of large regions whose wilderness features are disappearing. Even the most scenic and pleasant small areas do not have sufficient size to prevent them from being overrun with people, a factor which destroys wilderness appeal as readily as do roads and landing fields.

Another obstruction to national forest wilderness preservation is the distinct lack of enthusiasm among many Forest Service employees for fitting wilderness preservation into basic multiple use philosophy. Against local pressures for economic or recreation development, it is claimed, the efforts for preservation cannot be justified by the relatively few who use wilderness regions. Lack of vigorous support for this national policy by agency personnel can only operate against its purposes in the long run. The multiple use concept, as it is presently interpreted and administered, will never preserve a series of large wilderness regions. Multiple use policy requires flexibility to meet the changing needs of local communities and regions and to give priority to economic rather than cultural values.

Since the National Park System is claimed by critics to contain more wilderness than is needed for the country, we should examine the land preservation policy of the National Park Service. It is true that national parks in the West alone contain more acreage than the 13 million acres of national forest wilder-

ness, wild, and primitive areas. It is also true that park developments are now limited to a small percentage of the total acreage. Wilderness conditions, of course, have vanished from developed areas; and the sight, sound, and sometimes smell of these concentration zones disperse so widely that quite large sections cannot be considered natural, let alone wilderness. National parks, too, must often justify their existence to the locality or state in which they are situated principally on economic grounds. As long as the drums throb for more tourist dollars, park administrators will find it hard to accommodate the increasing army of sightseers without extending development. It is highly improbable that a seemingly logical course of restricting visitation to any national park will be put into effect until every possible means of providing accommodations is exhausted. It is a fair question to ask how much of the parks will be developed by then.

Because of Congressional measures which ordinarily prevent utilization of wood, water, mineral, or forage resources in areas of the National Park System, the National Park Service is the most logical existing agency to preserve extensive wilderness regions. However, it is subject to the unrelenting pressures of mass use, and retreats gradually behind the cold logic that more areas must be developed to care properly for the public to which the land belongs. It is merely another application of the philosophy that as many people as possible should use these areas, even though finally there is little left of the original landscape.

Americans will continue to saturate choice recreation sites opened to motorized entry, and then complain because everyone else is also present.

The real democratic significance of these areas may not be in providing access and accommodations to everyone, but in holding a few undeveloped areas where high quality recreation benefits can still be obtained by those willing to make the effort. Most endeavors to retain such areas for a relatively small number gradually yield before the demands of an eager traveling public, which has not yet grasped the full significance of our National Park System.

The organic National Park Service Act of 1916 offers nearly as much flexibility in managing recreation resources as does the multiple use principle of the Forest Service. There is nothing in the Act directing how much of, or what part of, parks to develop, nor is there any clause in the law or interpretive regulations stipulating the reservation of park units in wilderness condition.

The National Park Service has established some precedence in trying to retain wilderness zones. It is questionable, however, whether the will of the administrator can be sufficiently strong to prevent development in the long run.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is another agency which has expressed interest in wilderness preservation by establishing 14 roadless and wild areas within Indian Reservations. These areas, containing nearly 4 million acres, may be discounted as regions where wilderness conditions are being retained for the future. The reservations are Indian property held in trust by the Federal Government. Any reasonable alteration of land use is made where it is of benefit to the Indians. About 800,000 acres have been removed from roadless or wild classification since 1937, and much more modification is being planned. There is little knowledge of, or interest in, these wilderness type designations either by Indians or reservation administrators.

The improbability of preserving a few extensive regions open only to primitive travel methods is not entirely due to easily altered Federal policies. Persons who favor wilderness preservation must assume a fair share of responsibility for the present situation.

There are still tremendous differences of opinion regarding wilderness area conditions and purposes existing among advocates of wilderness preservation. Wilderness understanding seems to have progressed but little in the past few decades.

Substantial evidence of the extreme variety of wilderness concepts now existing among State and national organizations and conservationists generally, can be found in the original correspondence of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in connection with the survey of 1948 that resulted in the report by C. Frank Keyser, entitled, "The Preservation of Wilderness Areas: An Analysis of Opinion on the Problem."

This correspondence furnishes dramatic illustration of the dilemma created for the conscientious administrator who may seek enough public opinion of one kind to support a decision favoring wilderness preservation.

Philosophic incantations about wilderness values and the repetitious theme of saving wilderness everywhere are too abstract for the average administrator faced with unshakable realism. Wilderness supporters have been chiefly defense minded, rushing to prevent developments that may have been carefully drawn and justified. The majority of areas now called wilderness exist because recreational or industrial developments have not, as yet, been economically feasible.

If there were well defined purposes and plans for a national wilderness system which could generate common support the wilderness movement might well be irrepressible. As it is, the disagreement among wilderness proponents is a highly important deterrent to wilderness preservation in this country.

The reluctance of land administrators to work harder for wilderness preservation is not solely because of ill-informed and diverse wilderness proponents. The vast acreages generally described as wilderness and the low recreation use figures for undeveloped regions also influence administrative attitudes toward wilderness preservation. Wilderness recreation requires more area per individual than any other kind of recreation, but the land now available in proportion to the few users raises the question of what constitutes a legitimate minority.

In 1950 nearly 100,000 visits were made to the 11 million acres comprising the large national forest wilderness areas. The visits constituted only a fraction of 1 percent of the 16,500,000 visits (not including motoring sightseers) for recreation to all national forests in the 11 Western States. Estimates made by officials of each major western national park in 1952 indicated that approximately 0.4 of 1 percent of the 9 million visitors made trips of more than 1 day duration into wilderness portions of those parks.

If we combine the 28 wilderness areas of the national forests and the 17 undeveloped areas in national parks, each over 100,000 acres in size, we find that less than 1 percent of all western recreationists on Federal park and forest lands have nearly 16 million acres for their use in 45 areas.

It should be remembered, however, that many of these regions no longer represent genuine wilderness conditions despite their designations or representations. It appears that there are large acreages still available to the limited number of people who use them, but at the same time many administrators have excused pet development projects for wilderness lands on the theory that plenty of wilderness is being preserved elsewhere. There is a constant nibbling away at wilderness units, more slowly in the parks than in the forests.

We must honestly recognize that American inventiveness is directing our way of life toward ever increasing comfort. This manner of living, which few actually resist, is not necessarily building a large corps of new wilderness travelers. Other records show that

regardless of increased use figures for wilderness regions, many of them created by counting everyone stepping over a wilderness boundary, real wilderness travel is enjoyed by only a few more than participated years ago.

The type of wilderness trips has changed too, covering less ground and staying out for shorter periods than earlier back country travelers. Forest Service estimates for 1950 show that 28 percent of recreationists using large wilderness areas are hikers, who remain in the areas an average of 2.8 days. The remaining users are horseback riders who stay an average of 4.7 days. The conveniences and services required by many of these wilderness users practically disqualify them as seekers of an arduous wilderness experience.

However, a wilderness purpose is now apparent which does not necessarily include the hardship of earlier wilderness travel. This objective, which is not new for public recreation, is to camp and travel in scenic regions away from mass recreation use. Preserving areas where isolation was possible has been the initial stimulus for the reservation of many recreation areas—now deteriorated from overuse.

There is every indication that wilderness areas of the future will consist of a series of small land units devoid of economic potentials. If attractive, these delicate natural zones will be swarming with outdoor enthusiasts trying to convince themselves that they are enjoying original wilderness conditions.

It seems that we have too much total acreage now called wilderness for probable future use, but not enough large areas which promise to preserve wilderness conditions for any length of time.

Those who understand the problems of wilderness preservation on Federal lands are convinced that Congressional action is necessary to retain wilderness areas for future generations. It is improbable, however, that Congressional action or tighter administration to retain important wilderness regions can be effected with only the support of uncertain and divided wilderness proponents.

The democracy of providing access to every parcel of our public lands may triumph, but will future generations appreciate this particular brand of wisdom?

PROTECTION OF THE INNOCENT BY THE FEDERAL NARCOTICS BUREAU

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, most people regard law-enforcement officials as being concerned primarily with the apprehension and conviction of law-breakers.

While this is generally true, there is another facet of law-enforcement work which is equally important—the protection of the innocent.

An outstanding example of the latter function occurred recently in California and Nevada, where a young school teacher was convicted of possession of marihuana, and was sentenced to a 2- to 10-year term at the Nevada State prison.

The teacher, Robert Enzensperger, of San Jose, Calif., protested his innocence, but to no avail.

But his family contacted Col. George H. White, district supervisor of the Federal Narcotics Bureau, in San Francisco, and asked that his agents conduct a separate investigation of the young man, since they were convinced of his innocence.

Colonel White, well aware that his duty is not only conviction, but also protection, as well, assigned teams of agents to the case.

They checked records in Las Vegas, where Enzensperger was convicted, and at the San Francisco and Burbank airports.

The case against the teacher was, briefly, that marihuana was found in his suitcase. He claimed the suitcase had been tampered with while en route by airline from San Francisco to Las Vegas.

Colonel White's agents found an airline manifest supporting the young teacher's claim. He submitted this information to Nevada authorities, with the comment that "there is a possibility of a miscarriage of justice."

A reporter for the San Francisco News, George Murphy, wrote a series of articles on the case which attracted the notice of a well-known San Francisco attorney, J. W. Ehrlich.

Through the combined efforts of Mr. Ehrlich and Mr. Murphy, the Nevada Board of Pardons and Paroles was called into extraordinary session on May 9 to consider the teacher's case.

After a 4-hour hearing, during which Mr. Ehrlich presented the case for a pardon, such pardon was granted.

It is a tribute to Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger for having selected such men as Colonel White for his Bureau.

It is a tribute to Mr. Murphy and Mr. Ehrlich for having devoted their time and efforts to free a man they had never met, but who they felt was unjustly convicted.

And it is most certainly a tribute to Colonel White and to the American system of justice.

In what other country could a private citizen be accorded the investigative facilities of a law-enforcement organization, merely on the statement that he believes a member of his family to have been unjustly imprisoned?

To the family's expression of gratitude that the young man was freed, I feel should be added an expression of understandable pride in the humanity, integrity, and diligence of Federal servants such as Commissioner Anslinger and Colonel White.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, in conjunction with my remarks, an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of February 29, 1956; and an article by Mr. Raymond Lawrence, which appeared in the Oakland Tribune of May 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of February 29, 1956]

WONDERFUL THING

That was a heartwarming story that came out of San Francisco the other day concerning the search for new evidence made by Federal narcotics authorities in a case where the possibility had developed that an innocent man had been convicted and imprisoned for a narcotics violation.

Col. George White, head of the Federal Narcotics Bureau in San Francisco, displayed exactly the same zeal in running down the facts that may ultimately result in the exoneration of the accused man that he has long been noted for in pinning down the guilty.

"It is a wonderful thing," as an observer commented, "when a law enforcement agency

goes out of its way to exonerate the innocent as well as to prosecute the guilty."

The case involves a young schoolteacher who traveled by airline from San Francisco to Las Vegas, after checking a suitcase which was lost en route and finally recovered and intercepted by police, who found it contained a quantity of marihuana.

The defendant claimed the original contents of the suitcase had been removed and the marihuana substituted during the nearly 60 hours it was out of his possession. That version was deemed unbelievable by a jury, and a prison sentence imposed.

But Colonel White was unconvinced. Checking back painstakingly, he found the suitcase and its contents weighed 20 pounds according to the manifest issued at the time of its surrender. But at the time of its recovery, after the period of 60 hours during which the defendant had no access to it, it weighed only 9 pounds.

What the final disposition of the case will be is up to the courts, but Colonel White thinks this puts an entirely new face on the matter and there is widespread agreement with his viewpoint.

Without losing sight in the slightest degree of the vital matter of innocence or guilt, the important thing for the purpose of this discussion is that the law enforcement agencies of the country have demonstrated not only the capacity but the will for tempering justice with humanity, a very important thing indeed.

Sometimes the skeptical disposition is to say that law enforcement is too often a callous matter of pinning a conviction on somebody, regardless of guilt or innocence.

To Colonel White goes the high credit for providing an effective refutation of this unwarranted and even frightening opinion.

[From the Oakland Tribune of May 8, 1956]
(By Raymond Lawrence)

A superior court judge sitting temporarily in a San Jose superior court unfairly castigates an honest and candid venireman and gets slapped down by an indignant bar association.

A Santa Rosa superior court judge bars the press and public from a murder trial and is inundated with comment about the functions of a court in a democracy. He is called before an appeal court to explain his action which, by now may be a moot question.

A Sunnyvale schoolteacher is caught in a narcotics mess and emerges completely vindicated.

Indeed, the ways of justice are devious and sometimes mysterious to the layman; but these cases point to some morals that should prove refreshing and encouraging.

CALLED TO ACCOUNT

Judges, as a rule, cannot act arbitrarily and unjustly without being called to account. There are various ways of inculcating and enforcing a sense of responsibility, as the two instances cited above demonstrate.

When justice miscarries, as may happen, there are ways of rectification.

For example, in the case of the Sunnyvale schoolteacher there was a combination of judicial procedure and an enlightened, fair-minded public official.

Robert Enzensperger, the teacher, went to Las Vegas on a brief vacation.

His baggage was mislaid in transit and he arrived at this destination without it.

OFFICIAL HELPS

After he was arrested in Las Vegas on a charge of possessing marihuana, his mother informed George H. White, Federal narcotics chief in San Francisco, that the young man was not the type who would be guilty of such a charge.