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INTRODUCTION

by Mark Barringer

Forests define East Texas, and to a great extent they always have. The vast pine and hardwood expanses that cover the region distinguish it from the rest of the state. Settlers in the region – Native Americans, French, Spanish, or Anglo-American – lived in the forests, utilized their resources, and altered the woodland environment in search of security and prosperity. It seemed fitting that on the fortieth anniversary of the East Texas Historical Association that the *East Texas Historical Journal* focus on the forests of the region and on how East Texans have interacted with them over the years. The topical scope is broad, from a general overview of Southern forests to institutional and company histories, from personal observations of wildlife to personal tributes to forest history scholars. Taken together, these articles present a well-rounded historical picture of how East Texans have lived in and utilized their forests.

This issue of the *Journal* also includes a bonus. Inside the back cover you will find a multimedia, interactive CD-ROM supplement to “The History of the Stephen F. Austin Experimental Forest,” which begins on page 40. Produced by Carey C. Russell, a graduate student at the Arthur Temple College of Forestry at SFA, it provides an audiovisual tour of the Forest, interviews with many of those who have worked there over the years, and maps to orient readers to features mentioned in the article. Please take the time to browse the CD; we are proud that the *East Texas Historical Journal* is among the first publications to include such a supplement. And we believe that it is only a sign of things to come.
Practitioners of history tell us that we learn from the past, or that without knowing our past we have no future. In common parlance these ideas are frequently translated into the cliche that "history repeats itself." Sometimes it does, and often it seems that we have not learned much from the past — but it is far more common for history not to repeat itself exactly. However, similar issues, situations, and patterns do commonly occur, allowing us to gain insights into the present from studying the past. The forest history of the South provides some prime examples.1

Certification has been a recurrent issue among forest product manufacturers. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as railroads began to crisscross the South and link the southern pine forests to the consumers and markets of the North, southern pine lumber was not well regarded above the Mason Dixon line. It was considered tough to work, prone to warping, and haphazardly manufactured, with no uniformity in drying and manufacturing standards. The industry responded to these problems by creating manufacturers' trade associations like the old Texas and Louisiana Lumber Manufacturers' Association, the Southern Lumber Manufacturers' Association, the Yellow Pine Manufacturers' Association, and the Southern Pine Association. These organizations established manufacturing quality standards as well as inspection and grade marking, or certification, procedures, which enabled the consumer to buy a product with the assurance that it was of a certain size and quality. The public demanded standards and the industry responded. The advent of certification was an important factor in the rise of Southern lumber manufacturing to national leadership.2

Today an important segment of the population is again demanding action. Environmentalists and others have become greatly concerned about the rapid harvesting of the rain forests of the southern hemisphere and the old growth forests of the United States, as well as about the impact of some logging practices on streams and other parts of the natural world. The forest products industry has responded to these concerns with new kinds of certification reminiscent of grade marking. The first is called "green certification." Manufacturers who agree not to log in rain forests or old growth areas, and who do not use destructive logging methods, are monitored by outside agencies. If they abide by their agreements they are allowed to mark their products as "green certified." Although such products tend to be somewhat more expensive, retailers like Home Depot and Wal Mart have agreed to sell green certified products in their stores.3 The other component of the process is training loggers in the use of responsible techniques. The training is usually conducted under the auspices of state forestry associations, and loggers who complete the course and maintain certain standards are allowed to advertise
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that they are “certified in sustainable forestry initiative.” In the area of certification the present echoes the past.

Critters have been an integral part of the lives of Southern foresters, loggers, and forest products manufacturers over most of the last century. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the razorback hog was number one on the “public enemy list” of Southerners who attempted to reforest their lands after they were logged. The damage that a hog could do to young growth and plantings was documented by the pioneer Mississippi forester Posey Howell, who spent an entire day on horseback following a hog, observing that during that day the hog rooted up more young seedlings than a man could plant in a week. Fire and hogs were two of the major obstacles to Southern reforestation, and the construction of hogtight fences around planted areas was among the factors that brought the Southern forests back to life.

In recent years critters have again occupied center stage. Spotted owls have virtually shut down the timber industry in parts of the Pacific Northwest. In the South we have our own birds of a controversial feather, although they have never achieved the notoriety of their feathered brethren in the West. They are red-cockaded woodpeckers, and while not all environmentalists would agree with my statement, the Southern forest products industry and loggers have generally done a reasonable job of protecting their habitat without undue disruption of the industry. There are also efforts under way to protect and preserve other endangered or threatened species such as the Louisiana black bear, dusky gopher tortoise, Louisiana salamander, and various other plants and animals. Critters past and present have impacted the Southern forest and its human inhabitants.

Opposition to “government control” has existed within some segments of the American population since the colonial period when colonists took up muskets and barrels of tea in opposition to British imperial officials. Forest land owners and forest products manufacturers have been especially vigorous in their opposition to what they considered “excessive government zeal” in the governance or regulation of their affairs during the last century.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as the Southern lumber industry entered its bonanza era, cries from conservationists that the U.S. was facing a “timber famine,” and the announcement in the U.S. Census Report of 1890 that the frontier was gone, triggered efforts to preserve and protect some of the nation’s remaining “wild country.” Inspired by leaders like John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, and Theodore Roosevelt, the nation began to establish national forests and national parks to save some of our natural heritage. The national parks and forests of this period were concentrated in the West. The South was barely affected. Nevertheless, even then some Southern lumbermen and foresters decried the fact that valuable timberlands were being excluded from development. Pinchot’s calls for federal regulation of logging and cutting practices on privately owned land also met fierce resistance. Later, during the depression of the 1930s lumbermen who had cut over their lands with little or no effort at reforestation were all too happy to unload these
"worthless" tracts on the government for what seemed at the time handsome prices. Thus our Southern national forests were born, including the Angelina, Sabine, Davy Crockett, and Sam Houston National Forests in Texas. 7

Today, government regulation remains a hot issue. The potential for government regulation of logging practices remains real, especially in today's atmosphere of environmental activism. Thus we have seen in recent years the movement by the forest products industry to regulate its own practices through the implementation of "sustainable forestry initiative" programs implemented and monitored by state forestry associations. The sustainable forestry movement sounds a lot like Gifford Pinchot's old definition of conservation as "wise use." 8

We have also seen a renewed debate about our national forests. Today the question is not about their existence, but rather about their use and management. The national forests, administered by the U.S. Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture, have traditionally been managed under a "multiple use" philosophy. This means that unlike national parks and wilderness areas, where the management goal is preservation, in the national forests resources can be harvested and utilized. Water development, mining, and logging have been permitted in national forests, although they are supposed to be done in accordance with a philosophy of "wise use," with provision for the regeneration of the resources whenever possible. However, critics complain that the national forests have been run as little more than "tree farms" for the forest products industry, and they particularly object to excessive harvests, clear-cutting, road building, the disruption of wildlife, and "below cost" timber sales. 9

Some environmentalists believe that resource use in the national forests should be stopped entirely, or at least substantially reduced. President Clinton's recent effort to ban logging and road building on approximately one third of the national forest acreage is responsive to this point of view. On the other hand, the forest products industry and officials of rural counties that depend heavily on their share of timber harvest revenues from national forest lands within their borders complain bitterly about the influence of "radical environmentalists" on policy. Many environmentalists are also concerned that in an age of resource scarcity there will be additional pressure for development in the traditionally protected lands of our national parks, wilderness areas, and wildlife refuges. The growing debate over petroleum exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is emblematic of that issue. Controversies over the role of government in resource policy remain with us today. 10

Conservation is another issue that has remained in play over the last hundred years. At the turn of the last century there were two main strains in the conservation "community." There were preservationists, symbolized, inspired, and led by John Muir, who concentrated upon wild areas and wanted them set aside and preserved for eternity because of their scenic, historic, or cultural significance. Muir's legacy is our national parks, wilderness areas, and wildlife refuges. Muir's great antagonist among conservationists was the first chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, who, as mentioned
earlier, was the spokesman for utilitarian conservation, or what Pinchot termed “wise use.” Even Pinchot’s “wise use” philosophy was a hard sell among lumbermen, who considered themselves tough, practical entrepreneurs, and a public that regarded mowing down trees as “progress” as America “conquered” and “civilized” the “wilderness.” The prevailing attitude was summed up in 1919 by the general sales agent of the powerful Kirby Lumber Company, which operated in Texas and Louisiana. “As a lumberman,” said he, “my interest in forestry is nil....When the lumberman of today saws the trees he owns and scraps his plant, his capital will enable him to become the banker, the ranchman, or the manufacturer of some other commodity....”

Gradually, as knowledge grew, some Southern lumbermen like Henry Hardtner in Louisiana and public officials like W. Goodrich Jones in Texas began to realize the importance of harvesting trees responsibly, controlling fires and critters, and providing for planting or natural reproduction so that the Southern forests would not be exhausted. But the definition of a conservation-oriented operation was minimal. If you were doing something, anything, to operate responsibly you were, by the standards of the time, a conservationist. How to do it was another matter, and often a source of controversy, for as a later spokesman said to a crowd of foresters, “There are as many definitions of...good forestry practices as there are people in this room....”

Conservation remains an issue today, but it is more complicated and the terminology has changed. The term environmentalism has replaced conservation, and some modern environmentalists would not acknowledge the old foresters and conservationists of a half century or more ago as kindred spirits. Aldo Leopold has supplanted Gifford Pinchot as the patron saint of many environmentalists, and his ideas are closer to those of John Muir than of Pinchot. Leopold is famous for popularizing the concept of the “land ethic,” in which the land and the people who inhabit it are regarded as part of a larger community, called an “ecosystem.” In this system, humans have no greater status or rights than the other plants and creatures that inhabit the earth. For foresters and land administrators this has led to the concept of “ecosystem management,” under which all of these interests are to be respected and reconciled. Protection of wildlife and watersheds and responsible timber use and harvesting are all part of the package. Some foresters quarrel with the concept and say that it is nothing more than what they have done for years under the label “multiple use,” but the vehemence of their reactions and rhetoric indicate that there is indeed something new and that they feel challenged. Clearly the “new” resides in the modern emphasis on other components of the forest – water, wildlife, plant life, and aesthetics – in contrast with the old concentration on commodity production – timber.

Technology and technological change have triggered controversy over the last century in the Southern forests, although again the specifics have changed. Two examples will demonstrate this point. At the turn of the last century the new technology upon which the bonanza period of Southern lumbering was built was railroad-steamlogging. The economics of railroad-steamlogging lent themselves to the “cut out and get out” operational
philosophy adopted by most lumbermen. The equipment was expensive, the mills required a vast amount of timber to feed them, and most lumbermen operated on borrowed capital raised through the sale of timber bonds, with the timberlands, or more accurately the timber, as collateral.

The economics of the industry dictated that the lumbermen would move into an area, log it, and move the logs to the mill with steam powered skidders, loaders, and tramlines as quickly as possible. Then they would take up the tracks, salvage as much of the equipment as they could, and move on to a new area. Lumbering was a migratory industry, moving from the New England woods to the Great Lakes states, and then to the South and Pacific Northwest.  

The lands were left bereft of timber and seemed to have little value or potential for regeneration. The process was graphically described by one forester: “Steam-powered skidders with long cables dragged the logs from the stump to the rail siding. This process tore at, broke off, and often dug up young trees in the path of these logs. This type of operation left the land bare with stumps as the only reminder of what was once there . . . beautiful stands of trees. The bare soil began to erode and small rivulets grew into gullies.” A contemporary observer remembered “Loggers were chewing up the pine forests like locusts cutting a swath through a field of wheat.” William Faulkner utilized the theme of the lumber industry’s impact on the forest and on people in his writings. In Light in August he writes of a doomed sawmill town:

All the men in the village worked in the mill or for it. It was cutting pine. It had been there seven years and in seven years more it would destroy all the timber within its reach. Then some of the machinery and most of the men who ran it and existed because of and for it would be loaded onto freight cars and moved away. But some of the machinery would be left, since new pieces could always be bought on the installment plan — gaunt, staring, motionless wheels rising from mounds of brick rubble and gutted boilers lifting their rusting and unsmoking stacks with an air stubborn, baffled and bemused upon a stumppocked scene of profound and peaceful desolation, unplowed, untilled, gutting slowly into red and choked ravines beneath the long quiet rains of autumn and the galloping fury of vernal equinoxes.”

The destitution wrought by these logging and lumbering procedures was dictated by taxation, economics, and technology, and represented important components of the world that early conservationists and foresters sought to change.

Today many environmentalists see a similar threat to the natural world predicated upon technology. The danger they see comes from the pulp and paper industry, and the technology is in the form of chip mills. Machines known generically as chip-n-saws convert logs into wood chips, which become the raw material for paper and fiberboard products. The chip mills can utilize timber of much smaller diameter than the pulpwood processed by traditional mills, meaning that loggers who supply these operations are harvesting young trees that environmentalists see as the forests of the future.

The appetites of the chip mills are gargantuan. Their pace of moving through the forests that supply them is reminiscent of the railroad-steam
logging and lumbering operations of the past as they utilize more and faster clearcutting. The descriptions of their impact written by contemporary critics are chillingly akin to those left by the observers of the steam skidders and loaders of early last century. Again, however, this is not a precise repetition of the age of railroad-steam logging. When the lumbermen of the early twentieth century cut over an area, there was usually no provision for regeneration of the forest. Today, while the harvests may be huge and the cutovers large and ugly, we can usually assume that within a few years the forests will reappear.

However, the nature of these replenished forests also demonstrates the superficial resemblance and underlying dissimilarity of issues past and present. In the early twentieth century there was little debate over harvesting. The forests were rapidly clear-cut. The questions at that time centered around reforestation. The first question was would there be any effort to reforest at all. If the answer was yes, the next question was would the process be natural or by means of planting. It was assumed that the new forests would be pine.

Today, unless harvested land is converted to other uses, it is assumed that it will be reforested. But the methods of harvesting are controversial. The public has reacted strongly to the ugliness of clear-cutting. Industry has responded to these concerns, by limiting the size of clear-cuts, cutting in irregular mosaic patterns, and leaving trees along roadways to "screen" cut-over areas from casual view. Lumber companies have also adopted the practice of cutting some tracts selectively, taking only the older trees or others that for various reasons are candidates for removal.

On the reforestation front, the issues have changed as well. Many people today object strongly to the practice of harvesting mixed-age and species forests and replacing them with single-age pine plantations that do not in most ways resemble the forests they replace. This controversy reflects the fact that today's citizens take a broader view of the forest than did their predecessors. They do not view it either as an obstacle in the path of progress or as a single-purpose producer of wood fiber. They place greater emphasis on the total world of the forest - its wildlife, plant diversity, water quality, and aesthetics. They believe that the landowners hold those lands by the sufferance of society and have a responsibility to manage those lands wisely. In these concepts there is ample room for severe conflicts over landowner rights, societal objectives and values, and the proper role of government in setting and enforcing standards and adjudicating disputes.

While all of the issues I have discussed, and many others that I have not, are found throughout the span of Southern forest history over the past century, relatively few of the people who have actually made the decisions regarding the use and protection of our lands have exhibited much interest in history or the lessons some believe it can teach. Would it have mattered if they had been more historically minded? Could they have learned lessons from the past that would have enabled them to deal more constructively with the present? My answer is, yes.
As I have tried to demonstrate, at least in Southern forest history, history seldom, if ever, "repeats itself" precisely. Conditions, people, and other factors change. Yet there are many issues that in a broad sense seem to link the past with the present. It seems to me that knowing how we got to where we are, knowing what worked in the past and what did not, could surely make us more effective and sensitive in dealing with the challenges of the present and future. History can also reveal trends. For example, I think that the forest manager or landowner can readily assume that the citizens of today and the future will demand a greater voice, probably expressed through government, in how lands are managed. They will insist that forests be utilized for more than commodity timber production. They will expect to see other values of the forest — wildlife, water quality, and aesthetic — recognized and protected. They will not be willing to see all of our forests converted into single age monocultures in tree plantations. They will demand the protection of species and age diversity, and the preservation of at least some "old growth" forests. At the same time, the past shows that in many areas foresters and the forest products industry can achieve reasonable compromises with conservationists and environmentalists if all are willing to think creatively. The sustainable forestry initiative and green certification are examples.

Beyond any measurable "practical" uses, knowledge of our past is important in terms of pride, understanding, and enjoyment. It is fascinating to learn how our predecessors lived and worked, what they thought and felt, what they achieved, and where they fell short. Recounting and preserving their stories allows us to reach across the generations to know them and to understand better who we are today, why we value what we value and act as we act. Scholars like Bob Maxwell and Larry Walker of Stephen F. Austin State University were instrumental in getting the process of illuminating our forest history underway. Our challenge and responsibility is to build upon those efforts so that our children and grandchildren will better know, understand, and appreciate their legacy.

NOTES

I dedicate this article to the memory of Drs. Robert S. Maxwell and Laurence C. Walker of Stephen F. Austin State University who kindly encouraged my work and provided assistance over the years and to my dear friends Archie and Judy McDonald who have been eternally supportive and uplifting.

James E. Fickle, The New South and the "New Competition": Trade Association Development in the Southern Pine Industry (Urbana, 1980), pp. 11, 13, 15, 17, 33, 179, 181-190, 193-195. There is an account of the Texas and Louisiana Lumber Manufacturers' Association's organization and purposes in the Beaumont Journal (May 12, 1894), a copy of which is in the Alexander Gilmer Collection, University of Texas Archives. The Journal served as the official organ of the association. Copies of the group's reports and tables which it circulated to members are in the Kurth Papers, Box 2, housed in the East Texas Research Center of the Ralph W. Steen Library at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches.

James E. Fickle, Mississippi Forests and Forestry (Jackson, Mississippi, 2001), pp. 256-257.

Fickle, Mississippi Forests, pp. 257-258; American Forest and Paper Association


TWO WHO STOOD TALL
IN THE EAST TEXAS PINERY WOODS

by Robert D. Baker

Two academics at Stephen F. Austin State University during the second half of the twentieth century stood tall in recording the history of forests and forestry in East Texas. One was my neighbor for twelve years and the other was my boss for eleven years. I worked with them closely and marveled at their dedication to the history of the piney woods and their ability to make it come alive. Dr. Robert S. (Bob) Maxwell, a professional historian, and Dr. Laurence C. (Larry) Walker, a professional forester and an avid lay historian, both former teachers and administrators at Stephen F. Austin State University, exhibited a deep interest in East Texas forests and their history.

Dr. Robert S. Maxwell was born in Newport, Kentucky, on November 26, 1911. He attended public schools in Kentucky, received an undergraduate degree from Kentucky Wesleyan College, and taught high school for four years. Maxwell obtained a master's degree at the University of Cincinnati, then taught at Missouri Military Academy. Between 1942 and 1946 he served in the U.S. Army in Europe, mustering out just before V-E Day. He had already begun graduate work toward a Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin and, upon returning, resumed his academic pursuits and obtained a doctorate in history in 1949. From 1950 to 1952 he taught history at the University of Kentucky, and arrived at Stephen F. Austin State College in the fall of 1952.

Although research did not have a high priority at Stephen F. Austin State in those years – it was primarily a teachers' training college – school president Paul F. Boynton was delighted when faculty members involved themselves in research as well as teaching, and Dr. Maxwell was accustomed to doing just that. In 1953 Dr. Boynton presided over the creation of the Bureau of East Texas Research, and Dr. Maxwell was named its first director. This allowed for a reduced teaching load, and he embarked upon a number of projects. Among the most significant of these was acquiring the records of several East Texas lumber companies, which laid the foundation for one of the foremost archival

Robert D. Baker is Professor Emeritus in the Department of Forest Science at Texas A&M University.
collections of its kind in the United States at the Stephen F. Austin State library. The major contributors and some of the dates of acquisition of Texas lumber industry records were Angelina County Lumber Company (1955 and 1966); W.T. Carter & Bro. Lumber Company (1996); Chronister Lumber Company, Frost-Johnson Company, and Kirby Lumber Company (1970); Lutcher & Moore Lumber Company (1972); and Newton County Lumber Company, Southern Pine Lumber Company, and Thompson Bros. Lumber Company (1987). The author has visited these forest history collections 120 times since 1990.

These archival records formed the basis of Dr. Maxwell's noteworthy efforts in documenting the history of early East Texas forests, forestry, and the forest industry, as well as the transportation of primary and secondary forest products. The results were an impressive body of publications, academic papers, and presentations on East Texas forest history. Dr. Maxwell received a Fulbright award to England in 1960 and was designated as a Distinguished Professor in 1966. He was named a fellow of the Forest History Society in 1972, and served as president of the East Texas Historical Association from 1973 to 1974. He was the first recipient of the Regents Professor for Research award in 1980 from Stephen F. Austin State University, and was honored with the Ralph W. Steen Award for service to the East Texas Historical Association in 1983. When he retired in 1983 he had written or collaborated on three forest history books; after retirement he contributed three additional books.

Among his books and articles on East Texas forest history are the following:


Dr. Robert S. Maxwell died December 29, 1990. To honor his contributions, and in fitting tribute to his legacy, *Whistle in the Piney Woods*: 
A Symposium on Railroads and Logging in East Texas, was held October 18, 1997, at Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches. The title, of course, was from Dr. Maxwell's 1963 publication of that name. Dr. Archie P. McDonald, executive director of the East Texas Historical Association, opened the symposium with a tribute to the pioneering forest historian. The inside cover of the program presented photos of Dr. Maxwell and a woods train, as well as a quotation from Whistle in the Piney Woods, which was reprinted for this occasion.

**Dr. Laurence C. (Larry) Walker** was born in Washington, D.C., September 8, 1924. As a youth he joined the Boy Scouts, which provided him a lifelong sense of dedication and perseverance. He earned the rank of Eagle Scout and continued in scouting, accumulating numerous awards including the Silver Antelope and the Distinguished Eagle Scout for service to the forestry profession.

In 1943, while a student at Pennsylvania State University, Dr. Walker was called up from the enlisted reserves, took basic training at Camp Fannin in Northeast Texas, and served a stint at Washington & Jefferson College in western Pennsylvania. He was then stationed in Europe, even past V-E Day, as a member of the occupation forces before returning to continue his education. He earned a BS degree at Penn State, a master of forestry at Yale University, and in 1953 a Ph.D. at New York State University College of Forestry. He did not pursue these degrees consecutively, but worked between his studies for the USDA Forest Service as an assistant district ranger on the Sabine National Forest and as a research forester at Brewton, Alabama.

Dr. Walker began his teaching career in 1954 at the University of Georgia, and moved to Stephen F. Austin State College in September 1963 as head of the Department of Forestry. There were fewer than 100 forestry majors when he took over, but when he retired as dean of the College of Forestry in 1977 there were more than 1,000 majors. He was the Lacy Hunt Professor of Forestry until his retirement from teaching in 1988.

Dr. Walker was instrumental in continuing the pamphlet collection of the Forestry Library, housed in the Department of Forestry, and insuring its permanence in 1965 when it moved to the college library. The collection contains many East Texas forest history items.
The Texas Society of American Foresters, for which he chaired numerous committees, honored him in 1999 by renaming the Distinguished Service to Forestry Award as the Laurence C. Walker Distinguished Service to Forestry Award. Dr. Walker had received the award in 1968.

Dr. Walker was a prolific author. His repertoire ranged widely, including history, silviculture, forest fertilization, Texas timber economy, and other topics. He was a frequent contributor to the Farmer-Stockman from 1971 through 1985. He also conducted oral history interviews with many individuals made famous by the East Texas timber trade. Those included Paul Hursey, Don Young, Joe McPherson, W. E. Merrem, Ed Prud’homme, “Andy” Anderson, and Caton Carter.

Among Dr. Walker’s books and articles are the following on East Texas forest history:


Bob Currie paid Larry the ultimate compliment in his article, “Trail Blazers: Laurence C. Walker,” in Texas Forestry, March 1988. The sentence that exemplifies what Dr. Walker meant to East Texas reads: “Dr. Laurence (Larry) Walker of Nacogdoches, is a good steward, well known in the field of forestry, but possibly destined to be recognized as an even better steward of life.” Dr. Laurence C. Walker died July 26, 1999.

I knew both Dr. Maxwell and Dr. Walker well. I worked with each of them and understood their intense devotion to their professions. Not only did they stand tall in their professions and in their published remembrances of East Texas forests and forestry, but tall in their fights against cancer. Neither gave the disease any quarter, confronting it head-on in a positive manner. They then served as character models for me when I, too, was diagnosed with cancer.
During the weekend of January 20-21, 1940, Lufkin's coldest weather in a decade slammed the community with blasts of icy air, a five-inch snowfall, and bone-chilling temperatures. People trudged through the snow to reach the town's downtown drug stores to buy cameras and film, anxious to record the rare winter scenery.

The Lufkin Daily News' edition on Tuesday, January 23, took note of the weather with a front-page, eight-column headline of the bold-and-black type usually reserved for wars and disasters: "MERCURY PLUNGES TO 10 HERE."

Below the headline, four photographs and a smaller, one-column headline recorded another event that occurred that morning in the Daily News pressroom. The story reported: "This issue of The News is printed on Roll No. 1 from the Southland Paper Mills, Inc., Lufkin. The paper you hold in your hand is off the first run of commercially produced southern pine newsprint in the world."

While the roll of newsprint was the first to be used in printing a complete daily newspaper in Texas, the first paper supposedly produced at the Southland mill came off the mill's paper machine in the early morning hours of Wednesday, January 17. The paper had some defects and Southland's managers waited a week before delivering what they felt was "printable newsprint" to the Lufkin Daily News.

The 1,445-pound roll of white paper trucked to the Lufkin newspaper in late January, 1940, carrying a label stamped "No. 1," was symbolic of the enormous changes that subsequently occurred in America's newsprint and newspaper industries, the economy of East Texas, and Lufkin's own industrial economy. It was the first time newsprint - the basic commodity of all newspapers - had been made commercially from the southern pine trees that have existed for centuries in the southern United States. It was the first time paper of any kind had been produced in an interior East Texas community. It was the first time the interior of East Texas had a significant market for pine pulpwood, or "cordwood," as loggers called the wood. And for Ernest Kurth, the beaming barrel-chested lumberman shown holding a freshly-printed newspaper in one of the front-page photographs, it was the culmination of a challenge that had consumed him for more than a decade.

Kurth was the second oldest son of Joseph Hubert Kurth, a distinguished, spade-bearded German who arrived in Angelina County in 1888, purchased a small sawmill from Charles Louis Kelty and James A. Ewing, and planted the roots that would in forty years sprout a far-reaching lumbering empire in East Texas.

Bob Bowman is a past president of the East Texas Historical Association.
As he began to age, Kurth turned to his son, Ernest Lynn, a piano-playing sawmill manager with a keen intellect and good business mind. Ernest gradually assumed the helm of a lumbering complex that at its peak included dozens of sawmills, almost 100,000 acres of timberland, and a collection of other businesses ranging from hotels to insurance companies.

Kurth and his father had made considerable fortunes for those who had invested with them. From Angelina County, Kurth-led businesses spread throughout East Texas and western Louisiana. But by the late 1920s, Kurth knew the lumber business was changing in a significant way and was considering the construction of a paper mill.

The great timber boom of the late 1800s and early 1900s had left much of East Texas with forests cut over by gypsy lumbermen. Capitalizing on cheap timber and a demand for lumber in places such as Houston and Dallas, the gypsy loggers cut broad swaths through East Texas' virgin forests, left behind millions of stumps and dozens of abandoned sawmills, and moved on to other timbered states.

Eventually modern forest management developed as a result of farsighted timbermen such as those in the Kurth, Temple, and Kirby families, who hired professional foresters responsible for changing the way the forests were harvested and regrown. The Kurths and other lumbering families acquired thousands of acres of cutover lands and replanted them with young pines or encouraged natural regeneration, but they would not be lumber-sized for another two to three decades.

To grow properly, the young forests needed periodic thinnings. The thinnings were the right size for use as pulpwood in paper mills, but there were no such mills in interior East Texas.

Paper mills in the South were also few and far between before the 1930s. By 1920, there were only six kraft mills in the South. Eight more were added in the 1920s. After long sales pitches to northern banks, the money began moving south in the 1930s and soon mills developed from Virginia to Texas. Fifteen kraft mills were completed in the 1930s.

Texas had a few paper manufacturing operations on the fringes of its timber belt in the 1930s. A mill at Oak Cliff made paper from used paper and some wood fiber. Another mill in Orange made paper from southern pine residues. But neither bought sufficient amounts of timber in the heart of East Texas.

By the 1930s Kurth was a promising and aggressive lumberman in his late forties, as well as a commanding figure in the industry and within Texas' business and political circles. Despite the gloom of the Great Depression, Kurth began promoting the construction of a paper-manufacturing complex in interior East Texas. At first, he felt the production of kraft paper—a heavy brown paper used principally for paper bags, wrapping and packaging—held the greatest promise for East Texas. Blessed with abundant timber and cheap labor, the Southern United States had become attractive to kraft manufac-
turers. East Texas, Kurth reasoned, had the same potential, plus promising markets in Texas' expanding cities.

Aware that there was little, if any, newsprint production in the South to compete with Canadian newsprint made from spruce, balsam, and hemlock trees, Kurth flirted with the idea of building a newsprint mill to serve newspaper publishers in the South and Southwest. Jack C. McDermott and C.S. Boyles, Jr., publishers of Kurth's hometown newspaper, the Lufkin Daily News, made him aware of the problems and costs incurred in importing newsprint from Canadian and Scandinavian manufacturers.

Because of increased demands for newsprint during and after World War I, newsprint production increased from 800,000 tons in 1920 to 4,000,000 tons in 1930. But most of the expansion was in the Canadian industry. Because American paper manufacturers could not obtain wood from the Crown lands of Canada, they had constructed paper mills in Canada. As a result, Canada provided two-thirds of the newsprint tonnage consumed in the United States by 1930.

In 1934, a ton of newsprint cost $40 in New York and Canadian suppliers took full advantage of their near-monopoly. Southern newspapers seized every opportunity to criticize the Canadian manufacturers openly; they contended that the Canadians had allowed a shortage to develop, caused by rising prices. They saw themselves as being penalized by a shortsighted policy on the part of Canadian producers.

Southern publishers were especially hard hit by the rising cost of Canadian newsprint. Their greater distance from the Canadian mills made it necessary for them to pay several dollars a ton more in freight than did publishers in the Northern U.S. Some of the paper from western Canada had to be shipped by a long and circuitous route through the Panama Canal to ports on the Gulf of Mexico, where it was transferred to freight cars for inland deliveries.

Canadian newsprint manufacturers and New York brokers tried to discourage the development of Southern mills. Southern pine, they said, contained too much pitch and resin to be converted into newsprint. Even if the paper could be made from pine, they argued that it would not be satisfactory for modern, high-speed presses.

If the United States was to free itself from Canadian dominance in newsprint production, American paper producers knew they would have to find supplies of cheap wood in the states as well as suitable mill locations. With its rapidly growing forests, cheap labor, low-cost transportation, and ideal mill sites, the South was a logical place for paper mills.

Kurth, like other American newspaper publishers and paper manufacturers, was discouraged by conversations with paper company executives and scientists who believed southern pine wood fiber contained excessive amounts of pine pitch that would gum up paper machines and discolor the newsprint, making it unusable for newspapers.
In 1927, Sidney D. Wells and John D. Rue of the United States Forest Products Laboratory conducted a series of experiments in pulping four varieties of southern pines (loblolly, slash, longleaf, and shortleaf) by four separate pulping processes (soda, sulfite, sulfate, and mechanical). The work indicated that pines would not make newsprint acceptable to newspaper publishers because of their pitch.

When Kurth began to consider building a paper mill, there were no production-integrated paper mills in East Texas and few throughout the state.

In March 1863, the Ninth Texas Legislature chartered the Texas Paper Manufacturing Company to produce paper in an attempt to relieve the acute shortages of newsprint and writing papers during the Civil War. Although the company was incorporated and sold stock, it apparently was soon terminated.

Other attempts were made over the next several decades to produce paper from rags, cornhusks, hemp, cotton and cotton linters, Spanish broom, silkweed, flax, cane bagasse, rice straw and any other fibrous material that was available.

Several efforts to establish paper manufacturing facilities were made in Texas around 1900, including a mill near Houston using bagasse, a byproduct of sugar cane production, and a mill in Orange that made limited quantities of paper from yellow pine. Neither mill was successful. A small Dallas mill made paper from wheat straw, but the founders' inexperience defeated their dreams. John G. Fleming of Philadelphia took over the mill and put it on a productive basis. The mill prospered and its output grew from about eight tons a week to more than 1,000 tons a week by 1943. The mill chiefly produced cardboard, egg cartons, wallpaper, and a variety of building-grade papers.

In 1902 a small Pensacola, Florida, paper mill was moved to Orange, where it became the Yellow Pine Paper Mill. After several experiments, Edward H. Mayo developed a method of making a strong wrapping paper, used to make bags, from pine fiber in 1911. It was the first chemical pulp mill that used southern pine, and marked the first large-scale effort at papermaking in Texas.

The first proposal for a Southern newsprint mill, based on the experimental work by Dr. Charles H. Herty at his Savannah, Georgia, laboratory, emerged in 1934. That year, Major George Berry, president of the Printing Pressmen and Assistant's Union and an official of the National Recovery Administration, outlined a proposal for a mill in the South, a plan endorsed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, to supply the needs of southern newspapers.

In 1936, at a chemurgic conference in Detroit, Michigan, Wirt Davis, a Dallas banker, and Victor Shoffelmayer, the agriculture editor of the Dallas Morning News, were honored for their efforts to promote more commercial use of East Texas pine, for newsprint in particular. Also in 1936, Champion Paper and Fiber Company began construction on a pulp mill in Pasadena. Pulp from the bleached-sulfate pulp mill was shipped to Ohio, where it was manufactured into fine printing papers. The mill later began manufacturing paper at the site in 1940.
Ernest Kurth was already worth well over a million dollars. More than any other man, he had made Angelina County one of the most industrialized counties in Texas. By 1936, he was restless for a new challenge. As Kurth pondered the possibilities of a paper mill in East Texas, the most significant step he took came in March 1936 when he traveled from Keltys to Beaumont to attend a Chamber of Commerce meeting in which business leaders, scientists, and agriculturists explored ways to use Texas' resources to overcome the Depression. Kurth talked with one of the speakers, an aging but crusading Georgia scientist named Charles Holmes Herty, who described his theory in which the onerous pitch problem could be resolved and newsprint made from southern pine fiber.

Fired by Herty's enthusiasm and ideas, Kurth returned to Keltys convinced that there was a way to build and operate a newsprint mill in East Texas. His conviction forever changed the economy, the paper industry, and the newspaper business of Texas and the South.

The son of a pharmacist and Civil War soldier, Herty was born in 1867 at Milledgeville, Georgia. When his father died in 1878, following the death of his wife two years earlier, eleven-year-old Charles and his nine-year-old sister became the wards of their grandmother, Frances Lawler Herty. Herty attended Milledgeville's public schools and the Middle Georgia Military and Agricultural College, where he was graduated in 1884. He then spent two years studying chemistry at the University of Georgia. With the chemistry classes overcrowded, Herty was graduated from the university with a bachelor of philosophy degree. At the urging of his hometown pastor, he decided to continue his education at John Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. On his application, Herty said that he wanted to become a teacher, but he was becoming increasingly intrigued by research. He changed his study fields and completed his Ph.D. in 1890.

In 1891, the University of Georgia hired Herty as an instructor of chemistry, allowing him to focus on research and the publication of several scholarly articles which attracted attention from chemists as far away as California and the Netherlands. Herty spent a sabbatical year in Germany and Switzerland, furthering his training as a chemist. In one of the papers he wrote in Europe, Herty noted that industrialists had used the sulfite process to make paper in parts of Germany where the "tannenbaume" flourished. Perhaps, he speculated, southern pine fiber could be used for a paper industry in Georgia.

When he returned to Georgia, Herty was convinced that the South's existing industries could be improved and expanded to improve the economy. His belief blossomed into a crusade. In 1915, when he was elected president of the American Chemical Society, he continued to raise the possibility of making paper from southern pines and indicated the need for laboratory work on the problem of controlling pitch. By late in 1928 Herty, who had reached the peak of his prominence as a scientist and innovative thinker, began working for the Savannah Industrial Committee. He concluded that timberland owners, if they wanted a perpetual income from their properties, needed a profit-making use for the thinned young pines.
As he traveled around the South, Herty was moved by the plight of farmers whose lands lay idle from the Depression. Young pines were growing naturally as a result of seeds blown from older, adjacent pines. “The development of a white-paper industry in the South could mean the salvation of many farm families,” he said.

In 1930, aware of the widely-held belief that southern pine contained too much resin to make newsprint, Herty began his own research. He found a resin content of about 1.38 percent, nearly the same as spruce. Enthusiastic and excited, he persuaded a paper mill in Pennsylvania to make a small-scale sulfite cook of slash pine. The pulp was bleached easily to newsprint whiteness, adding support for Herty’s beliefs. Herty next arranged to have groundwood pulp made from young slash pine at a paper mill in South Carolina. Again Herty’s experiment was a success and refuted the old contention that pine had a yellow color which would affect paper quality.

Supported by Herty and his Georgia friends, the pulp and paper industry, and Francis P. Garvan’s family-operated Chemical Foundation in New York, in 1931 the Georgia Legislature approved legislation providing $2 million for the establishment of a laboratory in Savannah to conduct research on wood pulp and cellulose under Herty’s direction.

The most important experiment conducted by Herty and his staff took place in the winter of 1933, not in his laboratory, but in a Canadian paper mill. Herty’s Savannah crew prepared a batch of twenty-five tons of air-dried loblolly pine pulp, containing one-fourth sulfite pulp and three-fourths groundwood pulp, and shipped it to Beaver Wood Fiber Company of Thorold, Canada. Herty felt the southern pine pulp should be tried on a fast commercial paper machine before it would be acceptable to the paper industry.

On November 1, 1933, after scrubbing every trace of spruce pulp from a paper machine and loading it with a mix of southern pine sulfite pulp and groundwood pulp, the Thorold crew prepared the crucial test. The milky pulp traveled over the paper machine’s fast-moving forming wire at the machine’s “wet end” and soon a 155-inch-wide sheet began traveling through the machine’s steam-heated drying rolls.

Unable to stay still, Herty followed the sheet as it made its progress through the machine. “My heart almost stood still,” he said as he watched the acid test of years of work.

Finally, the first sheet of southern pine newsprint emerged pure and white, moved from one roll to another, and finally wound on the reel at the “dry end” of the block-long paper machine. Thorold plant manager John Ball examined a piece of newsprint torn from the reel and remarked, “We’re going to lick it, Doctor.” Herty asked that Ball give him the scrap of paper, on which he wrote Ball’s words.

Near midnight Herty was told that the Savannah pulp was almost gone. At 1:45 a.m., the last bit of paper came over the reel and Herty grabbed it for a souvenir. He wrote on the paper two other comments by plant superintendent
Henry Zieman: "Not a break in a carload" and "No sign of pitch anywhere." The paper was shipped to Georgia and distributed to nine daily newspapers in Georgia, who ran simultaneous editions using the Thorold paper on November 30, 1933.

Other Southern newspaper publishers began rallying to the Southern newsprint project. James Stalhman, publisher of the Nashville Banner, was named chairman of a Southern Newspaper Publishers Association (SNPA) committee to explore newsprint production in the South. The committee was organized on June 25, 1934, at Herty's Savannah laboratory and hired an engineering consultant.

Herty traveled to Dallas on May 23, 1935, to address 250 East Texas leaders about the opportunities presented by chemistry. He wrote that the audience was interested in "hooking up chemistry and agriculture, and the possibilities of papermaking" in East Texas. The meeting was arranged by Victor Schofflemayer, who had written a series of articles describing extensive acreage of low-cost pulpwood in East Texas. The articles quoted Ernest Kurth, who contended that East Texas was ripe for a pulp-and-paper mill that could use the younger trees as pulpwood.

Two pivotal meetings in the spring of 1936 helped Kurth enormously.

On April 28, he met Louis Calder, president and principal stockholder in Perkins-Goodwin Company, in New York City. Calder, whose company sold newsprint to newspapers, also had a Southern newsprint mill on his mind and had met Dr. Charles Herty and Francis P. Garvan.

In March, Kurth was present when Dr. Hefty spoke to more than a hundred business, economic, and agricultural leaders in Beaumont, Texas, at a chemurgic conference sponsored by East Texas Chamber of Commerce. While it may not have been their first encounter, it was likely the first time Kurth had heard Herty's newsprint speech in depth.

Hearing Herty in Beaumont altered Kurth's plans for a kraft mill. Conferring with Calder, he learned that the trend of newsprint prices over a period of years would likely be upward while kraft paper prices would probably fall. In subsequent visits with Kurth and Calder at the Savannah laboratory, Herty complained that he had been unable to find "anyone bold enough" to try building a newsprint mill in the South.

Throughout the remainder of 1936 Kurth met with other timbermen in East Texas, his new-found friend Louis Calder, and a number of banker and financial advisors, and discussed the mechanics of newsprint production with Herty and his Savannah laboratory associates. He also met and discussed Southern papermaking with Francis Garvan.

On January 22, 1937, Herty was invited back to Texas, this time to talk to a Dallas gathering of newspaper publishers, bankers, financiers, and lumbermen, including Kurth and his associates from East Texas. The meeting was arranged by E.M. (Ted) Dealey of the Dallas Morning News. Based on commitments for newsprint tonnage by the S.N.P.A. publishers, the group
agreed to move forward with a mill in Texas. As he left the Dallas meeting on January 22, 1937, Herty said: "I have been in a log jam for several years, but it has now been broken by the actions of you Texans. I am a very happy man over the result of our deliberations."

Herty was apparently back in Dallas on March 25, 1937, when a limited number of copies of the Oak Cliff edition of the Dallas Journal was printed on a roll of newsprint from Herty's laboratory. Although the paper was only an experimental sample, it was apparently the first time any southern pine newsprint had been used by a Texas newspaper.

Meanwhile, through his association with R.W. Wortham, Jr., a friend from Paris, Texas, Kurth met Albert Newcombe, a director of Perkins-Goodwin Company. Newcombe became a key negotiator between Calder, Kurth, the South's newspaper publishers, and paper industry officials because of his vast knowledge about papermaking. Newcombe and Kurth had similar personalities — determined, progressive, and visionary. They became good friends.


Following Kurth's discussions of the proposed mill, those attending created an organizational committee consisting of Davis, Adams, Kurth, Temple, and Republic National Bank executive Fred Florence to work with the Chemical Foundation and Perkins-Goodwin Company to decide on an organization and explore financial options.

George F. Hardy, the paper industry's premier engineer, was asked to investigate possible sites for the mill. He surveyed a number of locations within the timbered region of East Texas, including Hemphill, Jefferson, Liberty, Livingston, Newton, Tatum, Palestine, San Augustine, Jasper, Haslam, Conroe, Beaumont, and Lufkin.

There was apparently some conflict between Kurth and Davis over where the mill should be located. In an April 6, 1937, letter to Calder, Newcombe said the final choice had boiled down to a site near Lufkin advocated by Kurth and one near Livingston promoted by Davis, a large forest landowner and
native of the Livingston area. Newcombe wrote that either site was acceptable, but cautioned Calder that "the present controversy between the two important factors [Davis and Kurth] requires the most delicate handling at this stage to maintain both their continued and thorough cooperation ... this is the first time there has been any evidence of divergent interests between these two."

Hardy's study showed Lufkin to be the best site for several reasons, but his decision was likely influenced because of its proximity to Kurth's hometown of Keltys. Knowing of his dominant nature, it is unlikely that Kurth would have allowed the mill to be built too far from his business base.

The initial plans for the paper mill east of Lufkin called for a facility capable of producing 45,000 tons of newsprint and 30,000 tons of kraft pulp per year. The cost was estimated at more than $5 million. When the original plan did not meet with universal acceptance, a new plan was filed with the initial incorporation of Southland Paper Mills, Inc., on May 5, 1937, with the filing of a charter in Austin.

The corporation's name was taken from the prospects that it would sell paper to newspapers "all over the Southland." The incorporators were Davis, Florence, and Newcombe. Following the incorporation, the first meeting of the shareholders was held May 10, 1937, in Dallas, with the election of sixteen directors: Davis, brothers Ernest and Joseph H. Kurth, Jr., Doty, Florence, Adams, R.W. Wortham, Sr., R.W. Wortham, Jr., Newcombe, John R. Alford, Garvan, Ted Dealey, R.W. Kelley, Temple, J.M. West, and Dr. Herty. The board of directors elected Davis president, Kurth vice-president, Adams treasurer, and R.W. Wortham, Jr. secretary.

While Herty was present in Dallas and was proposed as a shareholder, he had little if any involvement in the early affairs of Southland after the meeting. "With the start in Texas," he wrote a friend, "it has been easy to get things going."

Most of the discussion at the meeting in Dallas dealt with plans for financing the company and it was clear that agreement would not come early. Lloyd G. Schenck, who wrote a history of the company in 1943, described the deliberations over the following months: "It became increasingly apparent that there could be no harmonious meeting of minds of all interested parties. But the project was kept alive by Ernest Kurth and his associates." These were Calder and Newcombe of Perkins-Goodwin Company, and several newspaper publishers, including Dealey, Stahlman of Nashville, and E.K. Gaylord of Oklahoma City.

The "closely knit" group Schenck described went on with engineering and financial plans "despite procrastination of others and a growing lack of interest of individuals formerly prominent in the project, and despite many interior obstacles that were seemingly insurmountable." It was not until the opposing interests withdrew from the project that it was possible to concentrate on the details and problems of the mill's engineering and financing.

Because of the "growing lack of interest" by some of the original busi-
nessmen, Southland was rechartered on June 4, 1938, and the original charter was dissolved. The new incorporators were Kurth, his brother Joseph, and Newcombe.

At the first meeting of shareholders, Ernest Kurth was named president, Arthur Temple, Sr. was chosen vice-president, Newcombe was named treasurer, and S.W. Henderson, Jr., one of the owners of Angelina County Lumber Company, was elected secretary. The directors were Kurth and his brother Joseph, Temple, Newcombe, W.C. Trout of Lufkin, Dealey, Gaylord, Dallas attorney Alex Weisberg, and Paul T. Sanderson of Texas Long Leaf Lumber Company, Trinity.

With Southland now a formal corporate entity, Kurth staked everything he owned, except the Kurth home at Keltys, on the prospect of making an unfamiliar product out of virtually untried ingredients in a place where paper had never been made.

The cost of building a pulp mill and paper machine had risen to seven million dollars, a vast sum to raise in the 1930s, even for a man with Ernest Kurth’s substantial fortune. “I beat the bushes. And businessmen ran from me as if I were a wounded cougar,” he told a Collier’s Magazine writer in 1951. “A lot of them said I was a fool ... and would soon be a bankrupt fool.”

In 1937, as he began to plan for the paper mill, one of Kurth’s first contacts was Houston Chronicle publisher Jesse Jones, who headed the New Deal’s Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC). Kurth felt he could secure commitments from newspaper publishers and East Texas timbermen for about $3 million. The RFC was asked for a loan of $3.5 million, slightly less than 50 percent of the capital needs, and in a letter dated November 11, 1937, the agency conditionally agreed to the amount requested. But by the spring of 1938 it became apparent that Southland’s backers could not raise their pledged commitments, and the RFC was asked to raise its commitment to $4 million, or 57.1 percent of the project’s costs.

In September 1938, Kurth and his associates completed a deal with Champion Paper & Fiber Company to supply Southland with chemical-made wood pulp from its mill at Pasadena. By using Champion’s pulp, the Kurth team would avoid having to construct its own chemical pulp mill, lowering the mill’s capital needs to $6 million. At the same time, commitments for stock subscriptions were assured, clearing the way for a practical financing package.

Jesse Jones said the RFC would lend Kurth $3.5 million to add to his own money, if he could match the sum with Texas collateral. Kurth agreed.

In addition to Jesse Jones, Ernest Kurth needed the support of another powerful Texan in Washington, Lyndon B. Johnson, to win approval for his RFC loan. Johnson, one of the strongest proponents of President Roosevelt’s New Deal programs, was on the road to becoming one of the most powerful men in Washington. Because of Kurth’s Republican leanings – his father was a solid Republican who had once lost a race for lieutenant governor on the GOP ticket – he was unsure of the reception he would receive from Democrat
Johnson, but at a meeting in Washington, Johnson agreed to help expedite the RFC loan.

Southland’s supporters began in 1938 to put together the components for building the South’s first southern pine newsprint mill. Kurth found his greatest ally in the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, which for years had tried to generate capital for a Southern newsprint plant. Led by Gaylord of the Oklahoma City Times, Dealey of the Dallas Morning News and Stahlman of the Nashville Banner, the publishers told Kurth: “We’ll take all the newsprint you can produce for the first five years.”


With the RFC loan, Kurth and his associates raised $1.6 million in cash subscriptions. Angelina County Lumber Company, Southern Pine Lumber Company, and Texas Long Leaf Lumber Company provided 108,000 acres of timberland valued at $7.50 per acre. Southland gave the companies 40,500 units of preferred-common stock for the lands. Southern Pine Lumber Company of Texarkana and Diboll gave the largest block of lands, some 40,000 acres. Other large blocks of timberland were added to Southland’s holdings in the 1940s and 1950s.

A construction contact was signed late in 1938 with Merritt, Chapman & Scott Corporation Company, which had built three paper mills in the South. The contract was approved when Southland’s board of directors held its first meeting in Lufkin on January 9, 1939. George F. Hardy was chosen as the engineer and Tom A. Wark, general manager of Watab Paper Company of Minnesota and a forty-five-year veteran in the paper industry, was selected as the mill’s general manager.

In 1939, Charles H. Herty’s crusade for a Southern newsprint mill was coming to an end. So was his life. In June, he suffered the first in a series of heart attacks. He admitted in a letter to a friend, “I overtaxed myself somewhat during the past two or three weeks.” Just five months before his seventy-first birthday, on July 17, 1938, Herty died of another heart attack. “He died a happy man; he knew Lufkin would build his newsprint mill,” said his former assistant, Dr. Charles Carpenter, who later came to Lufkin to become Southland’s chief chemist. Even though he was no longer there, Herty’s greatest legacy to his beloved South was just beginning. On January 14, 1939, his lifelong dream of a Southern newsprint mill began to materialize as Kurth, Calder, Southern newspaper publishers, and Herty’s colleagues from his Savannah laboratory, gathered east of Lufkin on a 240-acre site once used as a corn field and broke ground for Southland Paper Mills, Inc. Kurth turned the first shovel of dirt.

Construction began on March 14 and the mill was dedicated on May 27, 1939, even though it was only partially finished. During the ceremonies, the site was named Herty and Kurth unveiled a large plaque bearing the likeness...
of Herty and Francis P. Garvan, his Chemical Foundation benefactor. The inscription read: "The first plant for making commercial newsprint paper from southern yellow pine. This institution is the fruit of the genius and devotion of two great Americans, Francis Patrick Garvan and Charles Holmes Herty."

In 1939, Texas had only one major paper mill – the Pasadena facility of Champion Paper and Fiber Company. Consequently, there were few experienced papermakers available in the state to operate Kurth's emerging newsprint venture in Lufkin. At the same time, with no newsprint mills in the South, few Southern papermakers had newsprint production experience. For the few who did, Kurth's newsprint project was seen as too risky.

Kurth turned to Norman Lewis Beaudry of River Bend, Ontario, a French Canadian known in the paper industry as an able troubleshooter. "If they had problems, Daddy went in, straightened them out, and we moved to another mill," said his daughter, Norma Beaudry Bennett. "That was what he did best, moving from one mill to another." Beaudry remained with Southland as its first papermaking superintendent until the mill made its first paper and then returned to Canada with his family.

Many Canadians also came to Lufkin to work for Tom Wark. Surrey Slater, who managed a major newsprint mill in Canada, brought in additional Canadian workers. So did Walter McHale, who succeeded Slater. Dick Witherell, Southland's groundwood superintendent, was a native of Minnesota and the son of a Northern U.S. papermaker. Witherell arrived in Lufkin in November 1939, driving a 1936 Chevrolet coupe. "It took twenty-four quarts of oil to keep that ol' jenny running between Minnesota and Lufkin," he said.

The Canadians and Northern papermakers who came to Lufkin in the 1930s were largely union members. "When they came here, there wasn't a union anywhere in Angelina County, and hardly within the state," said retired personnel manager Robbie Warren. "When they started the mill, the men met in the Angelina County Courthouse and organized themselves in a group and started having their first union meetings. They also began negotiating with the company. But there were no bitter feelings between the company and the unions," said Warren.

Most of the arriving Canadians were French Canadians and spoke French. They brought to Lufkin new names such as Coty, Besner, Ballenger, Beaudry, LaBarr, Benoit, and Pelkey. Some applied for American citizenship after living in Texas for a few years.

In addition to the Canadians, Southland hired many of the laborers who had helped build the mill while working for Merritt, Chapman & Scott. Most of these were residents of Angelina County and the surrounding area.

Experienced workers in the paper mill usually were hired for about fifty cents an hour; inexperienced hands received thirty-five cents. Most workers dreamed of eventually getting a job working on the paper machine, which had its own peculiar system of employment. Because the machinery was complicated, six men were required for each of three shifts. They included a
machine tender, a back tender, and four others—a third hand, a fourth hand, a fifth hand, and a sixth hand, the lowest position.

James W. Moynihan, who was seventeen when he began working in the mill, worked the graveyard shift from midnight to 8 a.m., for thirty-five cents an hour. "I was working in the technical lab and soon got a chance to work as a sixth hand on the paper machine."

By the end of December 1939, the paper mill was completed and the machinery was tested. On Sunday, January 20, the first printable rolls of southern pine newsprint were produced at the paper mill and delivered to the Lufkin Daily News on Monday to see how it would perform on a newspaper press.

While it pleased Lufkin residents, Southland's decision to run its first commercial rolls on the presses of the Lufkin Daily News irritated E.M. (Ted) Dealey, the Dallas Morning News executive who had been among Southland's earlier champions. On January 27 he wrote to Ernest Kurth: "I am not mad, but I am terribly hurt. For a year the Dallas News was promised the first newspaper in the country to print on the product of Southland Paper Mills, Inc., would be the Dallas News. And yet here, the Lufkin paper slips one by us by printing its issue of the 23rd on East Texas pine." Kurth quickly made amends. He had the mill ship two boxcars load of paper to the Dallas Morning News pressroom the following week.

Charles Carpenter said while the Southland newsprint's only virtue in the beginning was its ability to stay on the press without excessive breaks, the mill soon began to make improvements in manufacturing a good sheet of newsprint on a high-volume, commercial basis, but only after converting its wood-grinding stones to a finer grit and solving a pitch (resin) problem.

The pine pitch issue plagued the mill for nearly two years. The pitch would accumulate on the papermaking equipment after long, continuous runs. "Day after day, I spent six hours scraping pitch off the press roll," recalled James Moynihan.

While Herty's laboratory work indicated the pitch would not be a serious problem, the problems faced in a daily production environment were different, and Southland's technical crews had to look beyond Herty's research for solutions. Papermakers had to use kerosene to wipe the pitch from the paper machine's innards, and it was such a problem that bucket brigades often carried away pitch accumulating on the paper machine's granite roll and scraped off by a "doctor blade" attachment on the granite roll. "But the mill couldn't survive with this system," said Carpenter.

In kraft pulp mills elsewhere in the South, the pitch wasn't a problem because the digesters used to produced the kraft "cooked out" the pitch and rendered it harmless.

After two years of extensive experimentation, the mill's employees learned to solve the pitch problem by experimenting with the proper use of
alum and caustic soda. Fred Bishop, a Southland chemist, said the control of these conditions with the addition of alum took "a tremendous amount of fine tuning," particularly because the Southland paper machine was running at speeds faster than other machines in the industry.

As the years passed, Southland's papermakers grew more proficient in making paper from southern pine, but the Canadian industry was still berating the Lufkin mill as a upstart. Some Canadians, however, were warning that the Lufkin mill should not be ignored. In a paper presented to an industry meeting on October 22, 1948, in Atlanta, Georgia, McHale credited Southland's work force with solving the mill's early problems: "The original idea of a newsprint mill was conceived by a few industrial leaders, but the ultimate execution of the project was made possible by the combined efforts of many hands, many hearts, and many minds."

Pitser Garrison remembers that the paper mill started an economic turnaround in East Texas. "All over the area, there was a tremendous amount of pulpwood timber, but we lacked the manufacturing facilities to utilize it," recalled Garrison. "The startup of the mill in Lufkin not only provided a market for the pulpwood, but created hundreds of new jobs, both in the mill and in the woods, during a time when they were critically needed."

Despite the early problems in the 1940s, Southland's employees were enthusiastic about their jobs, took pride in what they were doing, and worked as a team. Carpenter recalled an example: "One night around three in the morning, we had a breakdown and I was out with the maintenance crew to get the repairs made. Frank Rivenbark, one of the pipefitters, turned to me and said, 'Doc, we're all in this together and we gotta make it go.'"

Built during World War II, Southland Paper Mills, Inc. faced a series of unique challenges in its efforts to continue operations at the Lufkin mill. As early as 1941, Ernest Kurth was convinced the mill needed its own chemical (kraft) pulping facilities to lower the mill's costs. After only one year, Southland's five-year contract to purchase chemical pulp from Champion Paper & Fiber Company's Pasadena, Texas, paper mill had proven unsatisfactory. Kurth approached the War Protection Board for permission to build its own chemical pulp mill since industrial projects were being monitored by the government. But on December 16, 1942, the WPB rejected Southland's proposal, as well as a second newsprint machine, because they were not essential to the war effort.

Kurth suspected that his competitors in the newsprint industry were behind the rejection and sought help from several influential politicians in Washington, including Lyndon B. Johnson, who intervened on Southland's behalf with the WPB. Southland was able to add a chemical pulp mill and bleach plant in 1944 at a cost of $3 million.

When Southland incurred labor shortages among its pulpwood crews, Kurth began inquiring about using POW labor from internment camps in East Texas. He wrote Colonel J.R. Carvolth, commander of a POW camp in Walker County, and his request for laborers was approved. Southland and Southern
Pine Lumber Company leased a Civilian Conservation Corps camp from the United States Forest Service located four miles north of Lufkin on U.S. Highway 69. The Camp Lufkin POWs began cutting pulpwood early in 1944.

"They sent us Italians at first," said woodyard superintendent Eldridge Ryman. "It was impossible to work them; they wouldn't work, and wouldn't do anything but pout. So we sent them back and they sent us Germans. They were satisfactory. You didn't work them; they worked themselves," he said.

The German prisoners in Lufkin far exceeded the expectations of the people at Southland. They were also used to unload boxcars at the paper mill and worked in the woodyard.

Kurth never forgot Lyndon B. Johnson for his help in Washington during the war years. Johnson repeatedly came through with war-time certificates for Southland when they were needed. Whenever Johnson ran for re-election, Kurth always reminded his Texas business associates and Lufkin businessmen: "Look, you fellahs need to vote for this man; he saved our neck."

In the 1940s, as Kurth was battling the cancer that would eventually take his voice and then his life, he was working on Southland's expansion. In 1943 he asked engineer George F. Hardy to estimate the costs of a second newsprint machine, but the project was delayed during the war years. The project—which consisted of a machine capable of making 210 tons of paper a day—was scheduled for completion in 1947, but strikes in the steel industry, as well as allied industries, caused delays in materials and equipment, pushing the completion date to 1948. The No. 2 newsprint machine began making paper on March 29, 1948. Its production of 190 tons a day doubled the mill's capacity and was instrumental in record production, earnings, and income for Southland in 1948. In March 1953, Southland produced its one millionth ton of newsprint.

Having overcome its struggles to become one-of-a-kind industry in Texas and the South, Southland was now an integral part of Lufkin and East Texas. Lufkinites were so entrenched in the mill's success that they simply called it "the paper mill," a nickname that stuck with the mill for the rest of its life, regardless of who owned it.

In 1948, Kurth reported sales totaling $13,527,273, compared with $1,461,635 in 1940. The company's net income totaled $2,893,452, compared with a loss of $33,861 in 1940. Southland was on its way to becoming one of America's most successful paper companies.

The company completed a third newsprint machine in 1956 with an output of about 235 tons of newsprint a day and up to 270 tons a day of specialty papers. The machine further established Southland as a serious competitor to Canadian newsprint interests.

Almost immediately after the No. 3 paper machine was completed, Southland began work on a fourth paper machine at Lufkin to meet increased newsprint demands. The No. 4 project brought to the forefront another Kurth at Southland. Melvin E. Kurth, Jr., the only son of Ernest Kurth's attorney
brother in Houston, had worked a few months at Southland in the summer of 1950 to develop his engineering skills. When he finished his college education, he landed a job with Lockwood, Andrews & Newnam, a Houston engineering company. Kurth spent his time in Lufkin creating engineering drawings for the new No. 4 paper machine. Located in a Brown & Root Construction Company shack, he had little contact with his uncle or other Southland executives.

Completed in 1958, No. 4 was capable of producing nearly 340 tons of newsprint a day and was one of the world’s most modern newsprint machines.

Southland’s success at Lufkin soon precipitated widespread growth in the South’s newsprint industry. In the 1950s, other newsprint mills blossomed. Among them were Coosa River Newsprint in 1950; Bowater Paper Corporation, which established mills in Tennessee in 1955 and South Carolina in 1959; International Paper Company, which installed a newsprint unit in 1956 at its Mobile, Alabama, plant and built a new newsprint mill at Pine Bluff, Arkansas, in 1958; and Cox Newsprint, which opened a new mill in Augusta, Georgia, in 1966. “Thus did the Lufkin mill’s pioneering work pave the way for a burgeoning of newsprint production,” wrote Jack P. Ogden of the Forest History Society, Inc., in 1990.

In 1967, Southland added a second newsprint mill at Sheldon, near Houston, and became America’s second largest newsprint manufacturer.

In 2002, as the South’s pioneer paper mill celebrated the sixty-second anniversary of its startup, it remained firmly entrenched as an example of the entrepreneurship spirit that has made American industry a model for the world.

The heroes in Southland’s remarkable success story are numerous.

• Dr. Charles Holmes Herty spent most of his life trying to convince government and industry officials that quality newsprint could be made from the southern pines abundantly growing from Georgia to Texas.

• Ernest Lynn Kurth, the hard-driving lumberman from Keltys, Texas, also dreamed of building a paper mill, but it wasn’t until he met Herty in 1936 that he became enamored of newsprint as a product arising from the young pine forests of his homeland.

• Francis Patrick Garvan, whose family-operated Chemical Foundation made it a mission to free America from its dependence on foreign chemical makers and seized upon Herty’s Southern paper mill idea as the means to broaden his campaign for American industrial independence.

• Louis Calder, the New Yorker who rose Horatio Alger-like from the office boy of a paper sales company to its president and principal owner, was convinced that a Southern newsprint mill would broaden the South’s paper industry and enhance its economy.

• Newspaper publishers George Bannerman Dealey and his son E.M. (Ted) Dealey of Dallas and Edward King Gaylord of Oklahoma City, who pioneered the newspaper industries in their states, wanted to loosen the stran-
glehold foreign newspaper manufacturers held on the newspaper business in the South and Southwest. Their meetings with Herty, Kurth, Garvan and Calder led to Southland’s initial incorporation.

• Like most people, Arthur Temple, Sr., who had inherited his father’s lumbering empire in Texas, did not have much cash in the Depression, but he gave 40,000 acres of his family’s timberlands – more than any other timberman/investor – and became a founding director and officer. When his son, Arthur, Jr., decided to leave Southland in 1961, the family could have sold its stock to outside interests. Instead, the stock was sold to Southland, protecting the company’s independence for another sixteen years.

• The men and women who came to work for Southland in Lufkin in the 1930s were simply looking for decent jobs during the Depression, but they became heroes as much as Southland’s creators by overcoming the enormity of making Southland’s one-of-a-kind paper mill succeed when the experts said it would not work.

What made Southland succeed?

Melvin E. Kurth, Jr., Southland’s third and last president from 1973 to 1977, believes it was a matter of pride on the part of Southland’s founders and the men and women who constituted the Lufkin work force.

“For the most part, the people who worked at Lufkin were hard-working, honest and dedicated people who had a feeling that they had become part of something different in America,” said Kurth. “They wanted the Lufkin mill to succeed; they wouldn’t accept failure.”

Southland’s founders were men who were willing to risk their fortunes on an unproved industrial process. “The risks were enormous,” said Kurth. “The New York banks, who controlled America at that time, were reluctant to provide any financing, and the people who ran the major paper companies were skeptical that newsprint could be made from trees that had excessive amounts of pitch and resin.”

Charles Carpenter, the mill’s first chemist and former ally of Dr. Herty, had a similar observation in 1989 when he was interviewed by historian Bobby Johnson. Carpenter said that Dr. Herty’s work was done in Georgia, and the scientist had talked to Georgia state officials about a newsprint mill there. “But it took something the Georgians didn’t have...there was something in Texas that was catching. I can’t see the mill being established in any place except Texas.”
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*When Paper Came To East Texas*, symposium sponsored by the East Texas Historical Association and the Pineywoods Foundation, November 7, 1998, Lufkin, Texas.
Early accounts of East Texas almost always included descriptions of the thick forests of stately pines that covered the land. Modern East Texas residents and visitors might conjure different images of the region, but the sight and scent of pine trees remain inseparable from most impressions. Yet a mere seventy years ago East Texas almost lost its claim to this sublime forest image, as well as its economic foundations as both a lumber producer and a recreation center. By 1932 most of the long-leaf pine throughout the eastern part of the state and central Texas, plus much of the native hardwood, had been felled, cut into lumber, and shipped throughout North America to supply a decades-long building and furniture boom.

By the time the Great Depression ended this frenzy early in the 1930s, the vast forests of East Texas had nearly disappeared. While conservation of Texas forests had been discussed and envisioned for years, little replanting or erosion control had been practiced following the clear-cutting practices of private lumber companies who viewed forests as non-renewable resources and one-time investments.

Federal government officials debated conservation on public lands for decades before the 1930s. With the support of President Theodore Roosevelt and his chief forester, Gifford Pinchot, early in the 1900s, the powerful Forest Service Bureau of the U.S. Department of Agriculture successfully managed and restored dwindling timber reserves in the far western United States. But Pinchot and his immediate successors inspired only nominal efforts on non-federal lands, including those managed by the fledgling Texas Forest Service, which was founded in 1915 and began acquiring small experimental forests in East Texas in 1924.1

The earlier federal debate under Theodore Roosevelt exposed a conflict in federal land management between “conservation” and “preservation.” The former was a utilitarian philosophy that called for resources to be used, or conserved if necessary, to provide the greatest benefit for the most people for the longest possible time. The latter philosophy centered on aesthetic preservation and was best exemplified by the handful of national parks, including Yellowstone and Yosemite, carved primarily out of western federal lands and forests prior to Roosevelt’s administration. TR saw merit in both philosophies and officially nurtured both national forests and national parks, particularly the concept of public access and recreation within the park preserves.

When President Woodrow Wilson created the National Park Service in 1916, control of public visitation loomed as one of the new bureau’s greatest challenges. For the next several years federal forest and park interests – one based on conservation philosophy, the other firmly grounded in aesthetic

---
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preservation — suspended their debates and battles over presidential and congressional favors. The park service developed standard access and preservation practices on its lands and offered to aid state parks agencies in forging similar practices. At the same time, the USDA Forest Service became the national standard setter in its own field of conservation, likewise extending cooperation to state forestry agencies whenever possible.

In Texas this assistance and cooperation took the form of friendly advice from the federal agencies. Since the state included no federal lands, due to the terms of annexation — the former republic's land and debt were retained as joint collateral of statehood — its own institutions best reflected the progressive practices of the federal agencies. The Texas Forest Service exchanged information with the USDA, and the Texas State Parks Board fraternized with the National Park Service through annual meetings of the National Conference on State Parks.

During the 1920s, the Texas Forest Service, so named after 1926, enjoyed more success than the State Parks Board, created in 1923, in acquiring public land. The state forest service annexed its first two "state forests" in East Texas in 1924 as small conservation demonstration areas, and added a few more over the next several years. In contrast, the legislature's interest in "state parks," for session after biennial session, consisted mainly of discussions about merging the State Parks Board with the Texas Highway Department or, in at least one study, with the Texas Forest Service.

These state agency problems of recognition, land acquisition, and funding seemed minor after the New York stock market crash of 1929. The Texas Forest Service could not reverse the effects of failing lumber companies and over-cut lands, and the State Parks Board could only celebrate hollow victories through a handful of designations. In 1931, for example, Senator Margie Elizabeth Neal of Carthage passed a bill that declared all state-owned property beneath pine-and-cypress-framed Caddo Lake a "public park," though without funding or assignment to any particular agency.

By 1932 the economic depression had worsened, and President Herbert Hoover reluctantly cooperated with Congress on direct unemployment relief. That summer Hoover and Speaker of the U. S. House of Representatives John Nance Garner of Uvalde agreed that the newly-created Reconstruction Finance Corporation (RFC) should extend extraordinary federal relief funds to state and local governments. Texas Governor Ross Shaw Sterling simply passed these dollars along to county welfare boards, who immediately employed local men on civic projects, including park improvement and tree planting.

Hoover and Sterling, still optimistically expecting the depression to end soon, failed to grasp the potential of federal work relief and its positive effects on a ravaged electorate. At least two eager politicians across the nation understood the gravity: the governor of New York, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and former governor of Texas, Miriam Amanda Wallace Ferguson. In July, Roosevelt pledged a "new deal" for the American people, based in part on vague references to conservation and employment of youth. In August,
Ferguson drubbed Sterling in the Democratic primary -- the only election that mattered in one-party Texas at the time -- largely on a platform of supporting Roosevelt's last-ditch solution of massive federal assistance. Following his election landslide in November, FDR set about defining his program, dispatching Rexford Tugwell to the USDA Forest Service. Tugwell and veteran foresters discussed the creation of a corps of unemployed young men to work on federal lands. Governor Ferguson took office in January 1933 and created the Texas Relief Commission to channel RFC funds to appropriate agencies and prepare for the new president's additional programs. Within two weeks of his inauguration in March, Roosevelt proposed an employment plan for "useful work in forest improvements," and called it the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Rather than create a new federal bureau, Roosevelt directed that the CCC fall under the direction of existing cabinet agencies. As the program was envisioned, the Labor Department would enroll young men aged eighteen through twenty-five, the War Department would gather the recruits at existing Army posts, then send them to work on projects supervised by the Department of Agriculture's Forest Service and the Interior Department's new Soil Erosion Service. Forest Service officials quickly argued that work should be authorized beyond federal lands, since some seventy percent of unemployed young men lived east of the Mississippi River and ninety-five percent of the federal domain lay in the Rocky Mountains and western states.

Telegrams flashed from Washington, D.C., to governors across the nation, requesting lists of possible CCC work assignments. Strongly influenced by the Texas Forest Service and other well-organized agencies, Ferguson replied that as many as 120 camps of 200 men each could be assigned to forestry, flood control, and soil erosion projects across the state. Having no federal lands, Texas stood to benefit greatly from the CCC's extension to state and local property as well as certain private tracts of land.

As this vast program gained momentum toward nationwide enrollment of 250,000, Forest Service officials admitted that they did not have the resources to transport so many men to distant work sites. Chief Forester Robert Y. Stuart begged for yet another policy adjustment, and soon Roosevelt granted the Army authority to transport, as well as feed, clothe, and house CCC enrollees in remote camps. With some $300 million from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Army also served as paymaster for its charges, supplying a decades-old standard unskilled wage of $1 per day. Other quick changes to the program brought it in line with the government's progressive forty-hour work week, reserved ten percent of the CCC jobs for unemployed war veterans of any age, and allotted another ten percent to "colored" African American recruits. CCC administrators hired an additional 25,000 "local experienced men," including out-of-work foresters and lumbermen, to direct the work relief projects.

"You may be interested to know," CCC director Robert Fechner wrote to Governor Ferguson early in May, "that the President has approved" four forest
projects in Texas. The initial work camps were established on State Forest Number One in Newton County and on three private, cut-over lumber tracts scattered throughout six other East Texas counties. In mid May the San Antonio Light described the cooperative efforts of the Army, federal forest administrators, and state forestry officials to open these “first camps for tree army workers in Texas” rapidly.11

The early “tree army” moniker revealed the minor role played by the Interior Department and reflected the low priority Texas placed on state park proposals for its first CCC camps. Although Interior’s fledgling Soil Erosion Service, moved to Agriculture in 1935 as the Soil Conservation Service,12 found a strong reception in CCC planning, the National Park Service initially seemed to play no part in the windfall outdoor labor program. But soon the park service gleefully reignited its old rivalry with the Forest Service. Taking full advantage of that bureau’s stumble after its early attempt to dominate the CCC, the National Park Service captured a large CCC quota for its own parklands. Simultaneously, the agency prepared to assist state parks organizations nationwide directly with state-park planning.

Park service officials reviewed a number of potential sites identified by the Texas Relief Commission, since the State Parks Board had not yet awakened to these opportunities. On June 5, Army Reserve Captain Waller K. Boggs, acting for the state and the National Park Service, joined Harrison and Marion county citizens inspecting Caddo Lake. Smitten by the rustic, pine-scented setting, Boggs declared that “nature has provided a park in the rough, and it requires only the hand of man to make it one of the outstanding beauty spots in the Southwest.” On June 17, CCC Company 889 arrived at Karnack by train from Fort Sill, Oklahoma. On 468 acres donated by local landowners including Thomas Jefferson Taylor, father of Claudia “Lady Bird” Taylor, the men began work on “SP-1-T,” the first official New Deal state park project in Texas.13

CCC projects in Texas parks and forests strongly resembled each other, at least in their early development. Work on forest lands included scrub clearing, erosion control, access roads, and the planting of vast areas with loblolly pine, considered an ideal tree for lumber yield in relatively short term of growth. Park work at Caddo Lake and other sites included the same pine-reforestation formula, but with the fast-growing loblolly intended more permanently to shade recreation campgrounds instead of logging camps.

The National Park Service also extended its preservation philosophy to identifying and replanting native species in appropriate places. Landscape architect E.K. McGinnis of Dallas, one of hundreds of professionals hired to guide CCC work in Texas, delivered speeches on the topic to community groups. For Bonham State Park, McGinnis described transplanting “pecans, red oak, red cedar, hackberry and other shrubs as redbud, coralberry, sumac, yucca and many other plants which are ... suitable for carrying out the naturalistic park planting.” He added that, at appropriate state parks, “an attempt will be made to get a start of bluebonnets as the bluebonnet is the State Flower.”14
Caddo Lake State Park took years to complete, with CCC work continuing through 1937. The talented enrollees created a recreation icon for the region and conserved an invaluable ecosystem as a public campground and outdoor classroom. As the State Parks Board and National Park Service partnership matured through the 1930s, the CCC developed more than thirty-two state parks, the majority in central and West Texas.

Fortunately other East Texas state park projects followed the Caddo Lake model, with the CCC eventually creating pine-shaded recreation grounds near Daingerfield (1935-1940), Tyler (1935-1941), and Huntsville (1937-1942). State Forest Number Five, or Mission State Forest near Weches in Houston County, received a CCC camp in 1935 whose occupants built a small recreation area and a log-cabin allegory of Mission San Francisco de los Tejas. This state forest was transferred to the parks board in 1957 as Mission Tejas State Park. All of these projects involved replanting and rehabilitating abused pine forests and eroded soils, thus combining conservation efforts with the recreation master plans for each park. These projects seemed small, however, in comparison to others. Between 1935 and 1942 the USDA Forest Service bought and converted abandoned private timber cuts in East Texas into two massive conservation reserves: Davy Crockett National Forest, 161,842 acres in Houston and Trinity counties; and Sam Houston National Forest, 161,508 acres in Montgomery, San Jacinto, and Walker counties. A number of Texas Forest Service facilities received CCC improvements and reforestation efforts as well. In these combined projects the CCC enrollees planted millions of trees, built hundreds of miles of fences and fire breaks, and constructed several rustic public recreation grounds.

Political disputes and land-ownership questions caused CCC camps to come and go from both park and forest projects over the nine-year New Deal era that ended six months after the United States entered the World War II. But the U.S. departments of Agriculture and Interior each carried out ambitious programs with their assigned quotas of CCC companies, and accomplished nothing short of saving the East Texas forests and countless other endangered environments across the nation. The respective state agencies that cooperated with the CCC and federal experts achieved a maturity of management that survives today.

The old intergovernmental rivalry between agencies espousing natural resource conservation and those promoting preservation ultimately benefited Texas and other states. As the federal forest and park services each tried to outdo the other, they ironically discovered recreation as a pursuit common to both their missions. Their roads, buildings, water systems, and sweeping landscape projects share a common rustic appearance built to last indefinitely. And their associated pine-studded landscapes are now inseparable from the forested image of East Texas.
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On December 14, 1944, the Seventy-Eighth United States Congress passed a bill that authorized the transfer of 2,560 acres in Nacogdoches County, Texas, to the research branch of the United States Forest Service (USFS). This land became the Stephen F. Austin Experimental Forest (SFAEF) on September 19, 1945. One of eighty-one federal experimental forests and ranges nationally, it is the only one of its kind in Texas. Located seven miles west of Nacogdoches, three quarters of the Forest consists of bottomland hardwood forests along the Angelina River and the remainder of mixed pine and hardwood uplands.

The Forest is becoming increasingly recognized as a regional recreational destination and educational laboratory, but in past decades it was principally a site for forest research. Topics of primary study have evolved with shifts in need, legislation, and public interest in forestlands. Research during the forest's first fifteen years emphasized silvicultural studies for the improvement of southern pine species through the control of hardwood species. Beginning in 1961, scientists overseeing the forest at the Forest Service's Wildlife Habitat and Silviculture Lab (WHSL) in Nacogdoches reoriented research toward the study of wildlife habitat and nutrition, with an emphasis on white-tailed deer. In subsequent years research expanded to nongame wildlife, including threatened, sensitive, and endangered species. The history of the Stephen F. Austin Experimental Forest reveals how closely East Texans have always been to the natural resources, especially the forests, of the region.

Due to the physical barriers posed by the dense forests of East Texas, railways arrived later and commerce developed more slowly than in other areas of the state. Even after the Civil War and Reconstruction, settlement was scattered and isolated. During most of this period the region's economy stagnated and provided only limited opportunities to its citizens. Not until the 1880s, when entrepreneur Paul Bremond, a New York native and Galveston transplant, established the Houston, East and West Texas Railroad (HE&WT) was the region able to take advantage of its abundant natural resources, especially timber, and generate capital for further enterprises. Started in Houston in 1875, the HE&WT bisected the forest lands of East Texas through Corrigan, Livingston, Lufkin, Nacogdoches, and ultimately to Logansport and Shreveport, Louisiana. The rail line was completed in 1886, and soon thereafter the forests of East Texas assumed a more prominent place in the economy of the region.

Forests attracted considerable attention throughout the country at this time, but most of it focused on the timberlands in the West. Even as the East
Texas lumber industry boomed, concerns about dwindling forest resources dominated national policy debates. The 1890s were watershed years for the development of forest conservation in America. Two laws passed during this decade, the Forest Reserve Act of 1891 and the Forest Management Act of 1897, laid the foundations for the National Forest System. Since the passage of the Forest Reserve Act the federal government and the USFS have played integral roles in managing and conserving timberlands. The original western national forests were set aside to ameliorate a predicted timber famine and protect watersheds after 1900. They were carved out of public domain and cost the federal government nothing save lost sales revenue. But the Forest Reserve Act only allowed presidents to designate land within the federal domain as forest reserves. Over fifteen years presidents Benjamin Harrison (1889-1893), Grover Cleveland (1893-1897), William McKinley (1897-1901), and Theodore Roosevelt (1901-1909) set aside more than ninety-four million acres as forest reserves, renamed national forests in 1907.

In 1905 Congress created the Forest Service within the U.S. Department of Agriculture to administer these lands. Gifford Pinchot, a professionally-trained forester, was appointed as the first Forest Service Chief that same year. Pinchot had been largely responsible for the Forest Reserve Act in 1891 and remained one of the nation’s foremost proponents of scientific management of natural resources. Pinchot installed a system of scientific research stations in the western forests. Initially, national forests were a distinctly western phenomenon. The original thirteen colonies – and, notably, Texas – retained their public lands upon joining the United States, and most other states east of the Mississippi had long since seen their public domain sold off under various land dispersal acts during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The lack of federal landholdings in these states made it impossible for the federal government to establish national forests under the Forest Reserve Act, which limited such reserves to the federal domain. So national forests outside the West were assembled primarily from private tracts of cut-over forests or abandoned farmsteads. Most were brought into the system through federal relief funds during and after the years of the Great Depression for forest rehabilitation and rural economic relief. The Stephen F. Austin Experimental Forest was created in just such a fashion.

In 1910, Guy Arthur Blount and his wife, Lois Foster Blount, purchased and consolidated several small tracts of private land west of Nacogdoches. Originally surveyed and claimed by B.M. Hall, J.L. Pettyjohn, B.F. Whitaker, L. Tubbe, and J.I. Acosta, these parcels of mixed pines and hardwoods – both along the Angelina River as well as the upland tracts – were close enough to the HE&WT tracks to make it likely that the mature forests had been cleared during the early years of the timber boom. By the time the Blounts acquired the acreage the upland portion had been planted in cotton, and the consolidated holdings became known as the Blount Farm.

Guy Blount appears to have been a civic-minded individual as concerned about the economic well-being of East Texas as with his own. Over the years he served as a director of Commercial National Bank, director of the Nacog-
doches Grocery Company, president of the Nacogdoches Chamber of Commerce, and founded the Sabine-Neches Conservation District. Discussions pertaining to watershed protection and timber and soil conservation early in the 1900s could not have escaped such a public-minded citizen and business leader. Blount certainly would not have ignored the growing concern about, and need for, resource conservation. In fact, from early manhood, Blount expressed an interest in protecting the soil and timber resources regionally and throughout the state. On his own land in Nacogdoches County he practiced the best conservation methods known at the time and "never tired of showing his fellow citizens and neighbors how his conservation practices had paid dividends."4 Exactly what his practices were, and to what degree he utilized them, remains unknown; nonetheless, he appears to have been a thoughtful land steward, legitimately concerned with soil conservation for a man of his time.

In 1934, with the cotton market collapsed and economic depression entrenched throughout the nation, Blount sold his land for $60,000 to the State of Texas to provide small farm units for relief applicants.5 Typically, the state purchased such lands to reduce the oversupply of cotton and to rehabilitate soil exhausted by one-crop farming. Remaining under state ownership for only five years, the land was transferred to the federal government in 1939. As the Nacogdoches Farm Project of the Farm Security Administration under the U.S. Department of Agriculture's War Food Administration, it became the site of a National Youth Administration (NYA) camp dedicated primarily to teaching young men dairy farming. Often confused with the Civilian Conservation Corps of the same period, the NYA (established June 26, 1935), was a New Deal agency founded to improve the vocational skills of younger boys and girls not reached by the CCC. NYA camps offered enrollees a six-month residency and experiential education in improved agricultural techniques.6 The only remaining evidence of the NYA camp is the cement foundation of a dairy barn which sits under the Butler Building near the forest Headhouse.

With the onset of war in 1941, the federal government liquidated many of its New Deal-era assets. Among these were the NYA facilities on the tract west of Nacogdoches by now commonly referred to as "the old Blount farm." Shortly thereafter the land itself was offered for sale, but failed to attract a buyer. In 1944, the land was transferred by act of Congress to Forest Service management as the Stephen F. Austin Experimental Forest, part of the Angelina National Forest.

The catalyst for this transfer was the small teachers' college located in Nacogdoches. From its inception, Texas' only current federal experimental forest was closely linked to Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College (renamed Stephen F. Austin State University in 1969, and for simplicity referred to here as SFA). Founded in 1923, SFA was established by the Texas legislature to improve economic and educational conditions in Deep East Texas. Texas Senators W. Edgar Thomason, Nat Patton, and Eugene H. Blount were instrumental in making Nacogdoches the site of the college, overcoming challenges from regional competitors such as Tyler, Longview, and Lufkin.7 Over the following two decades, the college became an important teacher training school."
Dr. Paul L. Boynton, a professor of psychology at the George Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee, became the second president of Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College in 1942. Boynton soon realized that in East Texas economic growth was closely linked to the development of forest-related industries. Boynton believed that the college, if able to acquire adequate facilities and an experienced faculty, could become the leading forest conservation and agricultural training center in Texas. The determination of Boynton and local lumberman Lacy Hunt, both of whom lobbied the U.S. Congress to establish the experimental forest in 1944, made it possible for SFA to expand its role in East Texas and become the site of Texas’ first school of forestry.

Almost immediately, Boynton and Hunt discovered a potential obstacle. Texas A&M University officials believed that their institution was better suited to launch a forestry program. Texas A&M was already a university of considerable size with strong academic credentials and an established record of agricultural research and instruction. Boynton and Hunt, however, claimed that SFA had immediate access to an essential resource that Texas A&M did not — nearby forests. The Angelina, Sabine, and Davy Crockett National Forests were all convenient to Nacogdoches, but they were all far enough from SFA to render them inaccessible for instruction within a single class period. Knowing that the state legislature would approve funding for only one department of forestry, Boynton realized that obtaining access to a forest near the college would greatly increase SFA’s chances.

SFA had purchased numerous supplies and structures from the old Blount farm property when the NYA had abandoned it in 1941, including two buildings that were transported to campus and used for student housing. This transaction certainly made Boynton aware of the property’s status when it was offered for sale early in 1943, and he knew that it would be an ideal location for the forest he needed to buttress his claim to a forestry program. But with no end of the war in sight, Boynton also knew that the college would not receive a state appropriation to purchase the Blount farm for itself. The war years were especially hard on education; total enrollment at SFA fell to 348 students in 1943. Nonetheless, finding means to secure access to dedicated forestland was exactly what was needed to triumph over Texas A&M’s bid for a department of forestry.

Fortuitously, the U.S. Forest Service had increased its presence in the region since the establishment of the Texas National Forests in 1936. Since the arrival of New Deal relief programs in the 1930s, many Texans had become accustomed to partnering with federal agencies to overcome economic challenges. Boynton did just that, using the Forest Service to secure a forest for his envisioned program. Along with Lacy Hunt, he traveled to Washington, D.C., in 1943 to lobby Congress to transfer the old Blount farm from the Farm Security Administration to the Forest Service. The two men were aided in their efforts by State Representative Jewell Helpinstill, State Senator Ben Ramsey, U.S. Representative Lindley Beckworth, and U.S. Senator Thomas T. Connally, well placed as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.
Nutrition and Forestry. After much persuasion, Congress passed House Resolution 5551 transferring the land in 1944. The bill specifically directed the Forest Service to cooperate with SFA in forestry experimentation, which its sponsors found to be in the general interest of rural rehabilitation.

Typically, experimental forests and other research areas were established by an internal Forest Service Chief proclamation and removed by the same process, according to agency demands and budget limitations. The SFAEF was the only one created by congressional mandate, and was thus immune from internal agency issues. The experimental forest was the product of intense effort by Boynton, Hunt, and their supporters, but lacked support or input from Forest Service personnel who would ultimately be held responsible for its management. This end-run around traditional practices may have generated some resentment, as official Forest Service records lists the SFAEF as existing only since 1961, which was the date that the USFS Wildlife Habitat and Silviculture Lab was established. The recorded 1961 date may be a defiant gesture on the part of Forest Service loyalists, among whom the SFAEF has never found favor. In the early 1980s Forest Service officials went so far as to try and dissolve the SFAEF before being reminded that such a thing was not possible without congressional consent.

The creation of the SFAEF swayed the Texas legislature. On the evening of July 14, 1944, at a meeting of the Texas Forestry Association in Marshall, Boynton and Hunt announced that Nacogdoches and SFA would like to host the following year’s meeting, thereby making public their intentions to establish a department of forestry. The State Board of Control had already endorsed Boynton’s request, assuring legislative approval; the announcement was simply an attempt to secure the support and cooperation of local forest industries operators. With a rebounding postwar enrollment of 1,000 students and access to a new experimental forest laboratory, SFA held the first classes in its newly created Department of Forestry in the spring semester of 1946.

Forest Service research actually began in East Texas prior to the SFAEF, and has been conducted on other forest tracts in the region. In 1939, 2,200 acres of the Sam Houston National Forest, near Huntsville, Texas, were set aside as the San Jacinto Experimental Forest. The East Texas Branch, established in 1945 and located in Nacogdoches, was the first USFS research office in Texas, and some of its earliest studies were conducted on the San Jacinto Forest. In 1961, Forest Service Chief E.P. Cliff designated the E.L. Kurth Experimental Forest, a 1,200-acre forest tract located five miles south of Nacogdoches. Known as the “Kurth Tract,” the Forest Service had leased it since 1947 from the Angelina Lumber Company.

In the early years, experimental forests such as these were dominated by silvicultural research in successful establishment, growth, yield, measurement, regeneration, and improvement of regional commercial timber species. This was especially true of those located in eastern states – over half of the experimental forests nationwide. The heavily fragmented national forests in the eastern United States number fifty and consist of 24.5 million acres, or
thirteen percent of the total 191 million acres in the National Forest System. The seemingly disproportionate distribution of experimental forests in the East was justified by the research necessary to reforest and rehabilitate eastern national forests purchased out of cut-over forest or abandoned farm land. In stark contrast to popular images of forests, many of the first eastern national forests established in the 1930s were conspicuously lacking trees.18

For its first fifteen years, the SFAEF followed the usual pattern. Research was dedicated to silviculture and intended to accomplish four principle objectives: understand the best methods for controlling hardwood species to favor pine; determine quality and quantity of runoff within a forested watershed; examine the drought resistance of pine seedlings; and prescribe insect control, especially the southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis*).19 In essence, the original mandate for the SFAEF was to promote research that improved methods of growing loblolly and shortleaf pine (*Pinus taeda, P. echinata*).

In 1949 the East Texas Branch set aside forty acres as a demonstration forest where local landowners could be taught how to manage profitably small parcels of land for timber production. Forestry professionals had expressed concern that the greatest risk of forest and soil depletion existed on private forestlands, which still constituted the greatest acreage of timberland, although in smaller, more fragmented parcels than national forests. Therefore, instruction of private landowners was an essential part of the USFS conservation program. This particular project was titled the Farm Forest 40, and was not exclusive to the SFAEF. Farm Forest 40 tracts sprang up on many experimental forests during this time. The size of the units was significant, as it represented the average size of privately held forests whose owners would directly benefit from the program. The forty acres contained numerous small plots with different silvicultural systems, including small clear-cuts; however, the principle treatment consisted of smaller group-selection cuts.

Late in the 1950s regional supervisors at the USFS Southern Forest Experiment Station headquarters decided that the Farm Forest 40 program was not being utilized sufficiently by local landowners. The instructional tracts were not justifying their costs and, ultimately, not promoting the research objectives of forests, and so were terminated.20 At the same time clear cutting became more popular, and site preparation methods to improve pine regeneration, as well as programs funding research in other silvicultural systems, were dropped by the USFS. Selection studies conducted on the San Jacinto Experimental Forest since 1938 and the Kurth Tract were abandoned and these two experimental forests were decommissioned. On the SFAEF, however, another federal agency, the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), now the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), was still interested and committed to conservation education for private landowners and asked that the Farm Forest 40 demonstration forest remain intact. Dr. Laurence C. Walker, the newly appointed dean of SFA's Department of Forestry, agreed, and his department assumed management responsibilities for the small tract for a few more years.

Several years earlier Forest Service employee and acclaimed author of *A
Sand County Almanac, Aldo Leopold, had taken a special interest in the wildlife communities of the southwest. Leopold was convinced that foresters should not manage forests exclusively for their timber resources but also to benefit the wildlife that inhabited the timberlands. Leopold's observations of the quantity of browse species in relation to deer and wolf populations, outlined in his landmark text Game Management (1933), caught the attention of USFS officials. Widespread support for such management philosophies eventually elevated game management to prominence in American forestry. The USFS Southern Forest Experiment Station underwent a general reorganization to reflect these shifting concerns, with local work units assigned to specific research topics. Notable among these changes was the Nacogdoches center's transformation from a silvicultural research unit to one devoted to studies of forest wildlife habitat.

During the 1960s research projects focused on understanding the relationship between southern silviculture practices on loblolly pine stands and white-tailed deer habitat. The work unit assigned to the forest was officially renamed the Wildlife Habitat and Silviculture Laboratory (WHSL) and Lowell K. Halls served as Project Leader. In May 1964, two deer pens were built on the SFAEF as part of a cooperative study between the USFS and Texas Parks and Wildlife (TPW), with TPW providing the materials and construction expertise. The twelve-foot-tall perimeter fences were built by inmates from the state penitentiary in Huntsville. Through an arrangement with the Penal Co-op Program, TPW paid travel costs and incidentals for the men on the job site; over the years this cooperative program was responsible for other land improvements on the SFAEF, particularly fencing, until halting abruptly in the 1960s.

TPW employees Charlie Boyd and Dan Lay were actively involved in the project's design and implementation. The objective was to measure the response of understory vegetation and white-tailed deer nutrition to overstory silvicultural treatments. The northern pen enclosed mostly loblolly and shortleaf pines; hardwood species were controlled by girdling, but were not physically removed. Conversely, the southern pen surrounded stands containing seventy-five percent pine species and twenty-five percent hardwoods (Quercus, Carya, Ulmus, and Acer).

Since deer in East Texas remained scarce, white-tailed deer from western Louisiana were tranquilized, trapped, and released into the pens in the fall of 1964. Each pen was stocked with approximately ten does and five bucks. By the project's end, participating scientists generally accepted that, while the content of the deer browse may have differed between the two pens, available nutrients and subsequent deer populations were not significantly affected.

Legislatively, the decades of the 1960s and 1970s were a period of prolific lawmaking inspired by a burgeoning environmental movement. The Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act (1960), the Wilderness Act (1964), the Clean Air Acts (1965 and 1970), the National Environmental Policy Act (1969), the Endangered Species Act (1973), the Forest Management Act (1976), and the Clean Water Act (1977), all had far-reaching implications for the management
of national forests. From its establishment in 1945 until the mid-1970s, the SFAEF served as the primary research site for most of the early foresters of the East Texas Branch. Likewise, much of the early "game" research conducted by Lowell Halls and others took place on the experimental forest. By the mid-1980s, the Nacogdoches Lab's research was focused increasingly on threatened, endangered, and sensitive species, few of which inhabited the SFAEF. Consequently, with the exception of several important wildlife studies conducted by Dan Saenz, Craig Rudolph, and Dick Conner, most WHSL research gradually shifted to private timber company lands and other national forest units in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. In addition, the Unit's research on the impacts of alternative silvicultural systems on wildlife required well-structured, uneven-aged stands, none of which existed on the SFAEF because of past management practices. The SFAEF did, however, remain an important research site for many graduate students and faculty members from the Biology Department and the College of Forestry at SFA. And in keeping with Dr. Boynton's original intentions, the SFAEF also remained a favorite field-trip site for SFA classes.

Unit scientists sought to minimize harvesting on the SFAEF during the 1970s and 1980s to have an older, relatively unmanaged reference area – a rare resource in East Texas – to compare with the millions of acres of more intensively managed public and private lands nearby. However, as southern pine beetles destroyed vast areas of East Texas in the 1980s, Project Leader Ron Thill was directed by Assistant Station Director Stanley J. Barras to develop a plan to thin the upland pine and pine-hardwood stands on the SFAEF to reduce their risk of beetle infestations, several of which had occurred by 1986. Thill assigned L. Christopher Miller, a WHSL biologist and recent forestry graduate from SPA, the task of developing this plan. Miller's plan (1990), delineated seventeen "management units" and called for thinning seven of them; nine other units were to be harvested using even or uneven-aged silvicultural methods. This harvesting was completed in 1992. Management Unit 1, consisting of approximately 1,481 acres of mature bottomland hardwood forest, was not included in this timber sale. A second round of harvesting scheduled for 1997 was postponed because of a federal court-ordered injunction that curtailed many activities on the National Forests and Grasslands in Texas until late in 2001. The harvesting plan developed in 1997 is currently being reviewed and may be implemented in 2003 or 2004.

Since 1987 the SFAEF also has been home to the Natural Resource Conservation Service's East Texas Plant Materials Center. The center was established to develop improved plant materials for livestock forage and wildlife habitat enhancement, as well as a host of other conservation purposes. Under a cooperative arrangement with the WHSL, the center can utilize up to seventy acres of the SFAEF to plant and test various plant materials. One of only three such facilities in Texas, the Plant Materials Center is unique in that its charter called for a board of directors, including one representative each from the College of Forestry and the Agriculture Department at SPA, the WHSL, and the Deep East Texas and Northeast Texas Associations of Soil and
Water Conservation Districts, that has considerable oversight authority. Following Director James A. Stevens' move to Arkansas in 1987, F. Melvin Adams took over and oversaw the construction of Plant Materials Center facilities at the SFAEF, including a seed processing building in 1991, a new office building in 1994, and several additional buildings for storage of farm implements. Following Adams' retirement in 1999, Stevens once again became director of the center.

Also beginning in 1987 and lasting for approximately five years, a ten-acre site within the SFAEF served as an intensive research site for the Forest Response Program of the National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program, a multidisciplinary effort involving six federal agencies (including the USFS) and numerous colleges and universities. Richard Flagler, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Forest Sciences, Texas A&M University, supervised research at this facility, which was known as the East Texas Intensive Research Site. Flagler oversaw the construction of a well, several buildings, a greenhouse, and approximately twenty-five large, open-top growth chambers to study the effects of ozone and acid rain on the development of one-to-four-year-old shortleaf pine seedlings. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the USFS, and the National Council of the Paper Industry for Air and Stream Improvement funded this study.

As WHSL research moved off the SFAEF, opportunities for education expanded. In 1992, with the development of sixteen silvicultural demonstration areas and an expanding Forest Service emphasis on conservation education, WHSL Project Leader Ron Thill developed a plan to establish an interpretive trail system at the SFAEF. By 1994 Thill had secured nearly $26,000 in federal funding, and through a cooperative agreement with Dr. Paul H. Risk, director of the Center for Resource Communication and Interpretation in the Arthur Temple College of Forestry at SFA, the College of Forestry contributed $16,000. Risk assigned trail design and construction responsibilities to M. Steve Kirkindall, a doctoral candidate. Kirkindall's original design, consisting of a natural-surface trail approximately three-and-one-half miles in length, was revised to make the trail the first USFS project in Texas that complied with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Forest Supervisor Alan G. Newman approved the revised design narrative on July 12, 1994, and trail construction began that fall.

The primary feature of the trail system was the soil-cement-surfaced, universally accessible, 0.9-mile Jack Creek Loop. A second trail, the 1.5-mile-long Management Loop, was a natural-surface companion trail where demonstrations of a broad array of forestry and wildlife management practices could be conducted. The Management Loop was completed first and was opened unofficially for public use during the fiftieth anniversary of the SFAEF on October 19, 1995.

The SFA Interpretive Trail System, as it is now called, has been a partnership involving several diverse entities. Funding, resources, and personnel were obtained from the USFS Southern Research Station, Region 8 of the National
Forest System, the National Forest and Grasslands in Texas, the SFA College of Forestry through Dean R. Scott Beasley, the Center for Resource Communication and Interpretation, the WHSL, and the Texas Forest Service. Melvin Adams and Jim Stevens of the East Texas Plant Materials Center provided equipment during initial trail construction as well as subsequent trail improvement projects. Several Boy Scouts worked on Eagle Scout projects on the trail. On one occasion, Kirkindall utilized the Nacogdoches County jail inmate work crew and AmeriCorp students from Austin to clear the trail. During construction, Kirkindall employed fifteen SFA students to construct trails, benches, and bridges. A plaque commemorating the dedicated efforts of Kirkindall and these students - the "Trail Dawgs" - was presented to Dean R. Scott Beasley at the dedication ceremony on October 18, 1997, and now hangs in the Arthur Temple College of Forestry award display case. Kirkindall's involvement in designing and constructing these trails also led to his dissertation project on planning, design, and construction principles for universally accessible recreational trails.

The Jack Creek Loop was completed in September 1997 and the entire system was opened for public use officially on October 18, 1997. Both trails remain works in progress. Kirkindall and Thill obtained a $40,000 cost-share, trail-improvement grant from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department on October 18, 1999, which allowed them to finish the parking lot, develop a picnic area, and install drinking fountains, signs, and an information kiosk. They also built additional picnic tables and benches, constructed a fifty-foot bridge, and added a half-mile of trail to the Management Loop. Raymond E. Brown, a temporary wildlife biologist with the WHSL, wrote the Environmental and Biological Assessments for these improvements and worked with the Angelina National Forest to secure necessary project approvals. WHSL employees J. Howard Williamson, Rodney A. Buford, Ron Thill, and several SFA forestry students assisted Kirkindall with trail improvements during 2001 and 2002 under the TPW grant, as well as with periodic maintenance tasks.

With the prospect of increased public use of the SFAEF and its interpretive trail system, administrators became concerned about potential vandalism and theft. To guard against potential problems, Thill secured $3,000 in 1998 to develop accommodations for a resident trail host for the Forest at the site of a former experimental forest residence first occupied by forest technician Bill Duke and later by Frank Manchaca. In exchange for use of this site and free utilities, the trail host provided security and assisted with various trail-related tasks. Howard Williamson, Rodney Buford, and Ray Brown cleared the site with the assistance of the jail inmate work crew.

In April 2000 Thill and Kirkindall obtained $20,000 from a USFS conservation education initiative ("Million for Millennium") to promote the trail and develop conservation education activities using the SFA Interpretive Trail System. These funds are used to employ several forest recreation majors, including Crystal Tischler and Katherine Crippens, from SFA's Arthur Temple College of Forestry, as conservation education interns. USFS construction funds were obtained in 2002 to build accessible toilets for the trail. Demonstra-
tions along the Management Loop will soon feature forest and wildlife management practices including even- and uneven-aged regeneration systems, forest cultural practices (thinning, prescribed burning at different frequencies and seasons, fertilization, and competition control), integrated pest management practices, restoration of a longleaf pine-bluestem community, wildlife food plantings, and practices designed to benefit cavity nesting species.

The SFAEF has hosted many conservation education activities, including state Woodland Clinics, regional and state Wildlife Clinics, and special events for people with disabilities. The fifth annual Forest Awareness Day Event, a cooperative outing sponsored by the Texas Forest Service, the Extension Service, and the WHSL that targets fifth-grade students throughout Nacogdoches County, drew more than 525 students over four days in April 2001. Planning is underway for an International Migratory Bird Day sponsored by the WHSL, the Pineywoods Audubon Society, and TPW on April 27, 2002; this event will include bird conservation exhibits and demonstrations, as well as guided tours of the Forest and the adjacent Alazan Bayou Wildlife Management Area, which is managed by TPW. During its short existence, the trail system already has won several awards, including the Southern Research Station/Region 8 Conservation Education Award in 1998 and the Texas Trails Network Excellence in Innovative Design Award in 1999.\(^1\)

As public attitudes about forests and scientific understanding of forest ecosystems have changed in America, so have the research priorities at the SFAEF. From pine improvement to wildlife habitat to non-game habitat to conservation education, even a cursory examination of the research conducted at the SFAEF over the past fifty-seven years reveals an agency sensitive to evolving ideas about public land management. As popular understanding of forest landscapes increases, so does public expectations of forestry professionals. National Forest System administration is complicated by multiple, often conflicting, desires that impact a mosaic of ecosystems for which scientific knowledge is incomplete. Thus, the research branch of the Forest Service remains a vital component in acquiring the scientific knowledge necessary to make difficult decisions, identify future challenges, and apply best management practices. The SFAEF and WHSL have participated for more than half a century in research that continues to increase understanding of the forest ecosystems and wildlife habitat of the southeastern United States. Present and future development of the Stephen F. Austin Interpretive Trail will increase the SFAEF's importance as a unique destination for outdoor recreation and an irreplaceable tool in conservation education in East Texas.
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Texas was a land of bears and honey for the pioneer settlers starting about 1820. Land was cheap or free. Open ranges welcomed everyone's livestock and provided wildlife, water, firewood, and building materials. Newcomers found a vast, diverse natural world produced by at least 10,000 years of development since the last Ice Age.¹

The present account starts with 1920, when the bloom was off the wilderness and I was six years of age. Home was in Beaumont, but I preferred the open spaces nearby. There were students in my school whom I envied—they lived in houseboats and rowed skiffs across the Neches River en route to class. Boy Scouts helped in many ways, especially visits to Camp Mitigwa, located on Beech Creek in Hardin County.

The Depression was in full force when I finished high school in 1932. The stress of financial hardship was widespread and close to home. Dad, a pharmacist, urged that I try to go to college. Others had to help support their families. They were not free to go, as I did, to Texas A&M. There I found credit and jobs enough to stay in College Station six years, thanks to many kind people. Training in agriculture and wildlife was the beginning of learning about natural resources and people. In 1938, when I finished, a job was waiting with the Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission.

The first Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Project, Texas W-I-R, placed me in Beaumont in June 1938 as the regional game manager for twenty southeastern counties. The program was funded by hunting licenses and taxes, three-fourths of it from the federal government. The work involved distribution surveys of important game species and their habitats. Restocking was recognized as a need for deer and turkey. Both had been over-harvested during the Depression.

Soon the whole of East Texas became one of five regions and the office was moved to Lufkin. When World War II started, most of the able biologists entered military service and I moved to Austin to help keep some of the work going under Executive Secretary William J. Tucker. In 1945 I elected to return to field investigations in Silsbee, then Buna, and later Nacogdoches.

Public acceptance of the new science of wildlife management was generous and almost complete. We were inspired to protect the natural world. Young people could gain much from camping, fishing, hunting, and other outdoor activities. The intangible values were recognized. Tucker stressed these things in his public addresses. The public readily agreed that future generations should have the same opportunities to enjoy the outdoors.

In the twenty-first century the trends will continue and may accelerate. This is a message not of "doom and gloom" but of the need for serious planning. Wildlife is a minor product of land use but it offers a warning about

public health. The following is organized by time periods, except statements about deer and quail.

BEFORE WORLD WAR II

Two-thirds of the population was classified as rural. Farming of rice, cotton, chickens, and livestock required much hand labor.

An early fascination in Beaumont was watching the daily flights of blackbirds, wave after wave. Countless thousands nested and roosted in the cane marshes along the Neches River and fed in the pastures and rice fields west of town. When rice ripened, it was cut and tied in bundles by machine. Then hand labor was used to stand the bundles in small cones to dry for several weeks before they were moved to a stationary threshing machine. The straw was blown into haystacks, along with shattered rice. Ducks and many other birds swarmed around the dinner plate set by rice farmers.

Hunters were welcome and some farmers provided shells when the birds were at their most vulnerable. The same pattern followed all grain harvests from Canada to Texas ending only when agricultural engineers produced effective combines and drying equipment.

Other crop production was similar. Cultivation was just enough to make the crop of corn or cotton. Incidental growth of wild plants included many forms of value to wildlife. Fencerows received little hand-labor and were a mixture of local seed-producing vines and shrubs — all planted by birds. A tenet of agronomy at that time was that rotation with legumes was worthwhile because it helped develop the natural qualities of soil condition. There were few fences, except for farmlands. Prairies were burned early and marshes were burned in late summer. There was a constancy of composition.

Most woodlands were unfenced and open for use by everyone's livestock. Stockmen burned as often as there was adequate fuel, causing little damage. They had learned that burned plots turn bright green and attract both deer and livestock.

Diverse hardwoods were available. No stand had been "improved" by foresters. A report on lumber production in Texas in 1924 listed the following hardwoods by species: ash, basswood, beech, birch, cottonwood, elm, hickory, maple, oak, red gum, sycamore, tupelo, walnut, and all other. The latter probably included cherry, magnolia, and locust. Cypress, a conifer, was listed separately:² Ash, hickory, walnut, and cypress were worth more than pines.

Market hunting for ducks and geese was a major activity at Lake Surprise on Smith Point, across Galveston Bay from Galveston, before 1900. A prominent businessman, W.L. Moody, had a hunting lodge there and its 700-acre lake often was "covered" with canvasbacks and other kinds of ducks and geese. The staff, which served as guides for guests, also "killed thousands of ducks and geese, cleaned and packed them in barrels, and put them on express trains for the Northeast."³ A single canvasback brought $4 in the New York market. The lake was special because it contained a rare concentration of Banana Water-Lilly.
The good times of the 1920s included market hunting for ducks and prairie chickens. This became illegal in 1916 but federal game wardens were no more effective than the prohibition enforcers. Drought in the 1930s slowed the duck hunting and led to new programs for wildlife. The prairie chickens disappeared from the area east of Galveston Bay about 1942.

Many people literally lived off the land during the Depression. Fur trapping provided a significant supplement to cotton and other cash crops. Gatherers from town and country sought all of the local fruits as they matured. Many relished hickory and chinquapin nuts, as had the Indians before them. Roadside vendors found ready buyers for mayhaws, dewberries, blackberries, and grapes. A tree with a crown of possum grapes might get the axe for the fruit. Armadillos were not bad eating, despite the name of "Hoover Hogs." Judge R.E. Minton served me my first armadillo meal. Rabbits and opossums were plentiful. Another friend who was reared on a rice farm spoke fondly of dishes her family cooked with meat from the canals and fields — turtles, crayfish, frogs and various fish, served with broken rice, the cheapest grade from the local rice mill.

For deer and turkey, the Depression was bad news. Every track of a deer was enough to start a gathering of neighbors and hounds. Squirrels were the most commonly sought game. They were numerous, and withstood pressure well because of their high reproductive capacity. But they were wild! Quail were common in cropland and cutover woodland. Many made it to the table without being shot via traps.

Land prices were depressed. Many East Texans could not pay their taxes or wait to see if a new stand of pines would develop. Some spent parts of the year camped on the river bank, especially in summer after the last plowing of the corn and cotton. Appeals to Washington produced a market for forestland in some counties. U.S. Forest Service Forest Supervisor L.L. Bishop bought more than 600,000 acres from willing sellers between $2.50 and $10 per acre. Each tract was cruised and the price reflected the amount of standing timber by species. This formed the Texas National Forest.

This brought the first practice of forestry to Texas — girdling hardwoods with axes. I observed evidence of this in 1936 in a fine stand of beech. Another activity was the use of fire on cutover longleaf sites. Open sites were planted in loblolly or slash pine.

E.L. Kurth, a second generation "timber baron," built East Texas' first paper mill at Lufkin. The effluent drained into Peach Creek, later renamed Paper Mill Creek, and the Angelina River. From 1940, when paper production began, through the fall of 1944, game wardens and their supervisor from Austin talked to the mill superintendent about state water pollution laws. Promised ponds for settling out some waste were not built.

Finally Tucker of the Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission wrote a letter to Kurth stating that he would ask a court to stop pollution unless some action was taken. Tucker was under pressure from fishermen who had employed a lawyer in Nacogdoches after witnessing heavy losses of fish. Damage reached to the coast. Waste fibre clogged nets. Caustic chemicals
caused cotton and linen lines and nets to waste away. Some camp owners along the river had quit using their places.

Pointing to the jobs he had created, Kurth asked for help in Austin, and Tucker lost his job about six months later. The mill operated with little change until the 1970s when the Environmental Protection Agency forced some air and water protections.

Two notes about good hunting will finish references to the days before World War II.

My notes about a day in the field near Beaumont in September 1938 were placed in a short paragraph in an old report. The dove season had opened and I looked for hunters to record their success. At Fannett I found a group of hunters doing a lot of shooting in a fallow rice field. When they returned to their car, I asked to see the birds. They had bagged seventy-two doves. All of the crops seemed to be full with one kind of small black seed. A common plant was collected for identification. Later, I found the common plant did not produce the black seed.

A second trip to the field revealed a slender, inconspicuous, but sexy producer of black seed. This keyed out as Caperonia palustris, or Mexican weed, a nuisance in rice production. It was about as popular as prairie dogs on western ranches, but was attractive to doves.

When herbicides arrived, the plant disappeared. I looked for it. Younger biologists did not know it. A few years ago C.D. Stutzenbaker found some growing in a ditch near Anahuac.

In 1938 most waterfowl hunters bought day permits for two or three dollars at the gates of ranches from Big Hill to Smith Point. Fuller’s Cafe in Beaumont was busy from 2:00 to 5:00 a.m. serving breakfast. We checked the hunting success of 294 hunters at the Barrow Ranch in Chambers County. From November 15 to December 18, the total bag was 1,291 ducks and sixty-six geese. These were forty-two percent mallards and eighteen percent pintails, which shows the selective hunting for favorite species. The geese were seventy-seven percent snows and blues, twenty-one percent Canadians, and two percent white-fronted. The daily bag per hunter averaged 4.4 ducks and 0.23 geese.

GOOD TIMES 1945-1970

Hunters and bird-watchers found enough to be energized. When I moved to Nacogdoches in 1965, dove hunting was superb. Many watermelon fields grew crops of goat weed, which attracted doves. Two new reservoirs, Sam Rayburn and Toledo Bend, produced great fishing and duck hunting, especially in their early years.

Some problems produced demands for new legislation. These included modern agricultural chemicals that produced unwanted side-effects. Soldiers were “protected” from lice and mosquitoes with the wonder chemical DDT during the war. After the war related chemicals such as aldrin, dieldrin,
heptachlor, and benzene hexachloride were welcomed for pest control.

Early in 1958 I received a call from Austin to meet fire-ant control agents in Sour Lake. They planned to apply fifteen pounds of heptachlor per acre on the Fraisle Ranch in three days. My instructions were to “Please appraise results.” Birdlife was counted on ranch roads as a small pretreatment sample. Three days after the treatment the Plant Pest Control agents from the USDA acted as if they were shocked that there were no live birds but many dead ones. Also found in water were dead fish, crawfish, snakes, and nutria. A covey of quail was gone, though we found two dead members. After a second treatment in May, after more than a hundred nests of dicksissals and blackbirds had been tagged, there was no survival. Similar results were observed elsewhere, but not until after the publication of *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson in 1962 was this group of chemicals limited to certain applications. 4

One consequence of the hysteria about fire-ants was antagonism towards me, as if I had caused the problem. This came to a climax in Buna after fifty-pound sacks of heptachlor were distributed at no cost. Representatives of the U.S. Department of Agriculture promised complete control of the fire-ants and did not urge caution in its use. A dairy warning that milk should not be used for first three days after a pasture had been treated had been issued elsewhere. These friends and neighbors were going to apply the poison to home gardens. When I asked about this, I was asked to leave. I did not. A few days later the governor’s office received a petition from most of my neighbors asking that I be sent elsewhere. As usual, the staff in Austin considered such complaints an indication that effective work had been done.

Perhaps worse than insecticides has been the widespread effect of herbicides because they have more long-term effects on the ecosystem. Cotton production was shifted to better soil out west and small patch-taming in the east could not compete. Most East Texas cropland reverted to forest or was consolidated into pastures for dairy or beef. Herbicides were needed to convert weedy cropland to produce coastal bermuda grass. Clean fencerows, which saved labor, also needed herbicides. Mowing contributed to using the land for one crop – grass.

In forestland, herbicides were a part of the war on hardwoods. Various methods of girdling with axes and mechanical routers were replaced with injection of herbicides. Later aerial applications would be cost-effective. The first I observed on deep sands in north Nacogdoches County reduced the ground cover, including a heavy stand of grape. These were nurse crops for natural regeneration of shortleaf pine. Their shade in August was quite valuable.

When Congress authorized the National Forests in Texas, multiple uses such as timber, range, wildlife, water, and recreation were planned. Foresters and range people who staffed the four units initiated a “Memorandum of Understanding” with the Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission. Their objective was official cooperation for wildlife management, law enforcement, restocking, fire control, and hunting regulations. They offered to save as den trees, large hardwoods with cavities, and ten percent of the hardwood basal area, as had been planned in Arkansas. “Timber stand improvement” (TSI), was
the key problem because hardwoods provided more support for wildlife than pines. Much of the land had more than forty percent in hardwood, so it was not significant to promise to hold ten percent of the basal area in hardwoods.

By November 12, 1954, a letter from Forest Supervisor Frank W. Rasor, signed by E.E. Wagner, stated that 450,000 acres had been worked "deadening worthless hill hardwoods." Some of this acreage had been "worked over two or three times."

The promised ten-percent was not preserved. The foresters and range people had not negotiated in good faith. Wildlife biologists in other states had similar problems. The regional forester from Atlanta met in Hot Springs with some biologists and a committee met with Ed Swift, chief forester in Washington, who promised changes. By then some forests had more than three times as much pine as was being carried by the forest industry. The dominant culture among federal land managers was timber. Many subtle forces worked to give only lip service to wildlife.

Forest Service records for each tract document the species and sizes of the original trees. Early surveys delineated the longleaf type, the pine-hardwood type, the hardwood-pine type, and the bottomlands hardwoods. Some listed hardwoods by species. Soil surveys compiled in recent years would be useful if anyone wanted to document the original condition and composition.

Negotiations about leaving hardwoods became moot after 1964 when the Forest Service announced the abandonment of selective silviculture. This was a reversal after many years of telling landowners they should paint trees to be sold and keep all ages in the stands. The new even-age silviculture involved clear cutting, root plowing, and planting seedlings from nurseries. Most natural sources of seed were removed, especially the heavy-seeding oaks and hickory. Species with winged seeds, such as ash and sweetgum, fared somewhat better.

In 1973 the "Memorandum of Understanding" was terminated by the state for several reasons summarized as "failure to adequately implement established Forest Service management practices to insure quality habitat for Wildlife."

The status of dogwood marks the new silviculture. Natural stands without any TSI had more than a hundred stems per acre of dogwood on the Stephen F. Austin Experimental forest in 1965. Intensively managed sites of commercial forests now have few to none. Dogwood is important in the forest as wildlife food and soil conditioner. Leaves, stems, and fruit contribute more calcium than any other forest plant. This improves percolation and cancels some pine acidity.

For twenty years prior to 1965, red-cockaded woodpeckers (RCW) and I shared a section of cutover longleaf six miles east of Buna in Newton County. My executive director, John R. Singleton, wrote on August 8, 1969, to the U.S. Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife. He suggested its new Red Book of Threatened and Endangered Species should include the RCW. A few months later the bureau confirmed that the bird was falling through the cracks of silviculture and listed it.

Early response was refreshing. Many wanted to help, without knowing the
necessary concessions. The first official non-game project in Texas was a new Job 10 added to Federal Aid Project Texas W-80-R. Surveys on private and public lands sought to map locations of remaining birds. Three study areas were established and more than 100 birds were banded. These were in Compartment 58, the Angelina National Forest, Temple Inland’s Scrapping Valley area, and ten acres of old longleaf in a highway park located west of Hemphill.

The ten-acre park was of special interest. Its one RCW clan had made many cavities through the years which supported the following species that need cavities for nesting: pileated woodpeckers, after enlarging some cavities, wood ducks, kestrels, and one bee hive. Others were: Prothonotary warblers, brown-headed nuthatches, screech owls, crested flycatchers, starlings, bluebirds, tufted titmouse, Carolina chickadees, red-bellied and red headed woodpeckers, and flickers."

**INCREASED REGULATION 1970-2000**

Several new federal laws have made life more complicated for land managers and others. Texas pollution laws were not enforced before the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Some cleanups resulted, but pollution problems even increased faster. Houston had the worst air in the nation in 2000.

In 1973 the Endangered Species Act was passed by Congress and included the RCW. A team was appointed to develop a recovery plan, but little progress was made. The usual silviculture of clearcutting and selective removal of relic old trees used for cavities continued. Finally this was challenged in a federal court and the Forest Service was forced to face the RCW problems.

In 2000 the species remained on the endangered list while many people throughout the South worked for recovery. Meanwhile, the Forest Service seems to have a scorched-earth policy on the ground, using the federal court’s order for one more gain for silviculture. Crews have been sent long distances to remove one hardwood. Some use of fire has been replaced by herbicides. Unrealistic goals of future re-establishment of RCW have been used to justify complete removal of hardwoods where no RCW are likely to be established. Silviculture continues to dominate and biodiversity continues to decline.

It is ironic that fire exclusion has contributed to the declines of longleaf pines and RCW. The original three million acres of longleaf in Texas was burned often enough to exclude invading loblolly pine and other less fire-tolerant species. This produced the open-park-like aspect favorable to woodpeckers. Most of the remaining forty thousand or so acres of longleaf forest are in the Sabine and Angelina Forests. To reestablish all longleaf sites would require reversal of loblolly pine plantations. Promised efforts have moved slowly.

Bottomland hardwoods are even more threatened than those on uplands. Much of the original acreage has been lost to inundation by reservoirs. Some has been cleared for cropland. All of the remainder is subject to planning for future water projects. Although lost wetlands are irreplaceable, their
ecological service is mostly ignored. Natural parts of the Sulphur River which were set aside for mitigation of the Cooper Reservoir may be under water in a new impoundment soon. Natural habitats are weakened and fragmented by water projects and their associated developments. The future for hardwoods is better in the national forests than on intensively managed private lands, especially those of the forest industry. The Forest Service does leave excellent stream-side strips protected from clearcutting.

Researchers promise to double cellulose growth again with improved genetics and more intensive culture. This includes expensive use of agricultural chemicals – fertilizer, insecticides, herbicides – so that no plants but pine benefit from rainfall or irrigation.

The best future for hardwoods probably lies with the unmanaged private lands in towns and along many highways. A low flight from Nacogdoches to Beaumont would show a preponderance of unbroken dark green pine. The splendor of dogwood and magnolia blooms and the spring and fall colors of beech and hickory are much reduced.

A final problem: all commercial silviculture is moving towards shorter rotations. Boards are being replaced by products made from chips. Thus fewer trees live long enough to provide cavities or seed. The skills of foresters to manage natural forests are being supplanted by the skills of agronomists to manage tree farms.

The subject of biodiversity has attracted much study and comment. An editorial in the *Dallas Morning News* on April 27, 1998, concluded that continued declines in natural diversity are threatening human survival.

Many can confirm the decline of bird species in the pineywoods. In April 2000, the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department published lists of rare and declining birds by region. Those for the pineywoods numbered fourteen. Squirrels and quail, two of the most important game species, were not listed but have declined so much that they provide negligible amounts of hunting.

**GAME MANAGEMENT - DEER**

A summary of the sixty-year history of deer restoration and management will not do justice to the many people and funds devoted to it. The Depression demonstrated that a deer population can be wiped out. Restocking started about 1939 with deer trapped on the Aransas Refuge or other places in West and South Texas.

By then, the only huntable deer were on the hunting clubs near Lufkin. At Boggy Slough in Trinity County, Judge R.E. Minton had increased the deer population by limiting illegal hunting. He used armed fence riders and legal injunctions. The general public was tolerant of illegal hunting. Game wardens, with only one assigned to three counties, found it difficult to make a case, and hounds and headlights use was common year around.

The restocked areas had to be fenced and patrolled, as at the Devil's
Pocket in Newton County and Moore’s Plantation in Sabine County. Many dedicated people took risks and worked hard to improve the protection of deer. Biologists such as Charles Boyd and wardens such as Earl Sprott head the list.

The problem of general public support required many presentations to civic clubs and Wildlife Planning Boards. Gradually more and better-paid wardens arrived and the protection of deer gained the majority support. Then, when it became necessary to make shooting female deer legal, there was an adverse reaction.

While the herd was increasing, the quality of habitat was declining. Conversion of mixed pine and hardwood forests to pine plantations caused apprehension among deer hunters who knew the fondness of deer for acorns. Boyd stated in a talk to a civic club in Hemphill that pine plantations would become “biological deserts.” This made headlines and foresters objected.

Deer are adaptable animals with a rapid reproductive capacity. Most doe produce two young each year. If the range is adequate in forage quality, there will be two young added to the herd. Any acorns available in winter will be a bonus.

To avoid overpopulation, reduced survival of fawns, and even adult mortality, some doe must be taken during the hunting season. Public acceptance of this concept has been slow. Hunters see greenstuff and do not realize that much of it is lacking palatability or nutritional quality, as many studies have demonstrated.

Currently, there is a “trend toward privatization of state-owned resources (including deer) for private gain, thus eroding the legal authority of the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department to manage and regulate,” according to the Texas Chapter of The Wildlife Society. This concerns intensive management behind high fences and locked gates. Already these deer are close to private property.

Regardless of the legal status, the rising cost of access is moving us closer to the European system of hunting for the privileged few.

GAME MANAGEMENT FOR QUAIL

During the beginning years of wildlife management in East Texas, quail received more attention than any other species. The success of quail hunters remained high but was declining. How good was it? In 1938 drive census lines of forty men were used, thanks to manpower supplied by the Civilian Conservation Corps. Results for 7,414 acres in acres per quail were: cutover longleaf pine, 6.6; 3-8 year cutover loblolly pine-hardwood, 4.7; Walker County farms, 10.7; and Nacogdoches County farms, 7.7.

Wardens listed 349 owners of bird dogs in Hardin, Polk, Tyler, Angelina, and Nacogdoches counties. Results of a mail survey were: “the average hunter has 1.8 dogs, makes 11 hunts, bags 78 quail and took four friends hunting.” This was for the winter of 1938.

Quail declined because land use practices which favored the growth of seed-producing plants were being lost: cotton and other crop farming; open-range
livestock management with frequent fires; and conversion of longleaf pine forests with open understory and prairie-like vegetation to pine plantations without fire. All upland forests had some quail before modern silviculture arrived. In winter most creek bottoms had quail looking for tree mast, especially acorns.

None of the efforts to demonstrate good management for quail food and cover were as attractive to landowners as more intensive forest and pasture management. A costly quail hatchery failed to help.

At the end of the century, quail are an uncommon songbird in East Texas. Those hunters who can, go to South and West Texas for quail shooting.

SUMMARY THEN AND NOW

A review of wildlife management in East Texas since its beginning leaves me humble. How fortunate can one be? The work was engrossing and there is a possibility that some of it was worthwhile. I am indebted to many coworkers over forty years.

Fewer varieties and numbers of plants and animals are present now than eighty years ago. Most losses can be charged to rising numbers of people, who now need four times or more commodities and services. Losses in biodiversity should be considered a warning for the welfare of people.

Many of the present problems will only get worse. Construction of highways and schools may never catch up. Health threats from stress, crowding, noise, traffic, and less-than-clean water and air are serious. Whether or not populations double again twice in the next eighty years, some thoughtful planning will be required.

The cultural and intangible values of the natural world are more important than ever before. Scarcity contributes to appreciation. Those restricted to rocking chairs need to hear and see a hummingbird or watch a butterfly. Their grandchildren need places to sleep under the stars and listen to owls.

NOTES

1Joe C. Truett and Daniel W. Lay, Land of Bears and Honey (Austin, 1984).
3Shannon Tompkins, “Moody’s Lake a victim of 1900 storm,” Houston Chronicle, September 6, 2000, p. 16A.
5Lay Collection, Box 1, East Texas Research Center, Stephen F. Austin State University.
8Clifford E. Shackelford and Mark W. Lockwood, “Rare and Declining Birds of Texas,” Texas Parks & Wildlife, p. 9, April 2000.
Ed Eakin passed away on Wednesday, February 20, 2002, of a massive heart attack. I learned of his passing while I was attending the East Texas Historical Association's meeting in Texarkana. I was shocked when Archie McDonald announced the bad news. At first, I could not even imagine a world without Ed Eakin. He was such a great role model for me, and I much regret his death. Our Texas history meetings will not be the same without him.

Over the last few years, Mr. Eakin and his family have become good friends of mine and therefore most important to me. I first worked with Mr. Eakin in the mid-1980s. I contributed a chapter to a book that he published on Texas history, one celebrating the Lone Star's Sesquicentennial. In the early 1990s, we began a new project that resulted in Mr. Eakin's publication of my *Born in Dixie: The History of Smith County, Texas* (2 vols.; Eakin Press, 1999). In 2002, he published another volume for me, *Oklahoma and Its Heroes,* a book designed for Oklahoma's secondary students.

Over the years, I learned a few things about Mr. Eakin. I learned that he was an incredibly decent man, beloved by his family, by friends like me, and by people in the larger Texas community as well. A graduate of Baylor, he was a fine Christian man whose life's work was devoted to the information revolution — first as a crusading newspaper editor and then as owner and executive editor of a publishing house that produced books of both fact and fiction. His tastes were eclectic. His interests ranged from "hard core" history to cookbooks, from black history to Indian history, from the Alamo to World War II and beyond.

I could never call him "Ed," even though he asked me to do so. Once, when I called him "Mr. Eakin," he tried to correct me. Humorously, he said that when I called him "Mr. Eakin," he thought that I was talking to his father. I respect any number of people, most of whom I call by their first names. But there are exceptions. I never called my grandfathers or my father by their first names. I never called my grandmothers or my mother by their first names. And I never called "Ed" by his first name. He was too much a father figure for me to do that. He will always be "Mr. Eakin" to me, a man who commanded rather than demanded my respect.
NOTICES AND NOTES

NOTICES

by Archie P. McDonald

The award-winning Deep South Conference series' sixth international and multidisciplinary conference, sponsored by Louisiana State University, Shreveport, will focus on "Thomas Jefferson: Life, Times, and Legacy." The conference will be held on the LSU-S campus on October 16-18, 2003, during the bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase. The selection committee invites proposals for papers and panels. For additional information, contact Dr. Bill Pederson, American Studies Chair, International Lincoln Center, LSU in Shreveport, One University Place, Shreveport, LA 71115-2301. FAX: 318-795-4203. Phone: 318-797-5349. Email: wpederso@pilot.isus.edu.

NOTES

Robert Flynn’s *Growing Up A Sullen Baptist And Other Lies* (University of North Texas Press, P.O. Box 311336, Denton, TX 76203. $21.95) confuses me. This book is a collection of previously published essays divided into three sections: Baptist, Growing Up, and Sullen. “Baptist” is much the more fun of the three. I heard Flynn read one of these essays on the Baptists, Methodists, and Church of Chirsters in Chillicothe at a meeting of the West Texas Historical Association, and it was the funniest thing I ever heard. This section includes a dialogue essay with Joyce Roach about the relative demerits of Chillicothe and Jacksboro that is fun. “Growing Up” is less fun but instructive: it includes some of Flynn’s biblical analysis against the backdrop of Southern history and experiences as a reporter in Vietnam. “Sullen” is no fun at all, but his account of visits to India and Cambodia are worth reading. They are good reporting. The final essay, “John Wayne Must Die,” irritates me. It gives too much credit and blame for American attitudes to an entertainer. I am saddened that an interesting read ends on a sour note.

*The Texas Almanac, 2002-2003* (The Dallas Morning News, Box 655237, Dallas, TX 75265. $19.95), has made its appearance, again edited by Mary G. Ramos with Robert Plocheck as associate editor. In addition to the usual, and valuable, statistics we rely on, there are special features on the Natural Beauty of Texas, Historic Government Documents, Crime, Health and Science, and under History, sections on LaSalle’s Colony, Origins of Camino Real, Red River Boundary Settled, and a Brief Sketch of Texas History. Next to the *New Handbook of Texas*, this is the most useful collection of data on Texas, its history and otherwise. Every researcher or even those with less professional interest in Texas need a copy.

*Galveston: A History and a Guide*, by David G. McComb (Texas State Historical Association, 2.306 Sid Richardson Hall, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712-9820. $7.95), is the eighteenth monograph in the Fred Rider Cotton Popular History Series. This series was proposed by the late F. Lee
Lawrence more than twenty years ago, for, said Lee, readers who wanted to know more about a place or event but not read a “big ole’ book” about it. David McComb's *Galveston* fits Lee's prescription nicely. It contains fifty-one pages of text divided into sections on The Port City, The Sin City, and The Tourist City. Probably the middle part demanded extra research — actually it is pretty mild and mostly deals with crime. McComb is the authority on Galveston, so TSHA has brought subject and author together appropriately, and the yield is well worth while.

“In 1915, President Wilson designated what holiday to fall on the second Sunday in May?” (p.38) What ... politician from Texas often used the biblical phrase, “Let us reason together?” (p.205) You probably know the answers are Mother’s Day and LBJ, but there are lots of questions in J. Stephen Lang’s *The Complete Book of Presidential Trivia* (Pelican Publishing Co., 1000 Burmaster, Gretna, LA 70053. $17.95), that will force you to sneak a peak at the answers, which are located conveniently with each section of questions. Chapter topics that mostly explain what kind of questions are posed in them include Presidential Potpourri; Mixing and Mingling (flings and clubs); Quote, Unquote; Family Ties, Before They Were Presidents; The Man In Private; Campaigns, Victories, Defeats; Cabinet, Congress, Court; The Political Life; Events, Earth-shaking and Trivial; First Ladies; Domestic Tranquility: Home Life; Remembering the Presidents; and Twenty Questions (About Each). Try this one from page 281: “Who Was President When ... King George III of England died?” Told you. Would you believe it was James Monroe?

Joe E. Ericson’s *The Nacogdoches Story: An Informal History* (Heritage Books, 1540E Pointer Ridge Place, Bowie, MD 20716. $31.50), is a handy paperbound history on the community that claims to be the oldest town in Texas. In organization and style it is similar to *Nacogdoches: The History of Texas' Oldest City*, published by Best of East Texas Publishers in 1995 and “sold out,” no longer in print. Joe’s partners in that venture included Carolyn Ericson, James G. Partin, and yours truly. Joe decided that “sold out” meant there was still a hunger and thirst for the history of Nacogdoches, so he provides this offering for the famishing. It also advances beyond of the coverage period of the previous publication.

Carol Padgett’s *Keeping Hearth & Home in Old Texas: A Practical Primer For Daily Living* (Menasha Ridge Press, Box 43673, Birmingham, AL 35243. $13.95), is a rule-and-guide for living. The advice might seem dated to some, but it still has value. For example, “A set time for each member of the family to take a weekly bath will tend to promote the convenience of the household” (p.5). Seems as accurate in 2002 as at any time in the nineteenth century, the period the book describes. What we have here is lots of good advice for women on how to keep themselves well groomed, how to behave when courted, and what to cook and entertain, how to mourn properly, and much other advice essential to a well ordered life. Padgett also provides recipes, which will be the highlight of the book for the few women who still cook.

I Remember ... Personal Reflections on Greenville and Hunt County, Texas, (printed by Henington Pub. Co., Wolfe City, Texas), contains the recollections of ninety-seven-year-old Paul Mathews, a life-long resident of Hunt County. Mathews attended Burleson College and the University of Texas before turning to Greenville and a career in banking, the board of education, the Rotary Club, bird hunting, and golf. It is personal, but also insightful into the life Mathews lived for near a century in one place. I Remember ... is beautifully illustrated.

The star-struck among us (and who isn’t, truth told), will enjoy Marty Jurow Seein’ Stars: A Show Biz Odyssey, by Martin Jurow as told to Philip Wuntch (SMU Press, Box 750415, Dallas, TX 75275-0415. $35.00) It is, obviously, a memoir by one of the film industry’s leading twentieth-century producers. Jurow, now retired, lives in Dallas; Wuntch has served as film critic (a dream job) for The Dallas Morning News since 1974. Jurow doesn’t exactly “tell all” – thank the Lord – but he does tell much of his relationship with such moguls as J.L. Warner and actors/actresses Katherine Hepburn, Frank Sinatra, Marlon Brando, Elvis, Jack Lemmon ... and many others. Jurow produced such major motion pictures as “Breakfast at Tiffany’s” (1960), “The Pink Panther” (1962), and most appropriate for Texas, “Terms of Endearment” and “Waltz Across Texas” (1982-1983). Following retirement from film producing, Jurow served as a distinguished visiting professor at SMU. Contains photos, some posed, some candid, of movie stars and production folk. Many are signed “to Marty.” My only gripe is the two-column format; otherwise, this is an engaging account of Jurow’s life in the film industry.

The Big Lie: Hale Boggs, Lucille May Grace, and Leander Perez in 1951, by Garry Boulard (Pelican Pub. Co, 1000 Burnmaster St. Gretna, LA 70054. $17.95), and Texas Politicians Good ‘n’ Rad, by Mona D. Sizer (Republic of Texas Press, Wordware Pub. Co., 2320 Los Rios Blvd, Plano, TX 75074. $18.95) have much in common. Both contain biographical material on leading mid-twentieth-century political figures in their states. Sizer’s series includes primarily Governors James E. and Miriam Amanda Ferguson, George Parr,
LBJ, Governors James S. Hogg and Ross Sterling, and Senator Joseph Weldon Bailey, with secondary coverage of Governors James Allred, Allan Shivers, and President Bush the Elder. Boulard’s lineup focuses on those identified in the title plus Governor Earl K. Long, with older brother Huey P. Long, as he always is, the crucible of political life in Louisiana in that era. The books favor in concentration on persons that some might consider unsavory characters – Perez and Parr are obvious, but partisans easily could shade in the rest of the roster. Both could have benefited from better editing, Texas’ entry more. Typos are one thing; when one leads to a misreported outcome of an election it is more grievous. Boulard’s book deals with Perez’s accusation of Boggs’ flirtation with communism while a student at Tulane in the 1930s, through his stand-in, Lucille Mae Grace. Boggs and Grace were leading candidates in a race for the governorship. What I liked was the way Boulard set up the premise, then chased rabbits throughout the life and careers of all three principles with that gadfly of all gadfly’s, Uncle Earl Long, stepping in and messing up as he pleased. I loved Long’s “defence” of Boggs, which “helped” him lose north Louisiana and the election: “Hale Boggs ain’t no Communist. He’s too good a Catholic to be a Communist.” In biased, Protestant north Louisiana, Long knew, one label was as bad as the other. Bottom line: Boggs comes across as do-gooder with a lovely wife and family who fell just short of the power he wanted, and Lucille Mae Grace a nice lady duped and dumped by Perez, the embodiment of evil – and boss of politics in Louisiana and elsewhere. Sizer’s Texas biographies lack the depth or dash of their Louisiana opposites. And I think a little more highly of some of them than is presented here.

First Of A Kind: The Building Of The South’s First Newsprint Mill, by Bob Bowman (Best of East Texas Publishers, 515 South First St., PO Box 1647, Lufkin, TX 75902), is the latest work from the pen of our prolific friend from Across the Angelina. And his best. This is the story of the founding and maturing of “the paper mill,” as it is always called in central East Texas, whether in its Southland, St. Regis, Champion, or - currently – Abitibi incarnations. “The paper mill” was the first of its kind in East Texas, and its father-founder, Ernest Kurth, played a central role in solving the mystery of how to make acceptable newsprint from the gummy pines that grew in the region. Kurth was not among the chemists – they were Georgian Dr. Charles H. Herty and several on-the-job geniuses – but he provided the push and the business acumen to see the project through to completion against considerable odds. The region had the resource, and the need. What it lacked was the know-how to use its abundant pine trees. Kurth, Herty, and the rest solved the riddle and gave us a major industry. Bowman has wanted to tell this story since he worked as Southland’s public relations manager from 1966 to 1982. He has an intimate knowledge of the mill’s origins, development, and business ups-and-downs, and is the best possible person to tell it. Favorite anecdote: how Kurth managed to have Lufkin’s Daily News run the first newsprint, even though it had been promised to the Dealeys for Dallas Morning News. Read the book and learn more about these interesting entrepreneurs and their “paper mill.”

The thesis of Democracy Heading South: National Politics In The
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Shadow Of Dixie, by Augustus B. Cochran III (University Press of Kansas, 2501 West 15th, Lawrence, KS 66049. $29.95), is stated thusly: “My argument in this book is that our national political, and especially electoral, institutions, for all sorts of complicated and interrelated reasons, are coming increasingly to resemble the irrational and undemocratic politics of the old Solid South” (p. 2). Cochran wants us to know, and says so quite plainly, that he is of the South, born, raised, educated, teaches, and practices law in the South. This, lest someone think that his presentation of politics in the Solid South, which is post-Reconstruction through the return of Republicanism — roughly 1870s until the GOP returned as a force to be reckoned with in the 1970s and 1980s — too negative. What he is talking about is a century of government by a small, white, elite for their benefit. Despite obvious changes in the South’s economy and that it is now the most racially integrated section of the nation — an original Republican goal — the remainder of the nation now operates more like the Solid South than the other way around since the Contract With America revolutionized national politics in 1994. I think that pretty obvious. Now, whether one agrees with this or not depends, as usual, on one’s politics.

By The Muddy Angelina: Stories & Musical Wanderings in Search of the Old Pioneer Spirit of East Texas, by Steve Hartz (Mystery Ridge Pub. Co., 216 East Pillar, Nacogdoches, TX 75961), pursues, and pretty well captures, the musical heritage of “old time” East Texas. Fittingly, the preparer is Steve Hartz, proprietor of the Oldtime String Shop, which is located “on the square” in Nacogdoches. Hartz opened his shop in 1978, a short spell ago as Nacogdoches measures time, but sufficient for both man and business to become traditions — legends, even — in the downtown area. A fair Saturday afternoon will find Steve and friends sitting outside the store picking and singing the real old-time music. On the business side, Steve repairs and restores string instruments for the famous and for those who want to be. And in the interest of fair disclosure, he once ordered a custom-made guitar case for me that proved a perfect fit for my odd-shaped guitar. I wish he could have as easily made me a better picker. That aside, anyone interested in the “oldtime” music will find joy in this little book, because, first, it features an engaging essay on Steve’s interest in the music, and then discussions of various songs, all written or arranged by Steve, that narrate the history of East Texas. Second, the book comes with a CD that demonstrates for the ear what the eye reads. That, of course, is the point: music must be heard.

Max Lale has spent much of his eighty-four years writing for newspapers, in learned journals, at the behest of civic or historical organizations, and at least four books. However, when he began writing the manuscript that became Max's Memoirs, he thought he was writing for himself or at most for his family and a few close friends. Two of those friends, journalist Bill Moyers and Stephen F. Austin history professor Archie McDonald, convinced him the material needed to be published. They were right.

The manuscript was composed, chapter by chapter, on Lale's beloved Royal manual typewriter — graciously offered to the news staff of his former employer, the Marshall News Messenger, during what turned out to be the non-crisis Y2K crisis. He thought it might be needed if the computers crashed permanently. He knew full well there wasn't a soul around who could still make one work accurately.

Many readers, particularly those who know Lale or are aware of the publication of his World War II letters in Volume 32 of the East Texas Historical Journal, Stephen Ambrose's Citizen Soldiers, or his appearance in Moyers' television documentary, "D-Day to the Rhine," will expect another war memoir. It is, but it's much more than that.

Lale begins his story in Shawnee, Oklahoma, with the queasy consequences of his first puff, at age three or four, on his father's pipe. Eighty years later, his recollection of early Oklahoma adventures that included milking cows, the misery of the depression, schoolboy pranks, airplane rides in a World War I Jenny, hitchhiking to Oklahoma University, his secret marriage to Georgiana Aspley, and his first job as a reporter, is remarkable.

More important are the wonderful words Lale chose to relate those adventures. In a day when college graduates have problems making subjects and verbs in a sentence agree, he manages to draw from his extensive vocabulary the words necessary to paint a rich verbal picture of the fascinating life of what Ambrose would call "an ordinary man."

A couple of years after his Reserve Officers Training Corps experience at the University of Oklahoma, Lale entered the U.S. Army, reporting first to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio. He was good at the task assigned him — gunnery training officer — so it was 1944 before he met the European enemy as the executive officer under an unnamed but thoroughly disagreeable colonel. The man was so unprofessional in fact that Lale briefly considered talking to the inspector general about his superior's conduct.

Rather than rely on memories now fifty years old, as he recounted the Battle of the Bulge and the march to the Rhine River, Lale, chose to quote or paraphrase letters he had written to Georgiana from France, Belgium, and
Germany — letters she had preserved carefully until her death in 1982.

In March 1945, Lale predicted "an early collapse of German forces in the West ... If our advance continues, and the Russians are able to get to Berlin, it shouldn't be long." He was only two months off in his prediction.

All his recollections were not of battles and blood.

"In Nenderoth we established a civil government by taking a civilian off the streets and telling him, 'You are the Burgermeister,'" Lale wrote. "His instructions were to see that all arms were turned over to us. The next morning we accepted fancy fowling pieces, handguns, and ancient weapons which today would make any museum proud."

Lale's first job following war's end was at the Marshall News Messenger. Also on staff at the time was Lloyd Mae "Cissy" Stewart. Her friendship with the Lales continued for thirty-five years. Some fifteen months after Georgiana's death, she became the second Mrs. Max Lale, and was one of those who pushed Max to complete his memoirs and find a publisher. It is her photograph of Max, taken at the site in France where Germany formally surrendered, that was chosen for the book's cover.

If there is any adverse criticism of Lale's book, it is that its creation, over some four years, allowed for repetition of a thought or occurrence. It doesn't happen often, and good editing by publisher Eakin Press would have found the duplication.

That, however, is not the major criticism to be leveled at Eakin Press. There is no note on the cover that Bill Moyers wrote the foreword. Moyers averages dozens of requests a year for either a foreword or a review of an upcoming book — many coming from writers as well known as Moyers himself. Normally, Moyers' answer is "No." So the fact that the answer to Max was "Yes" was reason enough to make note of it on the cover or with Eakin Press's publicity about the book. The eloquence of Moyers' tribute to his friend is another, better reason.

Gail K Beil
Marshall, Texas


At last, Linda S. Hudson has written a definitive biography about Jane McManus Storm Cazneau, who speculated in Texas land before it was a republic, became a journalist for the United States Magazine and Democratic
Review and for the New York Sun, traveled to Mexico City on a peace mission during the Mexican War, and promoted revolutions in Mexico, Cuba, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

The central theme of her life and work, Hudson explains, was the “Manifest Destiny” of the United States - a phrase Cazneau originated to describe a policy of territorial expansion to the Pacific Ocean and beyond. Cazneau wrote columns in at least six metropolitan newspapers, articles in three national journals, fifteen books, numerous pamphlets, and edited five or more newspapers and journals. Many of her publications were unsigned. She used a variety of by-lines but was best known as “Cora Montgomery.” Her death made front-page news in New York newspapers when she died in 1878.

So why has she not been the subject of a definitive biography until now? Jane Cazneau was a woman born nearly 200 years before her time. Heroines of the Texas Revolution almost all can be called long suffering. Cazneau’s life sounds like the script from a contemporary sit-com. No portraits of her have been found, but she is described as petite, with a dark complexion – one grandmother may have been an American Indian – and violet eyes.

Jane was born in Rensselaer County, New York, in 1807, and educated at a Litchfield, Connecticut, boarding school. Her father, William McManus, represented Rensselaer County in Congress for one term, 1825-1827. Jane married Allen B. Storm in 1825, and the following year gave birth to a son, William McManus Storm. By 1832, Jane had resumed using her maiden name and Storm had disappeared. Jane McManus was a single, apparently divorced, working mother, and by some accounts the twenty-six year old mistress of seventy-six year old Aaron Burr, former vice president of the United States best known for his duel with Alexander Hamilton.

As early as 1831, Jane and Burr worked to obtain large tracts of land in Mexican Texas for her McManus family at little expense. Jane was employed by Anthony Dey, who formed the Galveston Bay and Texas Land Company to promote European settlement on some thirteen million acres covering twenty present-day East Texas counties. Jane and her younger brother, Robert McManus, sailed from New Orleans to Mexican Texas in December 1832. It was the first of nine trips to Texas that Jane made between 1832 and 1849. Some sources claim the Mexican government granted Jane McManus eleven leagues of land, but she lacked the finances to move her German settlers to the designated colony and her land speculation in Texas failed.

The failure did not dim her enthusiasm for Texas. When the Texas Revolution began in 1836, Jane wrote: “I cannot bear arms for my adopted country – but if the interest I possess in her soil, will be guarantee for any money, I will with joy contribute my mite to the purchase of arms for her brave defenders.” Later, her columns in the New York Sun helped swing public opinion in the United States in favor of the annexation of the Republic of Texas.

Jane McManus married William Leslie Cazneau in 1849. Cazneau was a
politician and a soldier who was a member of the guard that escorted the prisoner Santa Anna to Galveston after the Battle of San Jacinto. Jane and her new husband were close friends of Mirabeau B. Lamar, second president of the Republic of Texas, and Lamar dedicated a volume of poetry to Jane.

Jane and Cazneau founded the town of Eagle Pass, and in 1852 she used the experience there for a book, *Eagle Pass; or Life on the Border*. During the Mexican War, Jane was authorized by President James K. Polk to play an important part in a peace mission to Mexico City, nearly a century before a woman was appointed to the United States Foreign Service.

Linda Hudson's scholarly biography of Cazneau lists her newspaper articles, giving details such as date, place, and topic of each, as well as a table of textual analysis of Jane's publications — a contribution of modern computers to historical research. The impressive bibliography stretches over twenty-eight pages, followed by forty-five pages of notes plus a detailed index. The Ottis Lock Research Grant from the East Texas Historical Association and the John H. Jenkins Research Fellowship from the Texas State Historical Association helped fund necessary travel for Hudson's research. Hudson is professor of history at East Texas Baptist University in Marshall and past president of the East Texas Historical Association.

The only major disappointment in this book is the jacket — a reproduction of John Gast's oil *American Progress*, featuring a classically draped female figure with flowing golden hair. That won't matter in a couple of years when *Mistress of Manifest Destiny* should become a PBS television series, produced by someone of the stature of David Grubin, whose monumental series on Napoleon recently earned him an Emmy award. Or the book could become a Steven Spielberg movie — it is time the noted director gave equal attention to feminine heroes.

Cissy Stewart Lale  
Fort Worth and Marshall, Texas

---


Jo Ella Powell Exley researched and wrote for sixteen years on the Indian captive Cynthia Ann Parker and her family. Exley visited the places mentioned in the book and presents the reader with a view of the landscape as well as the times. Using church and family records, diaries, reminiscences, and interviews, plus books and articles on Baptists and Indian captives, Exley meticulously documents and brings to life a Texas pioneer family and its most famous members, Cynthia Ann and Quanah Parker.
In five parts, Exley places five generations of Parkers in the context of their times as they migrated from Virginia to Georgia to Tennessee to Illinois and to Texas. Exley opens with the Pre-destination, foot-washing Baptist, Elder John. The saga continues with Daniel, the fanatic who disseminated the Two-Seed doctrine and anti-missionary movement. He led his family to Texas in December 1833. Daniel’s son, James, and the family members that built Fort Parker near the falls of the Brazos in Limestone County, were massacred and kidnapped by Indians in May 1836. Exley allows granddaughter Rachel Parker Plummer, a married and pregnant woman with a small child, to tell much of her captive ordeal as she roamed five states. The reader travels with Rachel’s father, James, in his mental anguish, physical torment, and relentless quest to rescue his daughter and granddaughter from the Comanches. Rachel was ransomed in 1838; James, broken in health and spirit, gave up on finding Cynthia Ann in 1845. Parts four and five make up the last half of the book and tell the tragic story of Cynthia Ann and her son Quanah, chief of the last Comanche band to surrender. This book is a must for those interested in Texas Baptists, the frontier, the revolution, captives, or Indians.

Linda S. Hudson
East Texas Baptist University


For historians of the nineteenth-century Southwest, Colonel Joseph King Fenno Mansfield’s inspection reports of military posts are the bread-and-butter research documents on the region. Less well known is Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Eggleston Johnston’s inspections of forts in Texas and New Mexico immediately prior to the Civil War.

Of the two inspectors, Johnston is best known for his role in the Civil War in command of the Confederate army in Virginia until he was wounded before Richmond in 1862, and in 1863-1865, when he twice commanded the Army of Tennessee against General William Tecumseh Sherman’s much larger Army of the Tennessee.

Thanks to Jerry Thompson, who has edited these inspection reports with copious and apt footnotes, scholars of the region’s history now have a superb documentary collection to which they can refer.

Of the two inspections, Mansfield’s is superior with more detail and excellent sketches of most of the forts which have been reproduced in the text. Johnston’s opinions concerning the competence, or lack thereof, of various
officers and units, are more acerbic, while Mansfield's tend to be gentler.

Interestingly given the imminence of the Civil War, little of the tension in either New Mexico or Texas comes through in either set of reports. The one major exception is Mansfield's comments concerning the commander of the Department of Texas, Brigadier General David E. Twiggs. Colonel Mansfield noted with thinly veiled sarcasm that Twiggs had released prisoners who had been convicted by a general court martial back into their units. Mansfield suggested that this probably was not a good idea for good discipline. Twiggs later surrendered all of the forts, munitions, and entire units throughout Texas to Confederate organizers.

Finally, Thompson provides an excellent conclusion that describes Mansfield's and Johnson's subsequent military careers and a marvelous appendix which identifies officers mentioned in the reports with brief information on their later careers and when they died.

Louis R. Sadler
New Mexico State University


Lizzie and Will survived the Civil War – but, not without cost!

Erika L. Murr used Elizabeth S. and William G. Neblett's diary and letters to tell the story of their marriage, the birth of their children, and their lives during the Civil War. At first, I did not care for Lizzie, who seemed to be the biggest "whiner" in Texas – certainly a far cry from the stereotypical image of the "can-do" Texas frontier woman!

However, Murr skillfully expanded her story through seven chapters: "The Coming Pains of Labor," "Tied to the House by a Crying Young One," "Working for Negroes and Children," "No Sympathy From the Curious World," "A Bare Living & a Grave," and "Pray That God May Grant Us Peace." Interestingly, these titles refer to both the progress of the war and the expansion of Will and Lizzie's family.

One factor that makes Murr's book a treasure is that the Neblett Papers contain letters from both Lizzie and Will during the war years. This gives the reader the home viewpoint as well as the soldier's viewpoint – a rare component in most letter collections. A second factor is the changes the war years wrought in both Lizzie and Will. Lizzie started out being a naive Grimes County woman who had been raised as a Southern Belle. She married for love and hoped for a bright future. However, that was not to be. Lizzie had a dark
side to her character and succumbed to depression that robbed her of many of life's pleasures. She was petrified of pregnancy and childbirth, yet had six children. Will's first letters show a man reluctant to voice his heart's desires. However, by 1864 he is much more vocal in praising Lizzie and encouraging her to shake off her depression.

*A Rebel Wife in Texas* is a jewel and Erika L. Murr is to be congratulated on her fine work with these primary documents.

Beverly J. Rowe  
Texarkana, Texas


The growing body of literature about the notorious Texas gunfighter John Wesley Hardin has been supplemented richly by a volume of his correspondence. Roy and Jo Ann Stamps, residents of southern California, learned of a distant kinship with Hardin. While researching this fascinating mankiller, they discovered that a considerable amount of his correspondence is on file in the special collections of Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos. Most of the letters to and from Hardin were written during his fifteen-year confinement at Huntsville. His prison record is included, along with quotations from his autobiography. By publishing 281 items, the Stamps have provided readers with new insights into Hardin's attitudes and the sad plight of family members cut off from an imprisoned loved one.

In long letters to his wife, whom he had left penniless and homeless, convict Hardin protests endlessly at the injustice of his confinement while offering maudlin platitudes about how she should instruct their three children with moral values that he had ignored during his wild years as a gambler-drunkard-shootist. The same themes abound in letters to his son and two daughters. But in an 1889 letter to his fifteen-year-old son, who was supporting his mother and sisters by farm labor, an unreformed Hardin asserts that if sufficiently provoked, under "the laws of your country and the laws of God ... you have a perfect right to kill." This fatherly advice continued with instruction about tactics: "... don't make any threats but just quietly get your gun and double barrel let it be a good gun have no other kind, and go a gunning for the enemy of mankind, and when you find him just deliberately Shoot him down like you would a mad dog or a wild beast." (p. 218)

Punctuation, spelling, and grammar remain in original form, adding to the flavor of the letters. It is pertinent that Hardin was born and raised in East Texas, that many of his shootouts occurred in this region, and that a number of his correspondents resided in nineteenth-century East Texas communities.
Although more editorial information would have been helpful throughout the book, this volume is a welcome addition to gunfighter lore.

Bill O'Neal
Panola College


Charles M. Robinson III, author of numerous books dealing with Texas, the Civil War, and Native Americans, explores the life and military career of General George Crook. Crook, born in Ohio in 1828 and educated at West Point, started his military career in California guarding the surveying expedition for the transcontinental railroad until the outbreak of the Civil War. During the Civil War Crook’s successes earned him some recognition and promotion to the rank of brigadier general. At the end of the war Crook resumed his service in the frontier army in Oregon. While there he established a lasting peace between the Indians and settlers in the territory. This peace came about through Crook’s unusual treatment of Indians as equal to whites. Crook continued his success in Arizona and the Dakotas while pushing his idea that Indians should be defined as persons and enjoy the same civil rights as the rest of the citizens of the United States in federal courts. The general’s fight for better treatment for Indians did not end until his death in 1890.

Robinson succeeded in portraying both the good and bad aspects of Crook’s life and the general’s attempt “to advance the cause of the Indian as a human being” (xix). The author filled the book with numerous small stories that connected Crook’s life to the overall history of the frontier and Indian relations in the United States. Robinson brings the problem-riddled career of General Crook to life.

Charles Grear
Texas Christian University


Valuable contributions to understanding steamboat traffic west of Shreveport have been made by Jacques D. Bagur through this encyclopedic

Bagur applies professional research experience, intimate knowledge of navigation, and uncanny deduction to a survey of the Cypress Valley from the 1700s to the present. As an active participant in feasibility studies of navigation along Cypress Bayou since 1990, he has been a central figure in pinpointing sites of the *Mittie Stephens* wreck, the Robert Potter homestead on Caddo Lake, and the Alabama Indian village on Potter's Point.

Bagur's clear narrative and painstaking research far exceed his goals of examining water transportation and the socioeconomic factors that affected it in Northwestern Louisiana, East Texas, and the Red River. Dominant lakes on steamboat routes were Soda, Shiftail, Clear, Caddo, and Cross, with varying and multiple names. From incomplete newspaper files and other sources, he lists 324 steamboats known to have made trips along the route and another twenty-six strongly believed to have done so. The list includes year, port, type, tons, and dimensions.

Through admirable detective tactics, Bagur establishes March 1845 as the year the first steamboat, the *Lama*, reached Jefferson. He provides rich chronologies for each year between 1845 and the demise of steamboating along the route. As steamboat prosperity ended with the advent of railroad competition, Bagur provides a table of congressional appropriations between 1872 and 1918 that supported the Cypress Bayou and waterway project. He concludes with an account of the Shreveport-to-Daingerfield navigation effort of the Corps of Engineer during the 1990s. Planning ceased when the Corps declared it "infeasible on economic and environmental grounds."

This monumental book, sponsored by the Cypress Valley Navigation District, is a positive outcome of the abandoned project.

Fred Tarpley
Texas A&M University-Commerce


Retired architect, planner, and Texas A&M professor Gordon Echols has produced a sweeping review of Texas buildings, mostly residences and mostly from the mid nineteenth century. Featured examples represent a pioneering era in Texas that ranged roughly from the 1830s Republic through the 1880s, just as railroads penetrated great distances into the state. From the sophisticated
1839 Stephen Blount House in San Augustine to stark shelters collected at the Ranching Heritage Center in Lubbock, from the 1876 Sinai Hebrew Synagogue in Jefferson to the 1830s San Raphael Chapel in Rondando, Jim Hogg County, Echols selected a catalog of architectural elegance and serenity barely influenced by the industrial age.

Bookstores and on-line catalogs desperately need a current title demonstrating to students and newcomers the intriguing progression of nineteenth-century Texas architecture. While the quality of photo composition and reproduction in Echols’ new book pales in comparison to Blake Alexander’s and Todd Webb’s classic Texas Homes of the 19th Century (University of Texas Press, 1966), that volume is now thirty-five years old and out of print. Those with a copy featuring Alexander’s educating prose and Webb’s large-format photos will enjoy comparing the condition of common examples after a third of a century. The late-1830s Half-Way (James B. Johnson) House at Chireno has been uprooted twice in the last decade and barely survives; the 1850 Stagecoach Inn (Tavern) at Chappell Hill has thankfully been rescued and restored.

Echols ventured deep into the Rio Grande Valley for fine colonial examples along the Laredo to Brownsville camino, while Alexander and Webb covered little south of San Antonio. Yet Alexander and Webb braved to reveal the Victorian story of the late nineteenth century, not yet nostalgic in the 1960s, while Echols describes it with few examples as a style that “perhaps least reflects a decidedly Texan form of architecture” (p. 9). That’s a contradictory summary coming from an obvious standard-bearer for the Greek Revival, which had no more to do with Texas than the Anglo Southerners who brought it here from somewhere else.

Beyond filling a current space in available literature, Echols’ and TCU’s offering is perplexing and frustrating. The book is organized into five regional chapters, yet the only two sketch maps provided, “Eleven Geographic Regions of Texas” (p. 3), and “Five Settlement Regions” (p. 4), display independent divisions not exactly reflected in the text. This is a coffee table book, pure and simple, with a striking cover of maroon and black; it offers no pretext of assisting the mobile observer of Texas architecture through location maps or addresses. The author has drawn heavily from prior documentation and scholarship of the National Register (misnamed Registry) of Historic Places and the Historic American Buildings Survey, yet these sources and others are barely acknowledged, with no explanation of their own pioneering work in documenting many examples in the book.

Better organization and better editing should not have been lost to production budgets or oversights on such a book. An empty space still remains on the Texas architecture shelf, waiting for fresh research augmented with floor plans and site plans, state-of-the-art printing, and guidance for visiting these remarkable places in person.

Jim W. Steely
Austin, Texas

Walter L. Buenger explodes the myth that only FDR’s New Deal programs of the 1930s allowed Northeast Texas, an area more culturally Southern than most parts of the Lone Star state, to escape poverty and identify itself with the Nation’s future rather than the Confederate past. The Path To A Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction And The Great Depression persuades the reader that Northeast Texas began its ascent from poverty and Confederate mythology long before the 1930s. The region’s five-decade minor adjustment of its economy, its politics, and its society enabled it to take full advantage of the sweeping changes offered by the New Deal and World War II.

The greater depth and breadth of Buenger’s theme moves far beyond earlier writers’ more confined examinations, bringing into focus the major, interconnected relationships of race, gender, business, and politics with admirable clarity. A single example will suffice here. This work is the first that fully inquires into, and competently reveals, the integral association of banking reform and the development of major railroads and the lumber industry which created the Northeast Texas timber boom from 1880 to 1910. This integrated assault on Southern yellow pine assisted the modernization of the material culture and industrial networks of the region, linking it to the state and the rest of nation. One inevitable side effect was the destruction of the first-growth-forested woodlands of Northeast Texas.

Buenger cogently argues that Texas, because of its increasing alignment with the nation resulting from its fifty-year change from poverty to modernization, became more modern than the rest of the South in the area of women’s rights and offered greater social and economic mobility for its lower white classes. And, although horrific examples of racial brutality are noted by Buenger, racial violence in the region was less common than in other areas of the South.

The writer’s style and structure works well in the telling of the story. Considering the breadth of the subject, the history reads smoothly. The research is voluminous. Sources include area newspapers, oral interviews, manuscript collections, memoirs and autobiography, local histories, and agricultural studies. This reviewer believes that Buenger has captured a vital, missing aspect of Texas history between Reconstruction and the Great Depression. This reviewer also believes that every historian and layman interested in the history of Texas should have on his shelf The Path To A Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction And The Great Depression.

Melvin C. Johnson
Stephen F. Austin State University

This collection of essays allows the reader to see Southern politics as it unfolded after the Civil War. In the preface C. Vann Woodward commented that most Southern historians have omitted some of the racial problems faced in the South by freed blacks and that this collection would attempt to remedy this failing. Until recently most Southern historians focused only on people who had held the power and made the laws—the whites. Emancipation led to changes in the social makeup of Southern society which created racial tensions and hatreds that lasted for well over a century.

These essays look at different aspects of the African Americans' lives and the restrictions placed upon them. No specific date can be attributed to the beginnings of the Jim Crow system, but, it kept the South separated for years. Southern politics kept African Americans from obtaining equality, but they found ways to resist white domination. This book lived up to Woodward's expectation. It admirably describes the trials and turmoils of the African Americans. This is a remarkable book for anyone who is a Southern historian, politician, or simply likes to read about the past.

Donna C. West
Sacul, Texas


This volume contains data, arranged alphabetically by county, giving agricultural information about crops planted, livestock raised, and other interesting information. No population census is included, but there is a comparison between the figures for 1880 and 1887. The number of males and females is given, as well as ethnic diversity of the area. For instance, Nacogdoches County had 10,192 "Americans," 3,346 colored; four English; seventy-three German; nine French; fourteen Irish; three Italian; 374 Mexican; twenty Polish; ten Russians; and twelve from all other nations.

Figures include the number of bee stands, pounds of honey produced, tons of cottonseed, and number of acres planted in various crops. It was interesting to note that Rusk County produced grapes and wine in 1887.
Population totals for the towns in each county are given, and the school population and number of schoolhouses is included. Average wages of teachers revealed that white male teachers were paid $40.42 per month, while females received $33.66.

Yearly totals of the number of marriages, divorces, births, and deaths are given for each county. Organizational dates are provided and the person for whom the county was named is identified. The number of square miles in the county is listed, as is the average price per acre. Value of livestock is listed and the number and variety of animals slaughtered is included. The denomination of churches in the area give a detailed view of religious activity.

This volume is full of fascinating and valuable information about each county. It supplies cultural information and living conditions throughout the state, which complements the data given in population census records. Each library in the state would benefit from having a copy of this work in its collection.

Carolyn Reeves Ericson
Nacogdoches, Texas

_Twelve Years in the Saddle With the Texas Rangers_, W.J.L. Sullivan,

This book was published originally in 1909 with the title _Twelve Years in the Saddle for Law and Order on the Frontiers of Texas_. This is a valuable reprinting of an obscure and rather well written series of interesting "Texas Ranger" tales by a former member of the Frontier Battalion, Sergeant John L. Sullivan. The author lived only two years after the book's publication, dying in 1911 at age sixty.

Sullivan was born in Winston County, Mississippi, in 1851. He was an orphan at eight years old and found himself living in Arkansas with a hard taskmaster, the father-in-law of his stepfather. He and his brother ran away and were raised by the families of several Confederate soldiers who befriended them.

In 1871 Sullivan went up the Chisholm Trail with a cattle herd to Ellsworth, then worked for some time as a cowboy, but little else is known of his life before April 1889, when he enlisted in Company B of the Frontier Battalion. Sullivan was an easy man to pick out in a group because he was the only Ranger among thirty-four who wore a full beard in that famous photo of those assigned to prevent the Mayer-Fitzsimmons fight.

Near the first sentence of his book, Sullivan tells his readers that this is
not a story of his life, but rather a collection of twenty-five "exciting experiences" in which he played a lead role during his twelve years with the Frontier Battalion. Included are a number of poems, songs, and letters. These twenty-five short stories are why you want to read the book, although the reader would have been better served if a date had been included in each story indicating when it took place.

Regardless, I found most of the stories interesting and the collection gives the reader a broad view of the activities of a "Texas Ranger" after the Texas frontier largely had disappeared. John L. Sullivan ended his Ranger career after twelve years of service, in 1901, when he shot himself in the leg and spent the rest of his life crippled and in pain.

Allen G. Hatley
La Grange, Texas

G.W. Carroll: Southern Capitalist and Dedicated Beaumont Baptist, Terry Lee Rioux (Eakin Press, P.O. Box 90159, Austin, TX 78709-0159) 2001.

Recently an article appeared in the Beaumont Enterprise telling about a taxidermist who visited area churches and talked about the evils of alcohol. Trained birds helped illustrate his message. A cockatoo would walk a tight rope to show how one should "walk the straight and narrow" and a macaw would fly into a toy casket and "play dead" near empty beer and whiskey bottles. The talk always concluded with the taxidermist saying, "I told you it would kill you!"

Finding the article amusing, I also was reminded of another unusual tactic demonstrated one afternoon in 1903 by Beaumonter George W. Carroll. As a dedicated Baptist and political activist, Carroll, alarmed by the degrading conditions created by Spindletop, shaved his beard, threw on some old clothes, and marched into a Beaumont saloon. He climbed onto a billiard table and announced to all who he was. While this incident had little impact on the saloon and gambling community at the time and was out-of-character for the mild-mannered Carroll, it demonstrated his fervent fight against what he considered to be the elements of sin. Although he lost his bid as the Prohibition Party candidate for Texas governor in 1902 and United States vice-president in 1904, Carroll co-founded a Texas chapter of the Anti-Saloon League in 1907 and continued the "good fight" until his death in 1935.

More than the story of Carroll's quest to improve the moral fabric of society, however, this book portrays his role as a successful businessman involved in lumber and oil activities and offers glimpses into the lives of some of Beaumont's most prominent families. It also touches on the political and social issues of the times and highlights Carroll's connections with other
prominent Southern Baptists.

Well-documented and precisely written, anyone interested in the history of southeast Texas would enjoy this book.

Wanda Landrey
Beaumont, Texas


Some may boast of prowess bold,
Of the school they think so grand,
But there's a spirit that can ne'er be told,
It's the spirit of Aggieland.

Texas A&M University is one of the nation's leading universities academically, but it stands above other universities in one aspect – the spirit of Aggieland. Adams explains that spirit began 125 years ago with the Corps of Cadets.

Young men arrived at Texas A&M, never having been away from their homes, to face rigorous military discipline and academic work. Early Aggies lived a spartan existence in dormitories located on a remote, barren prairie. Under such trying conditions, they developed a tightly knit "fraternity" – a brotherhood – that would become the spirit of Aggieland.

Adams points out that rapid turnover of faculty and presidents, poor financial support from the legislature, and an unstable enrollment caused Texas A&M to lead a fragile existence during its first twenty-five years. It was President Sul Ross who brought about the financial and academic stability that insured the continuation of the university.

Texas A&M contributed more officers to World War I and World War II than any other institution, earning it national recognition. Following World War II, Texas A&M was guided through a transitional period by President Earl Rudder. As Adams explains, only Rudder's prestige, popularity, and influence could have brought about monumental changes during the 1960s and early 1970s: the transition to a co-educational institution; optional military training; and expanded academic programs, with major emphasis on graduate training and research. Rudder increased funding from the legislature and ushered in an unprecedented period of growth in the physical plant.

President Rudder recognized the importance of sustaining time-honored traditions and maintaining the Spirit of Aggieland, and he wisely placed that responsibility in the hands of the Corps of Cadets.
This is a splendidly written book and I like the writing style. Adams has researched his topic well and has provided an excellent bibliography. Along with facts, figures, and historical events, he interjects anecdotes that make the reading lively and interesting. I strongly recommend the book. For former students of Texas A&M, it is a must; for historians, it is an excellent history of Texas A&M; and for others, perhaps it will contribute to a better understanding of "the spirit that can ne'er be told" – the spirit of Aggieland.

Jack D. McCullough
Stephen F. Austin State University


How argue against success? Especially the successful allied landing on June 6, 1944, on the Normandy coast.

Because my own four campaigns in Europe did not include D-Day, I have no vested interest in attacking or defending either the planning or the tactical decisions made on that "longest day" in American military history.

Not so this author, however. Lewis, a retired Army major and now an assistant professor of history at the University of North Texas, would have preferred a perfect battle instead of the one which led to a lodgment on the continent and eventually the destruction of Hitler's Third Reich.

In his first chapter, Lewis recites all the problems that beset the effort – the load of gear carried by individual soldiers, rough seas, fixed obstacles, swamped vehicles – leading him to conclude that "in fact, the plan for the conduct of the battle had failed" (p. 10).

I write this forty years and two days after the infamous Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. There, a rag-tag force of 1,500 men went up against Castro's army of more than 100,000. They were allowed little air cover and landed far from a dense population thought to be home to thousands who would rise up in support.

Now there was real failure.

Few if any military analysts would minimize the difficulties encountered on Omaha Beach. Most, I suspect, would count them among the unknowns once the senior strategists have committed their plan to execution, from which point they are helpless – except for retreat.

Subsequent chapters after the first deal with joint-fire planning, joint and combined operations, and British and American visions of amphibious
doctrine, all of them aspects of the battle which inevitability led toward compromise.

Lewis' complaint is against the big-picture planners: "one of the stated reasons for landing during the hours of daylight, the need for navigational accuracy, was negated in the movement phase – that phase of attack with the greatest potential for confusion and error" (p. 207).

He faults also the brief duration of a thirty-minute preparation by bombers and naval artillery, comparing this phase of the battle, less convincingly, on the part of both Army and Marine Corps experience in the Pacific Theater. Though perhaps no less firmly defended, the outcome was less dependent on surprise that in France, where German reinforcements in the Pas de Calais might have been brought to bear against a handful of American and British divisions.

In his concluding chapter, Lewis undercuts in some degree his argument about the faults he finds in the way the battle was fought. He writes, "Between 1940 and 1944, the armed forces of the United States began operation in World War II a dearth of doctrine…. Between 1940 and 1944, the armed forces learned the hard way by trial and error.", (p. 255).

The author manfully lists an extensive collection of citations in notes totaling fifty-eight pages that are heavily weighed toward official documents and impressive bibliography. Graduate students will applaud.

Nevertheless, well clear of the "fog of war" which besets the journeyman warrior on the ground, the author apparently believes in hindsight that the battle on Omaha Beach should have – not could have – been a perfect battle. I do not buy it.

Max S. Lale
Marshall and Fort Worth, Texas


The anniversaries and reunions of World War II Veterans cropping up in the 1990s have become a treasure trove of primary source material for writers interested in pursuing a World War II topic. Thomas Alexander has used these sources to produce an extremely interesting and entertaining work on the United States Army Air Forces. The distance traveled and time spent with veterans by the author was rewarded with exciting interviews and previously untold stories that make this book different from others on the topic. The generosity of individuals with their stories and pictures and local history
organizations which have collected and preserved the history of their counties enabled Alexander to corroborate many military stories and "legends." This local flavor, along with a brief history of each town, greatly enhanced this book.

The author's methodology makes reading easy because he discusses each base, beginning with a brief history of the town in Texas where it was located. These include Pecos (Pecos Army Airfield), Sweetwater (Avenger Field), Amarillo (Amarillo Army Airfield), Greenville (Majors Airfield), Waco (Waco Army Airfield), San Antonio (Randolph Field), Harlingen (Harlingen Army Airfield), and Pyote (Rattlesnake Bomber Base). Reminiscent of railroad building days, each town was eager to accommodate the federal government in placing a base near them to help with their depressed economies. Much like the mining frontier, some towns "boomed" during the war years and become ghost towns by the 1950s. Each base has extraordinary personal stories and incidents, but generally all had the same story in terms of establishment and closure. Of great value are the appendices of formerly restricted United States Army Air Force Information Sheets of Statistics on each base and photos and specifications of the major aircraft flown on these bases.

What could possibly be a common denominator among women, rattlesnakes, Hollywood, the Taj Mahal, the "City of Waco, Texas," "mother-in-law of the Army," the Waco blackout, the Aquilas Aztecas, and big, bright Texas stars? You will certainly enjoy finding out!

Linda Cross
Tyler, Texas


Dusty wind-swept west Texas is the setting for this work that deals with the obscure story of the incarceration of Italian prisoners of war during World War II. A camp was established in late 1942 in the small town of Hereford to contain Italians captured in North Africa. By April 1943, the sole purpose of the camp was to house Italian POWs who refused to abandon Fascism. Known as "Mussolini men," these hard-core non-collaborators were kept in isolation and some proved to be stentorian in their defiance of their captors. However, a certain group of the prisoners responded when given the opportunity to paint Biblical scenes in the drab interior of St. Mary's Church in nearby Umbarger.

Many of the events that transpired in the Hereford camp, as well as painting the ceiling and walls of St. Mary's, are revealed through the letters and interviews of a prisoner named Franco Di Bello. From the beginning of
his incarceration this officer was a stubborn non-collaborator who remained uncooperative with his captors virtually throughout his time as a POW. Though quite vocal in complaining about overall treatment of the prisoners, he nonetheless chose to be stoically silent during a situation in which the camp commandant, a Colonel Carvolth, decided to reduce the prisoners' rations. This occurred near the end of the European phase of the war. Because of the horrors of Nazi atrocities that were just becoming common knowledge to the American public, Colonel Carvolth took it upon himself to punish the Italian non-collaborators to "get even" for sins committed by his prisoners' Nazi counterparts in Europe. Later the prisoners bitterly remembered these months in the summer and autumn of 1945 as the time of la fame (the hunger).

A Catholic bishop who visited the camp was appalled at the sight of the emaciated prisoners and began efforts to alleviate their discomfort. His concern, coupled with the desire of the rector of St. Mary's to adorn the dun-colored interior with murals depicting Biblical scenes, culminated in Di Bello and several other prisoners volunteering to complete the project. The results are still visible in St. Mary's today. In return for their efforts, these non-collaborators were fed daily by women volunteers and occasionally managed to sneak leftovers to other prisoners in the camp.

Through numerous interviews with former residents of the area and prisoners who were held at the camp, as well as by conducting painstaking research into letters, diaries, and government documents, Donald Mace Williams has developed a simple but compelling story that brings together the prisoners, their guards, and the civilian population of the two small towns, including members of the local clergy. The interactions of this strange mix remind us that compassion exists in varied and sundry forms and they take the reader back to a unique and nearly forgotten period of Texas history.

Mark Choate
Austin, Texas

Brown, Not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston,

When most Americans think of school desegregation, they focus on the Brown decision in 1954 and the struggle of African Americans to dismantle the segregated public school system. Professor San Miguel correctly refocuses our attention to the efforts of Mexican Americans to achieve equality in education, an effort that paralleled, and in some instances predated, the African American struggle. San Miguel examines the confluence between the school integration movement and the emergence of the Chicano political movement in Houston
in the 1970s, and the impact that this had both on the effort to desegregate the public schools and on the development of Mexican American identity and political power. He argues that the school integration movement caused Mexican American leaders to abandon their moderate, integrationist political agenda for an agenda that was increasingly militant and based largely on the assertion of a distinctive Mexican American identity.

San Miguel divides his study into three sections. The first traces the history of the Mexican American Community in Houston and its early efforts to organize itself and assert political power. This discussion describes the Mexican American campaign to integrate area schools in the 1930s and 1940s using the strategy that Mexican American were “white” and that to segregate them violated state and federal law. In the second section, San Miguel discusses the radicalization of Mexican American political leadership in the 1960s and emerging crisis in the Houston schools as authorities grappled with desegregation. The final section, which comprises over half the book, details the confrontation between school leadership and the Mexican American community during and immediately following the 1970-1971 school year. As school authorities attempted to “desegregate” schools by using “white” Mexican Americans to integrate African American schools, Mexican American leaders abandoned their earlier position, demanded that they be recognized as a separate ethnic group, and insisted that school desegregation must accommodate three groups – black, white, and brown.

San Miguel does an excellent job analyzing the emergence of Mexican Americans as a political force in Houston. His discussion of the early years of the community is very informative, while his detailed analysis of the dramatic events of 1970-1971 draws attention to a significant turning point in the history of the city and its increasingly diverse population.

Cary D. Wintz
Texas Southern University

Ethnicity in the Sunbelt: Mexican Americans in Houston, Arnoldo De León

In 1989, San Angelo State University historian Arnoldo De León published his well-received book, Ethnicity in the Sunbelt: Mexican Americans in Houston. In this book he “sought to determine historical flux in ethnic identity and culture, offer a framework for viewing the process of Chicano community building, and explain class formation and differentiation within the Houston Hispanic community” (p.vii). Using an obvious and viable chronological approach, De LeÓN covered a century of community building in Houston by
focusing on the first migrants to 1930, the growth of the Mexican American community during the crises of Depression and World War II, and postwar racism and discrimination. De León's analysis of the period after 1960, entitled "Many Mexicos," was especially significant and thought provoking.

This new edition of De León's study adds to the previous publication by including an historiographical preface and a final chapter covering the decade of the 1990s. In this well-conceived revision, he brought in noteworthy concepts based on new literature and research since publication of the original book. As before, this book is an example of a mature scholar, one who uses meticulous research, knowledge of the topic, familiarity with the literature, awareness of the issues, the ability to define and explain, and an aptitude for developing new approaches and theories. In his salient last sentence, De León is at his finest when he concludes, "...ethnicity, it seems, can be consciously preserved if individuals regard their homeland heritage as dear as the country they serve" (p. 251). De León's Ethnicity in the Sunbelt is a must read.

Bruce A. Glasrud
Sul Ross State University


We can be ethical only in relation to something we can see, feel, understand, love, or otherwise have faith in.


In this extraordinary, elegant, posthumously published work, Jeanne Norsworthy takes her readers on a journey much farther than that from the Big Thicket to the Big Bend. My wife and I first learned of Norsworthy when we stopped years ago at Fort Leaton on our way out of a Solitario shut up. A lady in the gift shop asked where we were from, and when we declared "Uncertain," she told us of her friend Jeanne who had just left for there from her ranch on Fresno Creek. Norsworthy called Caddo Lake in East Texas a "healing place." As we now also have a cabin in the Davis Mountains of the Big Bend, we know the physical journey well, and delight in the biological richness of the areas Norsworthy describes so evocatively.

However, hers is a multi-dimensional journey, not just through the biodiverse landscapes and aesthetically rewarding revelations of her art, but through even more enriching insights into the psychologically restorative power of nature, her spirituality, and finally into her own poetic Land Ethic. Norsworthy wrote and illustrated this book while she fought breast cancer and
confronted other major life challenges. She, like Leopold, wrote for all humankind: "Benign vastness holds me in its hand, Reconnects me to all the unseen known, unknown and forgotten" (p. 101).

Norsworthy has made more accessible those qualities in nature that Leopold knew needed interpretation through “successive stages of the beautiful and values as yet uncaptured by language.” Norsworthy, in fact, takes us through these stages with her brush, her word processor, and her poet’s pen. She enthralls with Ivory Bills, shamans, a rare aurora borealis, and the release of her inner Golden Eagles. You’ll never forget the malignant catfish lurking in foreboding cypress roots.

Her work illuminates arcane concepts such as Edward O. Wilson’s biophilia hypothesis and presages the consequences of new National Institutes of Health research into the psychological effects of natural environments, including the effect of nature on people with serious illnesses. One NIH study involves a group of women in the early stages of breast cancer.

Norsworthy helps the reader see, feel, understand, love, and have faith in her healing landscapes. Anyone who wishes to pass on a conservation ethic to future generations must experience this book.

Richard C. & Joanne K. Bartlett
Uncertain & Davis Mountains, Texas


Most everyone agrees that Palo Duro Canyon is a breathtaking geological anomaly made all the more dramatic by the vast and flat caprock that flanks it from the north, west, and south. It holds our attention because of its breadth and beauty, but it also serves as the cradle of historic Texas from when Coronado passed through in the 1540s to its rebirth in the post Civil War era when the defeat of the Comanches and the opening of the western plains sparked economic growth.

The Story of Palo Duro Canyon, published by Texas Tech University Press as part of its Double Mountain Books reprint series, covers this rich history and more. It reminds us of the region’s significant geology, archeology, and anthropology. Originally published in 1979 by the Panhandle Plains Historical Society, The Story of Palo Duro Canyon was a precursor to the now commonplace interdisciplinary approach that details a subject’s intellectual legacy and places it into context. Such research protocols have long been used in anthropological and archeological site assessments, and more recently to determine the environmental impact of federally funded projects. But the
EAST TEXAS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

book’s most important legacy is that it shows what can be achieved when biologists, historians, anthropologists, and geologists join in a common purpose – the enhancement of human understanding. Frederick W. Rathjen, professor emeritus at West Texas A&M, who has written a new introduction, aptly reminds us that the collective authors in this volume wrote not to impress other experts, but for the “curious, perceptive observers motivated by impulses characteristic of the great American naturalists” (p. xi).

Tai Kreidler
West Texas Historical Association

*El Niño in History: Storming Through the Ages*, César N. Caviedes
(University Press of Florida, 15NW 15th St, Gainesville, FL 32611-2079)

*El Niño in History: Storming through the Ages* is the work of historical detective Cæsar N. Caviedes, who has painstakingly unearthed meteorological and other records to trace the effect of *El Niño*, the Pacific Ocean weather phenomenon that influences weather all over the world. Surprisingly, as Caviedes notes, *El Niño* went virtually unrecognized except as a regional phenomenon until late in the 1950s and in the early 1960s. Caviedes and other scholars interested in *El Niño* have examined indirect evidence to draw conclusions about its impact on world history.

As an example of *El Niño*’s impact on history, Caviedes writes that Napoleon probably was its victim when he invaded Russia in the Fall of 1812. The climate of the preceding years had not suggested such a sudden and severe onset of winter, but Caviedes discerns that the *El Niño* effect that year caught Napoleon by surprise. Incredibly, Adolph Hitler apparently made the same mistake in the winter of 1941-1942.

Caviedes also traces certain natural catastrophes to the effects of *El Niño*, notably famines in India between 1685 and 1900 that took the lives of seventy million people as a result of droughts.

*El Niño in History* is handsomely produced, extensively illustrated with helpful graphs, maps, and tables, and contains eight pages of color photographs. The author, a professor of geography, successfully combines the historical and scientific aspects of the research. A fascinating work of history and a profoundly scholarly work, *El Niño in History* may be more meticulous in scientific detail than some readers will wish. But it is a satisfying book for anyone who wants to understand a natural phenomenon that affects us all.

J. M. Dempsey
University of North Texas

In RKO Radio Pictures Without Reservations (1946), John Wayne, Claudette Colbert, and Don DeFore pause inside Chicago's Dearborn Station to watch a departing Santa Fe Chief. Due to board a less luxurious train to California, the three transcontinental travelers gaze at the famous western streamliner as it rolls away and declare forlornly, "I wish we were on the Chief." Postwar movie audiences instantly connected with the statement. Santa Fe Chiefs were among the most famous trains of their time and remain perhaps the most identifiable of all name trains, even to later generations who have never ridden the rails.

Santa Fe - The Chief Way is a fresh and nostalgic look at Santa Fe luxury train travel from the late 1920s to the early 1970s. Published by New Mexico Magazine and distributed by the University of New Mexico Press, it is a handsome book suitable for the coffee table of any rail fan or transportation historian. The numerous images, and especially Santa Fe's original advertising materials - as famous as the Chief trains themselves - are vividly reproduced, and the captions are both descriptive and interpretive.

The authors effectively present the excitement, romance, and lavish style of riding Santa Fe's streamliners through the colorful Indian Country of the Southwest. "No other railroad," they affirm, "and perhaps no other company in the history of America, so completely embraced the territory it served and used the mystique of a land and its people to market itself to its customers." (p. 8) The authors' selection and presentation of images fully support their claim.

Although the book focuses on the premiere streamlined trains that operated between Chicago and California, such as the Chief, Super Chief, and El Capitan, the Texas Chief that ran between Chicago and Houston/Galveston beginning in the late 1940s is not completely overlooked.

Jonathan Gerland
T.L.L. Temple Memorial Archives, Diboll


"Mr. King, have you ever written a novel?" an uninformed Austin television interviewer asked Larry L. King at the end of a thirty-minute interview on The One-Eyed Man.
Larry, controlled and mild-mannered — not always his nature — gave a polite response under the circumstances. *The One-Eyed Man* is the only novel Larry has ever written — although he has written at least sixteen other books. Ethics require that I tell you that I am somewhat biased because Larry is a friend and we co-authored a play.

Larry has not been deluged with a lot of formal education. He went to Texas Tech for about six months. But he is the most perceptive person I know. He is well-read, self-taught, and has an ear for the English language equalled by few. Add to this his background in politics, and you are looking in the eye of *The One-Eyed Man*.

Larry has taught at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, has been praised in high places, and after he wrote *The One-Eyed Man*, Robert Penn Warren commented to Larry that it sounded like Larry had been writing in Warren’s sleep.

The introduction to the new version of *The One-Eyed Man* suggests that this story of a Southern governor might be set in Texas. Having been hatched on a stump down in Louisiana, I always assumed it was Louisiana. Truth is, it could have been set in a number of Southern states where politics is colorful, the politicians are entertainers, and before the term “political correctness” had been invented.

When the passage of Time dries the literary ink, Larry L. King will be included in the list of the best Texas writers of all times. If you like inside politics, earthy language, humor, and good writing, I recommend that you read Larry L. King’s novel, *The One-Eyed Man*.

Ben Z. Grant
Marshall, Texas


Set in an oil field town on the Texas Gulf Coast in the 1920s, this novel is the story of the coming of age of a young woman, Quincie Bolliver. Quincie is a shy thirteen-year-old when the story begins. Her father, Curtin Bolliver, was an oil field muleskinner. His ability to handle mule-teams which hauled heavy equipment supplied himself and his motherless daughter with a subsistence level of existence. Curtin was a hard worker but he chose to live a nomadic life following the oil business from boomtown to boomtown. He had too many financial and emotional troubles of his own to give much thought to guiding his adolescent as she developed into a young woman.

The theme of the well-written and often poetic book is loss and how each
of the characters attempt to adjust to a life in constant economic transition. Mary King successfully recreates life in an oil boomtown. One can see and "smell" the tired, old boarding house crowded with workers who reek of petroleum odors. She describes one character's frantic attempt to locate oil on her property by the old water-witch stick method and of the old man who dyed his hair because he knew no company hired white-headed oil workers. With gripping panic she pictures the raging fire in the earthen oil reservoir and the desperate effort to stop the spread of the fire. Using a young girl's point-of-view, King writes with realistic detail of the impact of the oil industry on adults as well as children living in an oilfield town.

Priscilla Benham
North Harris Community College


Butterflies Do Not Sleep in Hot Tubs: A Lawyer's Tortured Search for Truth is the inaugural publication of Houston attorney Nancy McCoy. As titles go, this one perfectly captures the serious introspection of the author's temporal philosophical development while always maintaining a refreshing sense of humor that clearly militates against the author taking herself too seriously. The "butterfly" reference in the title is taken from the topic of the first chapter that will seem familiar to readers of the wedded category that also touches, in a sophisticatedly synonymous fashion, on a deeper truth concerning paradigmatic aesthetics.

Before proceeding further the writer of this review must make a disclosure in the spirit of intellectual and literary candidness. McCoy and myself are fellow alumni of the South Texas College of Law, albeit by a couple of years, even having been taught by some of the same professors. One, in fact, a fine old gentleman, lawyer, and teacher, Charles J. Weigel II, is the subject of one of the chapters of McCoy's book.

That said, readers of this book will find that it has a lot to say. McCoy treats the reader to interesting anecdotes from her own life and those of others who have had significant influence on — and been a part of — her development as a person, parent, lawyer, and friend. This is done in a somewhat narrative manner that manages to entertain while sparking critical self-examination of self and society by the reader. The author, in 232 pages, chronicles her own personal evolution in neat, compartmentalized fashion, while avoiding the philosophical pretentiousness that often pervades such "self-discovery" literature.
A portion of the proceeds from sales of the book have been donated to the Harry Chapin Foundation, founded by the late songwriter's widow, Sandy. The author, a self-professed Harry Chapin fanatic, devotes two full chapters to the subject. One concerns the impact that Chapin's music has had in her life; the other recounts her meeting Sandy Chapin in New York in 1999.

_Butterflies Do Not Sleep in Hot Tubs_ is a highly readable, contemplative book that relates the every-day endeavor for the deeper meaning of a life that, according to its author, is "not particularly remarkable." Do not be fooled by McCoy's humility. She most definitely has taken Socrates' directive on the examined life seriously, much to the readers' benefit.

Bryan L. Simmons
Galveston, Texas
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