

When Forests Trumped Parks: The Maryland Experience, 1906-1950

By EUGENE PHILIP PARKER

Eugene (Sandy) Parker is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Geography and Environmental Systems, University of Maryland Baltimore Campus

First Printed in the Maryland Historical Magazine – Summer 2006

The competitive relationship between the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the National Park Service (NPS), particularly in the years before 1950 has been well documented. Rivals of the first order, the two agencies quarreled over a broad range of issues and contested jurisdictions. Each worked to have the other transferred, and thus its power greatly reduced, into its respective departments. Ultimately, these battles gave form and purpose to the agencies that characterize both to this day. Little has been written about how these tensions played out at the state level in the first half of the twentieth century - the formative years for both state parks and state forests in the United States.¹

An analysis of the development of state parks and forests in Maryland from 1906 to 1950 clearly shows that in every instance forests trumped parks. By 1950 almost a half-century after the state passed legislation establishing authority for the state parks and forests, Maryland had a remarkably dismal record of park support. This record came as the result of:

- 1) hostility toward parks as preserved landscapes,
- 2) a presumption that "recreational opportunities" meant parks and,
- 3) a bureaucracy dominated by a forester whose thirty-six year rule epitomized the "development is the first principle of conservation" philosophy of Gifford Pinchot, the first Chief Forester of the USFS.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, powerful forces worked on behalf of parks in the United States. Americans had come to admire and value the extraordinary landscapes of their nation, particularly those of the West, and increasingly called for the establishment of national parks to protect them. Municipal parks existed in some major cities (e.g. New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore) as a result of local efforts. By the late 1890s a national movement had arisen to promote parks in urban environments throughout the nation.²

Common themes connected the local and national movements. The nation had become increasingly aware of the degradation of resources and the environment. Across the country, forests had fallen to land clearing, timbering, and extensive and often devastating fires. Soils had been lost to poor agricultural practices, land abandoned, and river and stream quality had declined. Air and water quality in industrial cities had deteriorated dramatically. Trees, woods, and open spaces were virtually non-existent in these areas, and squalid conditions had given rise to serious health problems. Urban life for many people was an abysmal experience.³

Calls for parks at both the national and local levels often focused upon the spiritual and physical benefits such landscapes offered. The City Beautiful Movement, a driving force behind the influential American Civic Association (ACA), promoted parks, parkways, and open space to relieve the desperate poverty of the working poor. In an address to the 1908 National Conservation Conference of Governors, ACA President J. Horace McFarland declared, "It is incontrovertible that peace and health and good order are fostered in parks in proportion as they represent scenic beauty" To some degree, the municipal parks movement was very much an anti-urban movement, perceiving in parks the antidote to urban blight.⁴

State Parks, positioned as they were between national and municipal lands, had few advocates. Early support for state parks was generally limited to local historical societies interested in the preservation of historical - particularly military and archaeological – sites. In other cases the land for state parks came through private donations. Local grassroots action, unconnected to larger movements, spurred interest in state parks during the first two decades of the twentieth century. When the first conference on state parks met in Des Moines, Iowa, in 1921, nineteen states had parks.⁵

The Forest Conservation Act and the Board of Forestry

As was the case with the nation generally, by 1900 Maryland had experienced significant deterioration of its natural resources, particularly its forests. Extensive areas of forests had fallen to logging, agriculture, and fires. A substantial portion of Maryland's remaining forests were found on farm woodlots. Local newspapers frequently carried national and neighborhood stories about the damage. At the turn of the last century, Maryland newspapers often featured articles and editorials on the need for federal forest reservations, particularly in the east.⁶ In 1900, the Maryland Geological Society signed a cooperative agreement with the United States Division of Forestry to study the economic conditions of forests in Allegany County. This initial effort prompted subsequent projects in other counties over the next few years.⁷

It was against this background of forest surveys, fires, and federal assistance to landowners that Maryland took action. In 1906, Governor Edwin Warfield signed the Forest Conservation Act (FCA) into law.⁸ The legislation called for the establishment of a Board of Forestry and for the appointment of a state forester. Although the main focus of the FCA was on forestry, Section 2, the principal section defining the purpose of the act, called for the state forester "to direct the protection and improvement of State parks and forest reserves." At this time, Maryland had no state forests or state parks—in fact, the state owned less than one hundred acres of land, most of it linked to building sites.⁹

Fred Besley, the first state forester, graduated from the Maryland Agricultural College and joined the Bureau of Forestry in 1901 after working several years as a teacher. At the time of his appointment as a student assistant with the bureau, he was working as the principal of a grade school in Vienna, Virginia. Aware that he would be taking a significant cut in salary, he wrote Gifford Pinchot "I am willing to give up these positions which pay me more money for the sake of this new profession which I want to make my life's work."¹⁰

Besley took posts in New York, Michigan, and Kentucky before the Yale Forestry School accepted him in late 1902. Upon graduation in 1904 he became a forest assistant in the Division of Forest Extension, assigned to the Dismal River Reserve in Halsey, Nebraska. The work focused on nursery management and experimentation, yet Besley gained considerable experience in conservation education. He provided demonstrations of practical forestry at county and state fairs, and gave talks at local granges and town halls throughout the state. He transferred to the Pikes Peak forest nursery in Colorado where he was working in 1906 when he received the offer to become Maryland' s first state forester.¹¹

Besley began his work in Maryland with few resources at hand. Shortly after the passage of the FCA, the state received two gifts of land. The first, and by far the largest, was a gift of 1,900 acres in Garrett County in western Maryland. The land had been logged of its virgin white pines in the 1880s, logged again in 1906—the year Congress passed the FCA—and consisted primarily of scattered seedlings with a few large trees. The second gift was a forty-three acre parcel along the picturesque Patapsco River near Baltimore. Thus it was that Besley, with limited funds, a staff of one, and virtually no trees or forests under his control, set out to educate a state and to reverse decades of destructive timber practices.¹²

In addition to fire control and suppression, the early work of the Board of Forestry focused on two key areas, lectures and public demonstrations on forest management practices, and the production of a state map of county forest resources. Between 1908 and 1912, Besley visited and mapped every wooded area in the state of five acres or larger. A remarkable achievement by any measure, it is even more impressive in that he often traveled by horse and buggy over roads in deplorable condition. Besley' s efforts produced the first statewide forest survey in the nation. In 1912 he succeeded in getting the legislature to approve the establishment of a state nursery from which landowners could receive seedlings at a very low price.¹³

Early Parks in Maryland

Although Maryland had no state parks at the beginning of the twentieth century, the city of Baltimore had several parks—Druid Hill Park (671 acres), Clifton Park (253 acres), Patterson Park (106 acres), and three other smaller areas. Perhaps more importantly, there was considerable interest in expanding parks in the general metropolitan area. The Municipal Art Society of Baltimore City had taken an active role in promoting parks and parkways as part of a comprehensive municipal development plan as early as 1901.

In 1902, the Municipal Art Society retained Olmsted Brothers of Boston to design a comprehensive landscape plan for the city and its surroundings. The resulting study, published in 1904, envisioned a system of parks and parkways that made particular use of the several river valleys in the Baltimore area. Baltimore mayor Richard Venable was so convinced of the value of the Olmsted "park report" that he organized a movement to advance its recommendations. In 1906, the same year the FCA was enacted, Venable succeeded in having a million dollar ballot initiative passed for the purchase of additional parklands.¹⁴

The Municipal Art Society had become increasingly vocal in pushing the city to fulfill the Olmsted plan and by 1909 was urging the city to devote "every penny that can be spared" to the purchase of additional parkland. The following year the society formed a commission on the preservation of forest trees in the region in support of creating greenbelts around the city.¹⁵

Although the Patapsco River had not figured significantly in the Olmsted study, the report included the area in plans for the future development of parkways and metropolitan river valleys. The land along the Patapsco River donated to the Board of Forestry in 1907 was in the beautiful and rugged middle stretch of the river above the fall line. That portion of the river had long been used by local residents for picnics, swimming, and fishing. During the first decade of the century, the valley had seen increasing degradation and destructive logging. Mills still operated along the narrow middle portion of the river, and water pollution was becoming common.

In 1910 a particularly aggressive logging operation in the valley brought calls for its protection. William Ellicott, a member of the influential Ellicott family that owned property and mills along the river who had served as a prominent member of the Municipal Art Society, called upon the city to purchase the middle section of the valley. He argued that the Patapsco area would be a superb addition to the metropolitan park plan promoted by Mayor Venable. Local papers featured Ellicott's call, and supportive letters to the editor struck a nerve.¹⁶

Whereas the Olmsted study had focused on the western and northern portions of the Baltimore metropolitan area, Ellicott looked to the south. In 1910 he published an article in *American Forestry* in which he called for the creation of a National Capitol Forest stretching from Washington D.C. to Baltimore that included the middle section of the Patapsco. The Municipal Art Society passed a resolution urging state and federal legislators to lend their support to Ellicott's proposal. The significance of the society's resolution was not lost on Besley who had contributed a section on forests to Ellicott's article.¹⁷

Besley realized the effort to preserve the beauty of the middle Patapsco might prompt the state to allocate funds for land purchases. His 1910-1911 annual report reflected this awareness when he added scenic beauty to timber and water supply as the purposes of forests in the Patapsco reserve. To attract the attention of the legislature, Besley suggested that the Patapsco forest reserve should be managed as a state park for recreation and pleasure, noting, "It is the desire of the Board to increase the area of the reserve and to develop it along park lines provided the money is available." In contrast, Besley described the purposes of forest reserves in western Maryland as providing timber, clean water, and slope protection.¹⁸

In this effort to gain support for expanding the Patapsco reserve, Besley revealed his conflicting notions of forests and parks. Although he spoke of the wildness and beauty of the Patapsco, he referred far more often to the practical benefits of forest protection - the commercial importance of the river, the sole source of freshwater for many, and a valuable source of power. An expanded Patapsco reserve, he observed, could also be used to demonstrate forest management practices. He noted that the present reserve was "now

being managed along these general lines” and there would be revenues derived from cuttings in the nature of “cultural operations.” In the future, he said, preservation of the – “utility and beauty” of the forest reserve would be the primary objectives. Although the significance of this coupling of utility and beauty will be shown later, it can be stated at this point that beauty was advanced only to promote utility. If utility were threatened, beauty, as it were, would get the axe.¹⁹

In 1912 the General Assembly appropriated \$50,000 for the purchase of lands along a twelve-mile strip of the middle portion of the river “for the purpose of a State Forest Reserve.” The legislature also allocated \$8,000 to purchase land that contained the ruins of colonial Fort Frederick (ultimately purchased in 1922). In 1914 the legislature extended the Patapsco purchase area, although it did not allocate new monies. By the end of the decade the reserve had expanded from its original forty-three acres to just under one thousand acres with an additional fifteen hundred acres of auxiliary forest.²⁰

Some observers regard the expanded Patapsco Reserve as Maryland’ s first state park for two reasons. First, the reserve offered recreational opportunities in the form of camping, picnics, swimming, and hiking. Second, some publications of the era referred to it as “Patapsco Park” and “Patapsco Forest Park.” A recent article goes so far as to offer these two points as evidence that Maryland “was in the vanguard of the state park movement.”²¹

The forestry board promoted the Patapsco Reserve as a “pleasure grounds” and claimed recreation as the site’ s primary purpose. In 1919, a Board of Forestry pamphlet entitled *The State Reserves of Maryland: A Playground for the Public* focused on the recreational value of these state lands. Recreation was mentioned in reference to forest reserves in the western portion of the state as well, yet attention remained almost exclusively on Patapsco. The Boy Scouts used the first campsites, established in 1917, and the success of that venture led the board to offer camping to the general public. To encourage this activity the pamphlet included “The Art of Being Comfortable,” a primer on how to camp. By the early 1920s the board presented Patapsco as primarily a recreational landscape, yet recreation does not a park establish.²²

The USFS, NPS, and Recreation

The Maryland Board of Forestry’ s sudden interest in the recreational value of forest reserves mirrored national trends. The creation of the National Park Service in 1916, the phenomenally popular existing national parks, and the extensive coverage of these attractions in the press, forced the United States Forest Service to take notice. The service feared the NPS would seek to transfer large tracts of USFS lands to the NPS for the establishment of new parks and for the extension of existing sites. In addition, foresters worried that a muscular NPS would threaten USFS budgets and authority.²³

In 1917, less than a year after the establishment of the NPS, the forest service undertook a review of the recreational values of its forests. The subsequent report was effusive in its description of the role of recreation in forest reserves - “recreation stands clearly as one of the major forest utilities.” It is noteworthy to compare this pronouncement with Gifford Pinchot’ s 1907 “Use” book in which recreation was barely mentioned.²⁴

In 1920, Henry Graves, USFS Chief Forester (1910-1920), captured the general mood within the forestry profession regarding recreation, forests, and parks. Observing that there was a movement to enlarge federal and state forest and parklands, he said, in reference to forests, "while the occasion of such reservations is frequently the protection of watersheds, timber production, or other public benefits, all the areas afford opportunities for outdoor recreation." He further noted, "The recreational opportunities and the wildlife are regarded as important natural resources to be protected, used and developed in correlation with timber, grazing, water, and minerals." Graves defended the idea that recreation was an important and legitimate aspect of forest reserves and tied the concept to concerns that the NPS would take possession of the recreation portfolio, thereby leaving the USFS vulnerable. He also noted that failure to clearly distinguish the relative functions of national parks and forests had led to calls for large transfers of land from forests to parks, which could jeopardize the entire forestry system.²⁵

Graves was unflinching in his assessment of national parks. Although he acknowledged the necessity of removing "exquisite landscapes" from all considerations of industrial development, he did suggest eliminating lands with merchantable timber from national parks. He recommended the transfer of the NPS to the Agriculture Department so that its work might be "more closely correlated with that of the forest service."²⁶

The significance of this debate on the relationship between forests and parks, and the threat parks might represent, was not lost on Besley. As the 1920s began, the board continued to place heavy emphasis upon fighting fires, forest education, and the expansion of lands already under its control. Besley frequently mentioned recreation as an important function of state forest reserves. He saw recreation as a means to gain public support and, he hoped, as a way to obtain funding for new lands. Besley had to proceed cautiously, as a strong focus on recreation risked encouraging park advocates. This concern appeared in his 1921 annual report. "The recreational use of state forests do not, in any way, interfere with their primary use for timber production, watershed protections, and for conducting experiments and demonstrations in timber growing "²⁷ Besley echoed Graves' concern for the relationship between parks and forests and argued against having separate administrative units. That, he believed, would result in sustained rivalry and conflict.²⁸

For its part, the National Park Service faced an early challenge to keep inferior landscapes out of the national park system. Federal and state legislators had been quick to suggest areas for inclusion, but the park service deemed many of them inappropriate. Stephen Mather, the first director of the park service, realized that promoting state park systems might deflect many of these efforts. In January 1921, at Mather' s prompting, a national conference on state parks met in Des Moines, Iowa. and created the National Conference of State Parks (NCSP).²⁹

An interesting and instructive park-forest controversy emerged at Des Moines. The USFS had been increasingly frustrated by what they perceived to be a vigorous campaign by the NPS to bring under its control all things relating to recreation. In response, the forest service by 1920 had begun to aggressively publicize the recreational value of forests. At the conference, Arthur Carhart, a landscape architect with the USFS and the first in the

service to propose protecting a forest reserve area from development, criticized the park service for ignoring the recreational assets of federal and state forests. This prompted an angry response from Mather, and the simmering tension between the agencies was out in the open.³⁰

The early 1920s saw increased conflict between the two agencies that to a large extent prompted President Calvin Coolidge to host a conference on outdoor recreation in 1924. If the goal of the conference was to mend fences, it failed entirely and the fight over recreation would only grow worse in the next decade. The conference did contribute to a growing appreciation within the forest service of both recreational and wilderness values. What is clear is that without the perceived threat from a competing agency, the National Park Service, there is little reason to believe the forest service would have been inclined to consider recreation or wilderness values as particularly important factors in forest management.³¹

Maryland Parks and Forests in the 1920s

In 1919, the National Park Service asked each state to provide information on their state parks. Maryland reported it had no state parks but noted the city parks previously mentioned. Six months after the Des Moines conference, in July 1921, the NPS again contacted states regarding progress in establishing state parks. This time Besley responded and said the state had several forest reserves, which might be classified "as state parks for recreation purposes." Besley was equating recreation opportunities with state parks, something NPS deputy director Arno Cammerer noticed when he pointedly thanked Besley for the information he had offered on "the state forests of your state."³²

In 1922 state government in Maryland was reorganized. The State Board of Forestry became the State Department of Forestry (SDF) and fell under the authority of the Board of Regents of the newly established University of Maryland (formerly the Agricultural College of Maryland). Little would change in the duties of the state forester or in the mission of the renamed department, which continued to include the "protection and improvement of state parks and forest reserves."³³

Throughout the 1920s the NPS and the NCSP listed Maryland as having no state parks, with one instructive exception. In its 1927 annual report, the NCSP published a map of the nation' s state parks that showed Patapsco and Fort Frederick as Maryland state parks. This was undoubtedly due to Besley's description of these areas as pleasure grounds and to his description of state forests as state parks for recreation purposes. In an addendum to the report, however, and undoubtedly at the urging of Maryland' s forestry department, the NCSP published a re-traction in a section entitled "Additions to State Park Systems." There it noted that Maryland' s Fort Frederick and Patapsco, previously listed as state parks, were in fact state forests. The following year the NCSP reported that thirty-five states had state parks—Maryland was not among them.³⁴

Why such concern over labeling these two areas as parks? After all, the State Department of Forestry had occasionally referred to Patapsco as a "natural park" and as a "forest park". The reason was simple: Parks were landscapes within which preservation, not conservation, was the prevailing philosophy that informed management strategy. Besley, in his use of "park" as it related to Patapsco, only intended recreation, not preservation. In

this he echoed Graves' 1920 view of parks. Recreation does not threaten conservation, as do parks and park systems. A park would limit, if not deny, opportunities for forestry. The SDF used forest reserves such as Patapsco and Fort Frederick as demonstration forests, which Besley described in a 1932 interview with the *Baltimore Sun*:

The state department [of forestry] experiments in planting and cultivating new stands. Its aim is to furnish to the lumberman accurate statistics on what trees can best be grown on certain soils, the care necessary for their growth, and proper methods of cutting and pruning.... Besides facilitating the practical business of lumbering, the state department points out that the forest reserves afford excellent opportunities for hunting and fishing, to say nothing of their adding to the scenic value of the state.³⁵

There was yet another reason for Besley to keep Patapsco as a forest reserve and not as a state park - commercial potential. He had previously described Patapsco as "well timbered" and "rapidly increasing in value" and had observed that "only such select trees as are over mature and declining in value are sold"³⁶

Although there were (and are) no federal forest lands in Maryland, by 1925 Besley had grown wary of federal efforts to purchase lands for forest reserves in the East. He argued that Maryland was too small to support both national and state forests and suggested that federal efforts could leave the department with no forest lands to manage and thus "work itself out of a job." In 1927, the General Assembly reversed a 1908 law that had granted the federal government power to purchase lands in the state for the purpose of establishing a national forest. The following year the legislature granted the SDF funds to purchase lands for "public improvement."³⁷

In selecting lands for purchase, the State Department of Forestry revealed its hand regarding the value it placed on Patapsco and Fort Frederick as recreational landscapes, as well as its view of parks in general. The agency declared the minimum purchase area to be five thousand acres, a policy that effectively eliminated any chance of extending holdings in Patapsco or Fort Frederick, where there was little chance of finding that much land available. Although land costs would be higher around these two areas, it would have been possible to buy new lands for each with a lower acreage limit. Instead, the SDF increased its holdings in western Maryland and purchased a few smaller parcels in the southern and eastern portions of the state that would be used for demonstration projects.³⁸

Why limit purchases to parcels of five thousand acres or more? In 1925, Besley stated that from the beginning of the forestry movement, acquiring lands to create state forests was a primary objective. With sufficiently large areas, he reasoned, it would be possible to demonstrate correct principles of forest management on a scale large enough to give them practical value. "There is nothing that gives greater prestige, importance, and permanency to a forestry department," he noted, "than the ownership and management of extensive forests." Accordingly, from 1929-1932, the agency selected lands for purchase almost exclusively upon considerations of practical forestry. Recreation, if mentioned at all, appeared as an afterthought, and parks received no attention whatsoever. By early 1932, the SDF had increased its holdings to roughly 49,000 acres, the great majority of which lay in the western portion of the state, far from population centers.³⁹

What's in a Name?

A quarter-century of work by Besley and the State Department of Forestry had yielded only one significant recreational landscape (Patapsco), a number of forest reserves in western Maryland used primarily by hunters and fishermen, and not a single park. As noted, Patapsco had been referred to as Patapsco Park, or Patapsco Forest Park, but just as often it was simply labeled a forest reserve. The use of "park" was really a matter of convenience when speaking of recreational opportunities and did not reflect an operating philosophy. It was a "park" to the extent that people could recreate there, but it was in fact a forest reserve with an active management program that included the culling of "mature" and economically valuable timber of declining "worth." Recreational development in the Patapsco forest reserve had been limited to clearing sites for camping and creating a few hiking and riding trails. In point of fact, considerable camping took place on "cooperative lands," those adjacent to the reserve that private land owners leased to the state in exchange for fire protection and forest management. Fort Frederick, the other oft-labeled early Maryland park purchased in 1922, remained neither developed nor restored. Although some did camp there, an assistant state forester, in 1933, described the site as "falling apart" and the situation as "hopeless."⁴⁰

Campers and sportsmen used other state reserves in the western part of the state, but few improvements had been made to these sites. In his 1930 annual report, Besley described their function primarily as timber production, but noted that recreational use would be encouraged "as far as facilities can be provided." Without a budget or agency effort to obtain the funds, few of these facilities existed. It was clear that recreation in these distant areas, far from population centers, was of minor importance at best.⁴¹

Besley was not unaware that there were areas of scenic beauty and high recreation value that would be "better for park use." Interestingly, he argued that these areas could be "administered much more economically under the forestry administration than to have them set apart and administered separately under a park commission." Besley further observed that if separate departments were established, "there would be competing and conflicting interests which inevitably can-not be satisfactorily reconciled, and one or the other must be sacrificed."⁴²

What did Besley intend by declaring that irreconcilable "conflicting interests" would arise between separate park and forest agencies? The answer lies partly in the way he qualified his position regarding some areas being "better for park use."

There are other areas that are valuable *only* and *exclusively* for parks. Often these areas are in close proximity to cities and towns more directly interested, thereby becoming a local affair in which the city or town, itself, is chiefly interested, and should have control.⁴³

As Besley saw it, the ultimate purpose of forest reserves was timber production. There were no state forest lands to set aside solely and exclusively for parks. The conflicting interests he envisioned were precisely those that arose with the issue of harvesting mature timber.

Maryland's Forest Conservation Act had called in part for the state forester "to direct the protection and improvement of State parks and forest reserves," but little had been done on behalf of parks since 1906. If the record had stopped in 1932, some might view the SDF's focus upon forests at the expense of parks as understandable, given its limited funds and opportunities. But the story did continue—through the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC brought a new player into Maryland, the National Park Service, which prompted a competition between park and forest interests that had not previously existed in the state. As a result of this competition, the SDF's philosophy was made explicit.

The CCC in Maryland

Congress passed the Emergency Conservation Act on March 31, 1933 and five days later established the Office of Emergency Conservation Work, more commonly referred to as the CCC. The agency had the authority to undertake improvement and protection projects in national—and in state—forests and parks. On May 10, 1933, the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service hammered out an agreement on forest work in the states. The park service took responsibility for projects in which 50 percent of the proposed work did not include resource management. The USFS otherwise had control.⁴⁴

By the end of May 1933, Maryland had five CCC camps in operation, all under USFS supervision. A camp opened at Patapsco State Forest Reserve on June 11, and by the end of the year the state had secured several additional federal CCC camps. The work in those camps focused primarily upon forest management activities such as pruning and thinning, eliminating undesirable trees, eradication of disease, fire suppression, and the construction of fire trails and fire roads. The SDF made no application to the park service for CCC projects in Maryland. At this time, only the NPS had the authority to undertake work intended to develop and improve recreation facilities in forests and parks.⁴⁵

The NPS regional inspector for Region 1, which included Maryland, was Tell Nicolet, who first visited the state in late 1933. He met with Besley and the SDF staff on November 10 and found Besley non-committal regarding possible NPS projects. Although the SDF managed more than 49,000 acres, Besley held that only two or three small projects might be suitable for a NPS CCC camp. Presented with the opportunity to work with the NPS to advance recreation and parks in Maryland, Besley rebuffed the offer. Nicolet persisted, and by early 1934, assisted by several influential Marylanders, he managed to get Besley to suggest the restoration of Fort Frederick for a NPS CCC project. Under further prodding from Nicolet, Besley agreed it might make sense to transfer Patapsco to NPS control. Shortly thereafter, when Nicolet notified Besley that Fort Frederick would receive approval for a CCC camp, Besley informed him he had changed his mind about the Patapsco transfer, claiming that he saw no reason for the move since the site already had some hiking and bridle trails. Perhaps more importantly, Besley stated he did not want to erect any buildings in the reserve.⁴⁶

This latter observation is particularly telling. A major goal of the NPS CCC programs included enhancing state parks (and state forests) with such things as pavilions, cabins, and other recreation-related buildings and structures. The SDF, presented with a wonderful and virtually no-cost opportunity to improve the very limited recreational opportunities in Patapsco, the state's only recreationallandscape of any consequence,

refused to recommend the transfer. An NPS CCC camp at Fort Frederick was fine, for it contained only a few hundred largely deforested acres and a nearly collapsed structure. But Patapsco, with its much larger area of mature forest within which the SDF carried out forest research projects was another matter altogether. Undeterred, Nicolet informed Besley that he would only approve the Fort Frederick CCC camp if Besley applied for the Patapsco transfer. Besley reluctantly agreed, and the park service approved the two sites as CCC camps in March 1934.⁴⁷

In comparing the work done after the NPS replaced the USFS in Patapsco, Herbert Meyer, NPS Project Supervisor, wrote "this change necessitated work of an entirely different character from that done formerly as the park *is now an area for recreation*" (emphasis added). A park service report regarding work done by the CCC camp at Patapsco in 1933 and 1934 was scathing in its assessment of the negative impact upon wildlife and upon the recreational potential of the reserve that had resulted from the "forest stand improvement and thinning." The report also noted that damage would have been much greater had not a local nature study organization intervened. Five months after the transfer of Patapsco to the NPS, the *Baltimore Sun* ran an article entitled "The Old Patapsco Forest Reserve is Modeled into the New Patapsco State Park."⁴⁸

State Parks Board

The NPS worked hard to get states to establish independent park boards to ensure that a dedicated park authority would be in place to operate and maintain completed CCC projects in newly created or improved state parks. By the fall of 1934, Nicolet was working to establish an independent State Parks Commission in Maryland. In his October 1934 report, he predicted "something definite in the next legislature towards establishment of a state park department."⁴⁹

Aware of the increasing interest in state parks not only in Maryland, but across the nation, Besley in early 1935 requested an additional \$25,000 per year for three years to acquire land:

It is highly desirable that areas suitable for state parks be purchased along with state forestland. There is a strong movement for state parks, but we want to avoid a separate park board or commission, which would not only add much to the expense of operation but would set up a competitive agency, probably divorced from the forestry department and the University of Maryland. If we obtain sufficient funds to move the park program along with the state forests, under the forestry department, I believe those interests would be satisfied, but unless we do have substantial appropriations for land acquisition to carry out the program, we are likely to lose out with the park people.⁵⁰

This passage is interesting for two reasons. First, when Besley obtained significant funds for land acquisition (1929-32) that resulted in an increase in SDF holdings from 3,843 acres in 1928 to 48,947 acres in 1932, he added not one acre to the so-called park landscapes, Patapsco and Fort Frederick. Second, his sudden advocacy for parklands was driven more by the threat of an independent park authority than pressure from park

advocates. No funds were forthcoming, and this request represented the sum total of SDF efforts regarding the purchase of parklands in the 1930s.⁵¹

Nicolet, working with the encouragement of the governor' s office and in cooperation with the State Planning Commission, wrote language for a bill (S392) to establish a State Parks Commission in Maryland. The "parks" bill was submitted to the legislature early in 1935.

Unaware of the bill' s existence until after its first reading, Besley was furious. He described S392 as "ill advised and unjustified" and railed that a park commission would be expensive and would work "for large appropriations for acquiring areas for parks that could be secured to the state forest program at much less cost". Besley argued for lower cost state forest purchases because he did not distinguish between forest and parklands. Given the chance, he would buy land in far western Maryland, or on the eastern shore, where prices, and population, would be far lower, and place these properties under forest management. A state parks commission would be more inclined to purchase land where populations were greater and the land more expensive. (Patapsco, for example, would focus on recreation). Besley' s reluctance to promote parks even extended to gifts of land. Despite his efforts, S392 passed the Maryland legislature, but owing to a mix-up with the printer the final bill contained a funding provision that had not been debated. The legislature, in the final days of its session, had no time to rework the bill and pulled it from the list.⁵²

In 1934 the commissioners of Cecil County suggested that the National Park Service consider lands within the county for inclusion in the agricultural resettlement program, with the ultimate purpose of creating a national park. The commissioners hoped that with an established park they would also get a CCC camp.

After a survey of the area determined it was unsuitable for a national park, Nicolet suggested that the area was ideally suited for a state park. The possibility of a state park on the Chesapeake Bay, which lacked a recreational area for the general public, caught his attention. The county would have to find a way to purchase the land and deed it to the state before the NPS could set up a CCC camp.⁵³

Cecil County created a state park committee and, with Nicolet' s help, began raising funds for land purchases. By mid -1935 the county had obtained more than four thousand acres through purchases and gifts and planned to add an additional four or five thousand acres over the next few years. A particularly crucial land acquisition resulted from Nicolet' s success in persuading a local physician, Dr. W. L. Abbott, to bequeath his 355-acre waterfront property to the state. Although the State Department of Forestry played a minor role in the Elk Neck initiative, Besley did inform the county that the state would accept the land and maintain it as a park, a promise that prompted several large donations of land. To ensure that the state would manage Elk Neck exclusively as a park, the county at Nicolet' s prompting, included language in the deed that required the state to accept the land for the purpose of establishing a state park. In addition, the deed required the state to maintain it "for said purpose and no other, forever." As written the deed foreclosed any opportunity for forestry in the donated lands.⁵⁴

Besley and the SDF objected to the deed' s restrictive language, arguing that most of the four thousand acres had no park value, but had worth as a forest reserve. Besley stated

that the "park value of the Elk Neck property will be chiefly in the 25 acre waterfront property and the 330 acre Abbott property." The remainder, more than 3,500 acres, would benefit from good forestry practices that would eventually generate revenue. Besley, concerned that the deal might collapse, ultimately recommended that the board accept the restrictive language. However, Besley noted there was no clear distinction in Maryland law between "forest" and "park" He also observed that the deed contained no "reverter" clause by which the land would revert to the county in the event the SDF did not abide by the deed. Accordingly, Besley suggested they could call it a park if necessary but still manage the area as a forest. Besley told the board that if they did not receive an NPS CCC camp, he would arrange for a USFS camp. The board of regents accepted the land at their April 19, 1936, meeting.⁵⁵

Although local newspapers hailed the new "5,000 acre park on Elk Neck," Besley proceeded to manage most of the land as a forest reserve. Work begun in 1937 focused on fire control, soil erosion, stream pollution, and forest stand improvement. Elk Neck as a park received little attention. By 1941, the SDF had constructed nine cabins, but no bathhouse. In 1942, the state reported Elk Neck Forest Reserve at 3,762 acres and Elk Neck State Park at 807 acres. Four years later, in 1946, the only recreational area on the bay had no swimming facilities.⁵⁶

Neither Parks or Recreation

Elk Neck further demonstrated the SDF' s apathy, ad perhaps hostility, to the concept of formal parks, which it viewed as appropriate only in urban settings. Official park designation limited, and at times prohibited, harvesting of the land' s timber. In addition, Besley and many foresters viewed parks as unnecessary, because forests already provided, albeit minimally, for public recreation in the form of hunting, hiking, and camping. Little had been done to facilitate these uses of the forests. Even in Patapsco, work had been limited to campsites, trails, and pavilions. In the Cascades, one of the more beautiful areas of the Patapsco reserve, the SDF did not display effective management. The NPS 1937 site report on wildlife lamented the deterioration of the area, noting the degraded and disappearing vegetation, boulders blackened by campfires, badly trampled stream beds, the paucity of birds, and the complete absence of picnic or sanitation facilities.⁵⁷

After more than thirty years of the Forest Conservation Act and five years after the CCC began work in Maryland, the state had virtually no recreational infrastructure. Besley acknowledged as much in 1937 when he wrote that because CCC work had been "of necessity almost wholly utilitarian...recreation work in the forests may be regarded as still in its infancy." Moreover, the SDF tended to equate forestry work with recreation efforts, as in suggesting that fire trails were really efforts to improve recreation. Although trails could be utilized by hunters and others, the needs of fire control and timber harvest determined their placement.⁵⁸

Besley continued to place forest priorities above those of parks. In 1937 he described in glowing terms the recreational potential of Maryland' s western forest reserves and suggested that one area, the Herrington Manor section of Swallow Falls State Forest Reserve, could become "a Maryland Lake Placid." That said, he noted it was his agency' s policy to move cautiously and stated that he would only provide new recreational opportunities upon demonstrated demand. "If thousands of people avail themselves of the

recreational possibilities in the state forests ... then we will develop more areas for summer and winter use ... it all depends on the demand of the public." He then hastened to note that with increased recreation opportunities "more administration problems will surely arise," and "of course, the traditional purpose of the forestry service is to guard the water supply and develop timber."⁵⁹

The lack of recreational opportunities in Maryland was noted in a major report published in 1940. The study had been undertaken in response to the 1936 Park Parkway, and Recreation Areas Act, which authorized the National Park Service to assist states in inventorying their recreational resources. The State Planning Commission conducted the study, not the SDF, and included among its recommendations that the latter agency be renamed the State Department of Forests and Parks. Investigators reported limited recreational resources and noted, "public recreation, as a state government function in Maryland, is comparatively new." The commission recommended a dramatic increase in lands devoted to parks and offered the following observation:⁶⁰

Almost self-evident, yet worth emphasizing, is the policy of prohibiting any commercial timber-cutting within parks or other areas in which recreation is the primary factor. Except in sections where intensive use injects considerations of safety, it is a questionable practice to remove even normally dead trees.⁶⁰

This language was completely at odds with longstanding practices and the prevailing philosophy of the SDF regarding timber management and recreation on forest reserves.

In 1941 the state underwent a major reorganization of state government. The University of Maryland transferred the SDF to the newly created Board of Natural Resources, renamed it the State Department of Forests and Parks (SDFP), and charged the renamed agency with giving increased attention to parks. As the result of mandatory retirement, Besley left in 1942, having served as the state forester since 1906.⁶¹

Notwithstanding the change in leadership at the SDFP and the new name, not much changed during the 1940s in terms of park development. The end of the CCC in Maryland brought an end as well to the proactive role of the NPS on behalf of parks in the state. Without the stimulus of the NPS, the SDFP reverted to its practice of largely ignoring recreation and park matters. The war years saw little activity in the state's few "parks," which by 1945 were in particularly bad shape.

The state had done a poor job in serving the recreational needs of its citizens. By 1944 the imbalance between forests and parks had become striking -106,168 acres of forest reserves and just 3,804 acres of state parks, a significant portion of which had been donated. The following year, a report by the Maryland State Department of Research and Education ranked Maryland forty-third out of the forty-eight states in providing park facilities for its citizens. The report echoed the 1940 recreation study in calling for a major expansion of parklands and facilities.⁶²

The SDFP, though, appeared content to continue its passive approach to recreation and parks. For example, in 1946, responding to criticism regarding limited facilities in state

parks and in particular at Elk Neck State Park, where cabins were viewed as inadequate and swimming was still not available, SDFP Chief Kaylor stated, "It is the state' s policy to furnish only a limited amount of vacation accommodations at this park and that by such a demonstration, it is expected private interests will be encouraged to develop such additional units as are warranted in that vicinity." Kaylor added that in order for the SDFP to meet the existing needs it would have to develop Elk Neck as a major recreation area, a move that rising land costs would make expensive. He left no doubt as to his reluctance to embark upon such a project.⁶³

Not surprisingly, the SDFP offered no major recommendations for parks or recreational development in the 1940s. The effort to develop a bayside park in the late 1940s, prompted in part by the Maryland State Department of Research and Education, was largely managed by the State Planning Commission (SPC) with the assistance of the NPS. Likewise, the 1946-50 effort to develop the lower Patapsco Valley' s recreational resources was an outgrowth of a local businessmen' s group that enlisted the support of the SPC, which in turn sought and received the assistance of the NPS. The SDFP, involved through necessity, played a minor role.⁶⁴

The 1951 General Assembly noted the dismal record of achievement in parks and recreation and in response passed House Joint Resolution 7. The resolution charged the State Planning Commission with providing a report on how the state might undertake a master plan for the future development of its parks. State law-makers noted that the state owned thousands of acres of attractive scenic land and stated in their resolution that these areas are "totally inadequate" owing to a lack of development, an absence of facilities for well-rounded recreation programs, and poor distribution. Nearly fifty years after the establishment of the Board of Forestry with authority over parks and forests, the state had finally realized the extent to which parks had been ignored, neglected, and ultimately defeated.⁶⁵

The foresters who had controlled the board had successfully trumped parks at every turn, driven by a "development is the first principle of conservation" philosophy and by an inability to comprehend a logic that would preserve trees for the sake of parks and recreation. They had resisted a separate and independent park authority, because it might result in large chunks of land transferred to the new authority and to restrictions, even prohibitions, on timber harvests. In 1956, at the fiftieth anniversary of the Board of Forestry, Fred Besley was honored for his service to the state. In his remarks he noted that he was particularly proud that forests and parks had remained under a single management.⁶⁶

The Last Stand

Perhaps more than anything else a single grove of trees demonstrates how forests trumped parks. The 1940 State Planning Commission recreation report had included a recommendation to change the Herrington Manor area of the Swallow Falls State Forest Reserve—the same area Besley had suggested could become Maryland' s "Lake Placid"—from forest reserve to state park and encouraged the transfer of even more land to ensure that clear-cutting in the surrounding area would not affect the proposed park. The land included an extensive grove of virgin oak, which Besley had previously described as a

major asset. The SPC report had called for a halt to commercial timbering on all state park lands, but it had been circulated before its September publication. Besley, a member of the study panel, had seen it.

On September 14, 1940, the *Baltimore Sun* reported lumbermen moving through what was believed to be the last big stand of virgin timber in Maryland, a three-hundred-acre grove of oaks in Herrington Manor, many of which were more than three centuries old. "Tall and straight, they are little scarred by the passing of the centuries, and under the canopy of their foliage the woodland lies in perpetual gloom, brightened only here and there by stray splashes of sunlight."

One veteran lumberman said, "A man ought to put on a white shirt to cut trees like this." The great white oaks stood in excellent condition, remarkably free from fire scars. The paper noted that state foresters had held out for a premium price for the oaks, believing they were better for something else than "railroad ties or ordinary lumber."⁶⁷

Confronted with the transfer of the forest reserve to a state park, the SDF had quietly sold the great white oaks to a Baltimore firm to be turned into staves for whiskey barrels.

With utility threatened, beauty got the ax.

Footnotes:

¹ On the competition between the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service see Hal K. Rothman, "A Regular Ding-Dong Fight: The Dynamics of Park Service-Forest Controversy During the 1920s and 1930s," in Char Miller, ed. *Forests: Nature, Culture, and Politics* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1997). 109-24; Richard Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 35-38. 57-58. Donald Swain, *Federal Conservation Policy 1921-1933* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1963), 134-38; Robert Shankland. *Steve Mather of the National Parks*, (New York: Knopf. 1954); Harold Steen, *The U.S. Forest Service: A History*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press. 1976). 152-62. On the general history of state parks, see Raymond Torrey, *State Parks and Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States* (Washington DC National Conference of State Parks, 1926); Beatrice Ward Nelson, *State Recreational Parks, Forests, and Game Reserves* (Washington, DC: National Conference of State Parks, 1928. Herbert Evison, *A State Park Anthology* (Washington, D.C: National Conference of State Parks, 1930. Freeman Tilden. *The State Parks: Their Meaning in American Life* (New York: Knopf. 1962). On state forests see Ralph Widner, ed., *Forests and Forestry in the American States: A Reference Anthology* (Washington, D.C.: Association of State Forests, 1968).

² Aside from Yellowstone (1872), established national parks at this time included Yosemite (1890), Sequoia (1890), Kings Canyon (1890), Mt. Rainer (1899), and Crater Lake (1902). Early proponents of national parks included the Sierra Club. and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Appalachian Mountain Club, and the American Civic Association. Two organizations that promoted urban parks were the American Park and Outdoor Art Association and the American League for Civic Improvement (the two merged in 1904 to form the American Civic Association). A dated but useful source for nineteenth- and early twentieth-century organizations involved in urban parks is Charles Doell and Gerald Fitzgerald. *A Brief History of Parks and Recreation in the United States* (Chicago-The Athletic Institute, 1954).. See also Terrance Young. "Social Reform Through Parks: The American Civic Associations Program for a Better America." *Journal of Historical Geography*, 22 (1996) 464-72.

³ On urban landscapes at the beginning of the twentieth century, see David Schuyler, *The New Urban Landscape* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1986); Martin Melosi, ed., *Pollution and Reform in American Cities, 1870-1930* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980); Joel Tarr, *The Search for the Ultimate Sink: Urban Pollution in Historical Perspective* (Akron: University of Akron Press, 1996).

⁴ MacFarland quote cited in Young, "Social Reform through Parks;" 464. On the anti-urban aspect of the city park movement, see Galen Cranz, *The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982). On the City Beautiful Movement, see William Wilson *The City Beautiful Movement* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1989).

⁵ Tilden, *The State Parks*, 5. For examples of state park histories, see Martha Carlson, "Born of Fire and Trespass: A History of the State Parks [New Hampshire];" *Forest Notes*, 159 (1985): 2-8; Rebecca Conrad, "Hot Kitchens in Places of Quiet Beauty; Iowa State Parks and the Transformation of Conservation Goals. *Annals of Iowa*, 51 (1992): 441-79; Thomas Cox, *The Park Builders. A History of State Parks in the Pacific Northwest* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988); Thomas Cox, "Before the Casino: James G. Scrugham, State Parks, and Nevada's Quest for Tourism" *Western Historical Quarterly*, 3 (1993): 333-50; Dan Cupper, *Our Priceless Heritage: Pennsylvania State Parks 1893-1993* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1993); Joseph Engbeck Jr. *State Parks of California: From 1864 to the Present* (Portland: Charles Belding. 1980); Roy Meyer, *Everyone's Country Estate: A History of Minnesota's State Parks* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press. 1991); Jay Price, "Preservation, Recreation, and the Arizona State Parks Board: Forty Years of Stewardship" (Ph.D diss.. Arizona State University. 1997); James Steely, *Parks for Texas: Enduring Legacy of the New Deal* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999).

⁶ See for example Baltimore Sun, October 21, 1895 [hereinafter cited Sun], August 21, 1896, March 9, 29, 1897, August 29, 1899, and January 22. 1901; Baltimore American, January 4, 1905; Baltimore News, January 20, 1905.

⁷ Beginning in 1899. the federal government offered to provide assistance to local landowners in Maryland and other states in the preparation of forest/woodlot management plans. *Maryland State Board of Forestry. Report of the State Board of Forestry 1906-1907*: 3 [[hereafter cited SBF]. Federal assistance to commercial landowners in managing forests began with the issuance of the Division of Forestry Circular 21 in 1898, and was extended to private landowners in 1899 by Circular 22.

⁸ Geoffrey Buckley and J. Morgan Grove, "Sowing the Seeds of Forest Conservation: Fred Besley and the Maryland Story, 1906-1923," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 96 (2001): 303-27.

⁹ Maryland Legislature, Acts of 1906, Chapter 294, 1906; *Baltimore American*, January 5, 1905. A State Board of Forestry was created to oversee the Board of Forestry. It comprised the governor, state comptroller, the president of the Johns Hopkins University, the president of the State Agricultural College, and two citizens appointed by the governor.

¹⁰ Besley to Pinchot, January 2, 1901, box 13, Office of the Chief, General Correspondence of the Forest Service 1898-1908, Record, Members of Bureau of Forestry, United States Forest Service, National Archives and Records Administration Record Group 95 [hereafter referred to as NA-RG95]. By the time of his retirement in 1942, thirty-six years later, Besley had served longer than any state forester in the country.

¹¹ Besley's assignments are described in various letters: Price to Besley, May 9, 1901, Price to Besley, August 29, 1901, Pinchot to Besley, June 6, 1902, Hall to Besley June 8, 1904, box 3, Records of the Division of Timber Management; Correspondence of the Office of Forest Extension, 1899-1909; Scott to Sterling, May 5, 1905, box 1, Division of Timber Management, 1896-1952, NA-RG95.

¹² Southeastern Association of State Park Directors. *Histories of Southeastern State Park Systems* (Southeastern Association of State Park Directors, 1977), 81-92.

¹³ SBF Reports 1906-1914. Fred Besley, "Forest Research Under State Auspices," Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Division of State Relations of the National Research Council, Washington, D.C., June 11, 1925, reprinted in Reprint Series, No. 70, National Research Council, 1926.

¹⁴ Barry Kessler and David Zang, *The Play Life of a City: Baltimore's Recreation and Parks 1900-1955* (Baltimore: Baltimore City Life Museum); Olmsted Brothers, Report Upon the Development of Public Grounds for Greater Baltimore (Baltimore: Municipal Art Society, 1904); Sun, January 6, 1906.

¹⁵ Minutes of Municipal Art Society of Baltimore, December 14, 1909, November 21, 1910. MS 2840: Maryland Historical Society.

¹⁶ Sun, November 15, 21, 1910.

¹⁷ William Elliott and Fred Besley. "A National Capitol Forest," *American Forestry*, June (1910): 4-11. Minutes of Municipal Art Society of Baltimore, April 4, 1911, MS 2840: Maryland Historical Society.

¹⁸ SBF Report 1910-1911, 26.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

²⁰ Maryland Legislature, Acts of 1912, Chapters 749 and 794, Acts of 1914, Chapter 209. SBF Report 1920-21, 16. Auxiliary forests (also called cooperative forests) were initially informal arrangements between landowners and the SBF that permitted the SBF to have access to lands, primarily for camping and recreation, in exchange for assistance in forest management and protection. This arrangement was formalized in 1927 by the Maryland legislature (Acts of 1927, Chapter 352).

²¹ Buckley and Grove, "Sowing the Seeds of Forest Conservation," 306-7.

²² J. Gordon Dorrance, *A Playground for the Public* (Baltimore: Maryland State Board of Forestry, 1919), 11.

²³ Hal K. Rothman, "A Regular Ding-Dong Fight," 109-24; Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 35-38; 57-58; Swain, Federal Conservation Policy, 134-38; Shankland, *Steve Mother of the National Parks*, 175-79; Steen, *The U.S. Forest Service: A History*, 152-62.

²⁴ Frank Waugh, *Recreation Uses of the National Forests* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918), 26. In Gifford Pinchot, *The Use of the National Forests* (Washington: U.S. Forest Service, 1907), the only mention of

recreation is found in a single paragraph (24) titled "Playgrounds, which begins "Quite incidentally, also, the national forests serve a good purpose as great playgrounds for the people ... Their value in this respect is well worth considering."

²⁵ Henry Graves, "A Crisis in National Recreation," *Journal of American Forestry*, 26 (1920): 394.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 400.

²⁷ SBF Report 1920-21,15.

²⁸ Fred Besley, "State Forests in Relation to the National Forest Program." Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Society of American Foresters, Madison, Wisconsin, December 17, 1925, reprinted in *Geological Pamphlets*, 78/93 (1925): 153-58.

²⁹ There is some confusion regarding the title of this conference. Although there is no formal record of the meeting, the *Iowa Conservationist* (Vol. 5, No. 1, 1921) published a full record of the meeting, "The First National Park Conference." Regardless of its title, the subject of the meeting was state parks. At the time of the conference, nineteen states had parks. Maryland was not among them. Although governors were encouraged to send representatives from all relevant organizations, there were no representatives from the Board of Forestry. The Maryland delegation consisted of a single individual, J. Cookman Boyd, President of the Board of City Commissioners in Baltimore. See *Iowa Conservationist*, 5 (1921), 17.

³⁰ Swam, *Federal Conservation Policy*, 1921-1933, 134-35.

³¹ There were advocates in the forest service for wilderness and for recreation, but they were a small if vocal minority. Without pressure from the NPS, it is unclear how successful they would have been in advancing the wilderness/recreation agenda.

³² Mather to Harrington, June 24, 1919, box 653; Radcliff to Mather, September 15, 1919, box 655; Besley to Cammerer, July 26, 1921, box 655; Cammerer to Besley, July 27, 1921, box 655, Central Classified Files, 1907-1949. National Park Service, National Archives and Records Administration Record Group 79 [hereafter referred to as NA-RG79].

³³ Maryland Legislature, Acts of 1922, Chapter 29.

³⁴ National Conference of State Parks, Annual Report, 1927 (Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Parks); Beatrice Ward Nelson, *State Recreation: Parks, Forests, and Game Reserves* (Washington, D.C.: National Conference of State Parks, 1928).

³⁵ Sun, July 7, 1932.

³⁶ State Department of Forestry (formerly Board of Forestry) Report 1922-23, 15-16 [hereafter SDF].

³⁷ SDF Report 1929, 13; SDF Report 1931-32, 11.

³⁸ The SDF received \$50,000 in 1929 and 1930, and \$25,000 in 1931. Besley to Pearson, December 17, 1929, box 5. Forestry Department 1927-1935, Reports of the Presidents Office Series VII, Maryland Room, Hornbeck Library, University of Maryland, College Park [hereafter referred to as RPO].

³⁹ Fred Besley, "State Forests," 153. Besley to Pearson, no date, box 17, RPO Series VII. These smaller purchases required the approval of the entire Board of Regents.

⁴⁰ "Old Landmarks Restored by CCC," [Hagerstown, Maryland] Daily Mail, April 1, 1936.

⁴¹ SDF Report, 1930, 13.

⁴² Fred Besley, "State Forests," 155.

⁴³ Ibid., 155.

⁴⁴ John Paige, *The CCC and the National Park Service 1933-1942: An Administrative History*, (Washington, DC: The National Park Service, 1985). On the CCC, see also John Salmond. *The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1967).

⁴⁵ Sun, April 16, May 28, 1933; Besley to Pearson April 24, 1933, box 17, RPO VII.

⁴⁶ Box 10, District Inspector Report (Tell Nicolet), District 5, November 1933, Reports of District Offices and Inspectors Concerning State Park Emergency Conservation Work, 1933-35, District IV, Wirth January 2, 1934. box 10, DIR January 1934, DIR March 1934, NA-RG79.

⁴⁷ DIR March 1934, NA-RG79.

⁴⁸ Sun, August 22, 1934.

⁴⁹ DIR October 1934. NA-RG79.

⁵⁰ Besley to Pearson, January 23, 1935, box 17, RPO VII.

⁵¹ Maryland Legislature. Journal of the Senate, 1935. SDF Report 1931-32, 10-11.

⁵² Besley to Shriver, March 20, 1935, box 17. RPO VII; Besley to Merriam, July 5, 1935; box 244, Records of the Branch of Recreation, Land Planning, and State Cooperation, State Park Files, 1933-47, NA-RG79; Nicolet to Byrd, August 8, 1935, box 2, RPO VIII; Nicolet to Third Regional Office (Richmond), August 17, 1935, box 244, Weatherwax to State Park ECW (NPS) August 17, 1935, Records of the Branch of Recreation, Land Planning and State Cooperation, NA-RG79; Nicolet to Byrd August 24, 1935, box 2, RPO VIII; Personen to Besley, August 26, 1935, Besley to Personen, September 4, 1935, Records of the Branch of Recreation, Land Planning, and State Cooperation, NA-RG79.

⁵³ Cecil County State Park Commission, untitled memorandum, September 4, 1935. details history of efforts to have Elk Neck declared a park. See also Cecil County Historical Society, *History of Elk Neck* (Elkton, Md.: Cecil County Historical Society, 1973). Folder Elk Neck State Park and History, Cecil County Historical Society The NPS required all projects to be conducted on state-owned lands with the explicit understanding that the state would assume responsibility for operations and upkeep when the project was completed.

⁵⁴ Cecil County State Park Commission, untitled memorandum, September 4, 1935; Besley to Abbot September 4, 1935; Folder, Elk Neck State Park and History, Cecil County Historical Society, DIR October 1935, November 1935, NA-RG79.

⁵⁵ Presentation by Besley to Board of Regents, March 31, 1936, Besley to Skinner, April 4, 1936, box 2, Forestry Dept, RPO VIII; Minutes of June 19, 1936, box 2, Board of Regents Meeting, February 1936, Record of the Board of Regents, Series IV.

⁵⁶ Sun, May 25, 1937, July 6, 1941, April 4, 1946; Department of State Forests and Parks, *Our Maryland Forests: What They Mean to Us* (Baltimore: Maryland Commission of State Forests and Parks, 1942), 24, 27.

⁵⁷ Memorandum from O. B. Taylor to Ford (NPS), June 29, 1937, "General Survey of Wildlife. Patapsco Park," box 248, Records of the Branch of Recreation. Land Planning, and State Cooperation, NA-RG79.

⁵⁸ Sun, February 25, 1937.

⁵⁹ Ibid., May 23, 1937, April 7, 1940. Cabins were built in state forest reserves in western Maryland. not so much due to Besley's efforts but at the initiative of the USFS. The service had successfully outmaneuvered the NPS and had received permission from the Office of Emergency Conservation Work to undertake recreation-related projects similar to what the NPS was doing. Between 1937 and 1940 a total of thirty-five cabins were built in Maryland by the CCC; by 1960, the state had managed to add exactly four additional cabins. Maryland State Planning Commission, *Maryland*

Recreation Areas: A Report on Present Assets and Future Needs for Nonurban Public Recreational Areas (Baltimore: Maryland State Planning Commission, 1940), Table A, 14-15, 39; *Sun*, December 11, 1960.

⁶⁰ Maryland State Planning Commission, *Maryland Recreation Areas*, 39.

⁶¹ Maryland Legislature, Acts of 1941, Chapter 508; Edna Warren, "Forests and Parks in the Old Line State." *American Forests*, 62 (1956): 13-25, 56-77.

⁶² Karl Pfeiffer, "Maryland Forests," *Maryland Journal of Natural History*, 14 (1944); *Sun*, February 2, 1945.

⁶³ *Sun*, April 9, 1946. It is worthwhile to note that for several years there had been hundreds of applications for the state's few cabins; cabins were taken for the entire season before the season even got underway.

⁶⁴ "Little Cove Point for Recreation and Demonstration," *Maryland Tidewater News*, 1 (1945); Truitt to McCloskey, January 22, 1945, box 2973, Central Classified Files 1933-49, NA-RG79; 1945 Report with no name; Truitt to Wirth, February 23, 1945, box 2973, Central Classified Files, 1933-49, NARG-79; *Sun*, March 15, 1945; Caldwell to Kennedy, April 6, 1945, O' Connor to Drury, March 5, 1946, box 2973, Central Classified Files 1933-49, NA-RG79; Ammerman to Allen, April 4, 1946, Pasarew to Demaray, March 13, 1946, Allen to Pasarew June 21, 1946, Records Concerning the Recreation-Area Study, Classified Files 1936-47, NA-RG79.

⁶⁵ Proceedings of the House of Delegates, House Joint Resolution 7, May 7, 1951.

⁶⁶ *Old Line Acorn*, 13 (1956), 4.

⁶⁷ "Hundreds of Majestic Oaks in Garrett Fall Prey to Ax;" *Sun*, September 14, 1940.