

Letter from George to Fred Ott  
re: Mead Reservoir

Babcock, Wisconsin  
August 10, 1954

Mr. Frederick L. Ott  
1358 N. 63rd St.  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Dear Fred:

I have read your letter, which arrived this morning, with a good deal of regret.

The sincerity of your beliefs, however, is evident. You have every right to your opinion. If you feel that Mead Reservoir is bad, by all means do your utmost to defeat it. All that can properly be asked of a man is that he follow his convictions. Nevertheless, in some respects I am not sure that you have arrived at your ultimate conclusions, or convictions.

Since you state very definitely that you read Woerpel's News and Views issue of July 31, put out by the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs, the origin of some of your attitude and ideas is very clear. The News and Views issue I refer to contained libellous material about me, and has done harm and damage to me. I believe you also read The Milwaukee Journal story headed "Hired to Make Report, Game Expert Testifies", since you say how "shocked" and "deeply hurt" you were when you learned of "my appearance as paid consultant for the N.V.I.C.". This story, likewise, (and certain other press stories) did enormous damage, and placed me in a completely false light, and has inflamed people like yourself. I intend to deal with these libels in due course, in an appropriate and realistic manner. Since you suggest that you may, on your own, distribute additional copies of News and Views for July 31, 1954, I wish to caution you not to do so, for to do so would make you a party to the distribution of this libellous material. Libel is a very serious matter and there is going to be an accounting for it.

There is no question, from your letter, that you feel that I sold out my beliefs and convictions for money. Your references to "Wallace before Sausau", and afterward, and your remark "somewhere in his conscience they're still there" (thoughts, before "a change of heart") bear this out. I do not know of any greater affront than to charge a man with selling out his beliefs. A man's integrity, and reputation for integrity, are the most important possessions of life. I am sure that such a wonderful friend as you have been, and are, and one who has been so appreciative and helpful, would never in the world call me a "hireling", or words to that effect, if you had not been influenced by the printed libels I have already referred to.

As a matter of fact, you know very well that I cannot be bought, either for money, or through friendship, or by CNRA. The precise thing that you so intensely dislike is the fact that I said what you

did not want me to say, and the thing that you and Owen have both beat me over the head about is that I am not subject to your control or to control by anyone else. The reason for the malicious statements by Woerpel, and certain others, is the very fact that they could not prevent my testimony, and that they had nothing factual with which to rebut my testimony. The only recourse left, for these people, as they saw it, was to attempt to discredit me, and to try to damage my reputation by crying "hireling".

However, in your own case, you present certain additional points which you feel sustain your stand, and I know that you do so in all sincerity, however much you have been misled by Woerpel and others. Your letter consequently deserves detailed reply.

I may say that I have been a game consultant for years. My letterhead once read: "Wallace Grange, Game Breeder and Consultant". In recent years I have not wished to be away from the farm, and have seldom taken a consulting job. The last one I turned down was from the Conservation Department, which wanted me to make a "Sharptail Management Survey" in Rusk and Sawyer Counties. This was, I believe, in 1952. I did not take it because, after reflection, I decided that they wanted to "use" me, to get something that would serve as "window dressing", and that nothing tangible whatever would come of anything I reported or recommended for Sharptailed Grouse. I, also, felt that my taking such a job would have been a slap at Hammerstroms, who are the current Department experts on the same subject, and I discussed the matter with Fred and Fran. I have done consulting work for the Iowa Conservation Department, for More Game Birds in America, and I always classed my work as Grouse Fellow at the University, and as Game Biologist for the Department, in the same category. I have been paid for such work, with the exception of a great deal of consulting work by mail which I have done gratis.

I have had exactly one experience in which the agency paying me felt that it could control my findings, and that was the Conservation Department in Wisconsin, which for years suppressed Wisconsin Grouse Problems partly because of its references to fire, and to the adverse effects of reforestation. Even after the book was finally published, and after 4000 printed copies were available, the book was under lock and key for months, and not even Game Division officials could get copies. In the end, the book was released, largely I think because of Bill Aberg's insistence, and the supposedly "controversial" sections of it have been accepted by thousands of laymen and by some members of the Conservation Department itself. It is my belief that a great deal of comparable suppression of facts still occurs in the Conservation Department, and in various other public agencies. I did not encounter any such situation with WVIC. They did not know what was in my Report until I filed it. The only change of any nature that was suggested

was a factual correction of my statement as to the number of acre-feet to be pumped, which statistic I had inadvertently confused. I accepted the WVIC consulting job upon express condition that I was to bring in the facts, whatever they were.

As to any "change" in my beliefs; such as you imply in your references to "Wallace before Wausau", I can only judge that you are almost totally unfamiliar with my life, record, reports, letters and utterances over the last 20 or more years, or have not analysed these, since my beliefs have been highly consistent.

For example, it has been my conscious aim to help steer the CNRA into reasonable support of private wildlife enterprise, and the recognition of private rights. I can cite numerous instances such as Public vs. Private Rights, published by CNRA, and several legislative analyses dealing with specific bills. It is my conception of CNRA, and always has been, that we were one organization with intelligence enough to know what the American free enterprise system is, and to adhere to its concepts, avoiding the hysteria of those who want everything to be "public", or who blindly tear down our system for imagined immediate "gains".

Some years ago, (long before CNRA) I was partially instrumental in killing a compulsory selective forest cutting bill in the Wisconsin legislature. At that time, I was accused of representing "the timber interests" although in fact I represented only myself, and my own rights as a landowner. Aroline Schmitt can tell you about this bill, for she was as militantly "for" it as I was against it. In fact, my first recollection of Aroline Schmitt is of meeting her at the Capitol that day, and talking with her in a very congenial way about that particular bill.

Only a couple of years ago, we were all plugging for a Flambeau Wilderness Area. Some of my good friends felt that I had "sold out to the Department", or "to the director", (although not for money), because I favored a 1/4 mile strip along the Flambeau rather than the 1-mile strip the Flambeau Committee, and others, proposed. Personally, if we could have obtained a 1-mile strip, I would have been as happy as anyone. I knew, however, that a 1-mile strip was impossible to obtain, but that we might secure the 1/4 mile strip. And here we are, in August, 1954, trying desperately to hold even that. I think I was quite bitterly assailed for "compromising", and for not asking for the moon. Throughout my contact with CNRA, I have tried to keep the organization from flying toward the four winds all at once, and to get it to apply its fervent desire to further grand ideals by proceeding carefully with very practical, and realistic, methods.

You cite Page 11 of my Report as an example of my "change" in viewpoint. It so happens that every idea on page 11 has been written by me, and publicly uttered by me, over a period of years, dating back years before CNRA days, and also since. After having had a Conservation Commissioner tell me that there should not be any deer farms "in deer country", and having seen the present policy of the Department as to Shooting Preserves, denying a license to any property that still has good pheasant habitat, I understand fully that game can be a liability, and that it often is. In so saying, I am not talking theory, or anything new in my own outlook.

Likewise, if there is a "bitter" ring to some of my Report in respect to hunters, it has been distilled out of bitter experience. I cannot forget the fact that when I began my game farm here at Sandhill, Governor LaFollette was presented with petitions from many counties, signed by approximately 3,000 citizens, representing hunters and/or "conservation" groups, demanding that no license be issued me. These people did not want "wealthy men" meaning me, believe it or not, to "take over our hunting lands", and they were determined to see my legal rights denied. The fight that I personally experienced is almost a parallel to that of Mead Reservoir, except that my project did not involve any navigable water. What I learned about law, and about public opinion, in that greatest fight of our lives, has stood by me ever since, and with the theft of our deer, the wanton shooting of our European Red Deer, the pulling down of gates and cutting of fences, if I were not to some extent "bitter" about hunters, it would be strange, indeed. Furthermore, when they shoot beautiful Herons, Eagles, Hawks, Terns, Cranes, Woodpeckers, and slaughter even legal game in the most unsportsmanlike manner, I must confess that I am no champion of the run-of-mill hunter, who is, too frequently, a vandal rather than a sportsman. That there are a few "trophy hunters" here and there I accept as a fact, but they are entirely too rare. If you are one of them, I admire you for it.

However, when you tell me that to save Prairie Chickens it is necessary to shoot them, to "keep the interest up", I begin to have my doubts, for that line of argument I believe to be specious, and I do not accept it. It is hunting propaganda, Fred, and many hunters, and some technicians, prattle it off like parrots. I do not believe it is necessary to shoot Sandhill Cranes to "keep the interest up" (they have increased possibly 300% in 15 years in Wisconsin) and your argument is no more valid when applied to Prairie Chickens. Closing the season on prairie grouse on the contrary might shock enough hunters, and others, to wake them up to the point that they will do something. I know one hunter (a high type) who shot 38 sharptails in one season recently on the theory, apparently, that "they won't last long anyhow". The idea that we must continue open seasons in order to stimulate interest I consider pernicious, and an attitude to be overcome, not something to proclaim in the name of "conservation".

I hear it said that "hunting does not make any difference; the whole problem is habitat". It so happens that I have devoted perhaps as much study to northern habitat as anyone in practical game work, and I am very sure that my own writings have been of assistance in emphasizing the importance of habitat. Incidentally, my writings on this subject date back more than twenty years. But people, particularly non-technical hunters, and research men close to administration, (with a constant eye upon hunting license revenue) go from one extreme to the other. First, "law enforcement" was the whole key, and habitat extreme is justified. Unlimited habitat acreage will support a great deal of hunting, but the present Wisconsin problem as to hunting of prairie grouse is unlimited hunting in constantly decreasing, and deteriorating, habitat, and the fantastic idea that this is of no effect is not supportable either in common sense or statistically. There is no bag limit on the land itself, and under our present law each hunter can legally kill a seasonal total that is scandalous.

In this habitat connection, you maintain that Mead Reservoir lands are essential to the continued survival of Prairie Chickens in the adjacent rather extensive range, which extends more or less through parts of Marathon, Portage, Waushara, Marquette, Green Lake, Adams, Juneau, Wood and Jackson counties. The idea seems to be that elimination of the reservoir habitat would somehow make these other lands unproductive, and spell the doom of the species. I do not believe there is any technical or factual basis for your belief or that the reservoir lands are essential to the larger surrounding region. While it is natural to grasp at any straw in an argument, this particular straw will not, in my opinion, withstand analysis, irrespective of what authorities you may quote in support of it. All of the Central area still contains potentially valuable Prairie Chicken land, or land still producing these birds, and a suitable management effort is feasible in any of many counties. I am very confident that if funds were made available, plus complete control of the land, I could develop Prairie Chicken lands and that the populations could be maintained. All of the problems in this connection certainly have not been solved, and particularly the danger that at the low point of severe cycles the population may drop so low that some unexpected adverse factor may prevent recovery. It may be possible to produce enough Prairie Chickens, under management, to permit a limited amount of hunting, but this is not proved in Wisconsin. In the absence of adequate management efforts, and whether you like it or not, Prairie Chickens will inevitably fade from the hunting picture in Wisconsin (barring the opening up of "new" habitat by fire or other catastrophe). While a few very feeble and inadequate management steps have been taken, the plain fact is that despite the "interest" that you and others maintain in respect to this species, nothing effective has been done. And, if anything is to be done, the first requirement is that substantial acreages of publicly-owned land (or publicly-leased land)

must be taken out of some other type of land-use and dedicated primarily to the production of open-loving species. In very localized areas, something is possible without complete land control, but such places are exceptional, and the long-term outlook does not appear too promising. The Mead Reservoir lands are not the key to present or future preservation of Prairie Chickens and no amount of argument can make them so. What has been done in the Southeast (largely on private lands in large tracts) for both Quail and Wild Turkeys is an example of the type of approach which could, if applied, produce results in Wisconsin, with the necessary modifications based upon differing species habits.

I cannot follow you in any way in comparing Horicon with Mead Reservoir, or in your claim that I am not consistent as between the two. The sole issue at Horicon is hunting on an inviolate refuge. Mead Reservoir is not a refuge of any kind. One is publicly-owned, one is privately-owned. The law is completely different in the two cases, in many important particulars.

As to denying the majority a certain standard of living, I do not believe this should be done. I have never, however, advocated "share and share alike", which is impossible and completely unrealistic, and never in my life have I favored "land distribution", as you claim I have. I am not an "agrarian reformer", and I am not a Communist, and I have no use for the views of either category, which is, I believe, the source of the term "land distribution" which you use. I believe in the capitalist free enterprise system, and in private ownership, and in the rule of law, and the first principle of our system is that the actual rights (not imagined ones like your "right" to hunt on my land) are guaranteed both to the minority and to the majority. Even the majority can not just walk in and take over. When you say that I have favored "land distribution" as one solution of "hunting pressure", you have me confused with someone else, and it nettles me no end.

I have pleaded with our state conservation authorities time and again to work out something that will bring private landowners into the wildlife production picture, through establishing incentives, which might take either the form of "payments" (which I dislike) or the form of extending special open seasons on specific acreage in return for management that meets a given standard of productivity. I have set forth some of these ideas in articles such as "The Rise of Natural Propagation", "Semi-natural Game Farms for Waterfowl", "Proprietary Freedom", "Bag Limits for Land", (a principle that State and Federal authorities got around to applying to Geese in 1953), "Special Open Season Private Wildlife Management Areas" (submitted to the Wisconsin Conservation Department in May, 1950), "Practical Beaver and Muskrat Farming", "Wisconsin's Licensed Muskrat Farms, Beaver Farms and Game Farms", and other publications. I do not have extra copies of most of these. Some of them appeared in The Game Breeder

and Sportsman fifteen or so years ago, when for several years I conducted a "Practical Game Management" column or department.

Also, I have fought for, and helped to sponsor, legislation in Wisconsin which has established the present private wildlife enterprise in the propagation field, and year in and year out I have advocated the importance of private rights, and the principle that much of our future game production, and hunting, must come from some form of partnership between public and private interests. Also, I have fought the rural zoning laws in two or more counties, and have been on the side of property owners as against those who would have the public confiscate private lands, in effect, under the guise of "regulating billboards", or instituting some other type of control, and later I heard it said that I was "for the billboard interests". I cited my opposition to rural zoning in "Our Philosophy in These Times" (from which you quote another comment).

This is only a partial record of my activities along this line, ("you can't change the world") but it is sufficient to show, if you wish to be fair, that I have done my own thinking and have quite frequently been opposed to those who, in the name of "conservation" favored centralized government control, and unwarranted compulsion, as a means of achieving ends. Certainly my whole philosophy is to place emphasis upon individual responsibility, and upon the necessity of preserving private rights, as opposed to the concept that government must do everything, and as opposed to the idea that "the public interest" can be used to sanction such things as public hunting upon private lands.

A statement that gets my dander up is yours that the only reason WVIC (or Consolidated) has permitted hunting on its lands has been to "avoid the wrath of public sentiment". In the first place, you should re-state this to read "the wrath of hunters", and in the second place, the wrath of hunters will descend upon anyone who at any time closes his lands to uncontrolled hunting. The longer the land has been open, free of charge, the greater the wrath. In my own case, my land was open to general hunting from 1930 to 1937, and looking back, this was a serious mistake. When you refer to "idle land", the fact of idleness does not confer any right whatever to another, anymore than a vacant house is a place that anyone can move into and use without permission.

Tens of thousands of landowners, faced with such callous attitudes of ingratitude as you express in your letter, have closed their lands to hunting, and more do so every year. I have no sympathy whatever with your viewpoint on this subject. Now that some hunting land is about to be "taken away" from you, your wailing can be heard to high heaven. Had you done your wailing and gnashing of teeth five or ten

years ago, and under some constructive plan which would have permitted acquisition of the lands, I would have some respect for your position. Aren't you a little tardy in suggesting state acquisition? Under cross-examination, in response to this desperate last minute hope of getting the State to buy the reservoir lands, I said: "You are bidding on a horse that has been sold."

Your statement (page 1) that there "wouldn't have been any hearing if the private interests had previously acquired all the flood lands", is completely in error. The sole purpose of the hearing was to determine the public rights applicable to the permit sought, and the whole issue of the now existing private land ownership rights involved is a matter for negotiation, or for court appraisals, and ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> ruled by the Examiner as beyond the scope of the hearing. The same condemnation type of adjudication of private land rights was used in acquisition of Horicon marsh, and is applied daily with respect to highways, utility right-of-ways, etc., under procedures set up by the legislature, and under due process of law. It was publicly stated that the WVIC does not own all of the land, but it does own much of it, and its power, as established by the legislature, is quite evident. Whether you or I, or anyone, likes condemnation is another matter, but you will not change it except by legislative action, and if anyone bought land, as you say, "with full knowledge of the wildlife potential and the impending flood threat", it is also quite possible that he may have made his purchase, also, with at least half an eye on the sale price he could eventually expect to get from the WVIC.

You say (page 2) that I advocate "management of a different type" today, for Prairie Chickens, than I did in Wisconsin Grouse Problems. Your statement is entirely erroneous. I continue to advocate exactly the same thing as before, and I challenge you to produce a single fact in support of your statement.

I will comment on several additional points you attempt to make:

- (1) Atomic generation of electricity. The best information I can get as a director in the Oakdale Electrical Cooperative is that practical atomic power is many years away, perhaps 25 years, in terms of permitting substitution of it for hydro and steam generation. The General Electric circular you sent is interesting, but merely shows that they are working on it. When atomic generation does come, it may no more replace present facilities than the airplane has made automobiles obsolete. Eventually, it may perhaps work wonders, but I don't believe you and I will live to see it replace the present system. If you are right, wonderful.



You also state that "this horse and buggy excuse" (additional power needs) has been knocked into a cocked hat by the Public Service Commission and by the Supreme Courts. In the first place, I do not read the decisions as you do, and in the second place (presumably you refer to the Namekegan case) you had a truly scenic river, and a relatively small generation possibility. You do not have that at Mead Reservoir and the project means some 72,000,000 kilowatt hours without any additional generation facilities, through providing enough water to use present facilities more of the time. What you fail to appreciate, I think, is that no two legal cases are ever alike, and a careful reading of the Supreme Court record confirms my belief, that it is very essential for us to discriminate in making our decisions as to what we accept as inevitable, and as to what we will fight as avoidable. So far as our sentiments are concerned, none of us actually prefer any further encroachment of industry or other disturbance in wild areas. Nevertheless, the horse and buggy days that you mention are long past, and we face not only new dams and reservoirs, but new cities in the wildernesses of Canada and Alaska, and an unprecedented shrinking of wild area. I must repeat again that we cannot stop all of this expansion, and should not try, and that the intelligent approach is to choose the few really essential areas that there is some chance of preserving in natural condition.

- (2) Lake frontage for cottages. This is out of my field, and I did not cover it in my report.

As to "stink", I heard testimony that "exposed peat stinks". In my experience it does not, and I expose several hundred acres of it annually. Milwaukee stinks in my nostrils, and so do paper mills, but I expect to live with both of them.

- (3) Waterfowl foods in polluted water. 50% of the water will come from the Wisconsin at flood time, when pollution is least. I do not think comparison with DuBay or the Big Eau Pleine is warranted. I have not seen any competent technical evidence or testimony that the pollution in the Mead Reservoir will bar many aquatic plants. The parties who claim to have planted duck foods elsewhere, and failed, may have done any number of things to insure the failure of their plantings. Not one of them took the stand to tell his experiences, or to withstand cross-examination. There are several competent technologists, and at least one consultant (available for hire), who could give sound advice based on facts.

- (4) Clearing the flowage. Personally (and this is simply a matter of preference) I hope the flowage is not cleared. I enjoy seeing dead trees and snags in water, for often there is a Cormorant, a Tree Swallow, a Blue Heron, or a Kingfisher, on them. Death of trees by flooding is common in Beaver ponds, where I first grew to appreciate the weird beauty of dead trees. I would not want all lakes to be in this condition, but neither do I like to see all impoundments cleared and bare.

In my own flowages, I do not clear any trees that I flood and kill. Under alternate flooding and drying they rot so rapidly that, sooner or later, I am certain that we will be hauling in specially-cut trees for the purpose of increasing minnow nesting and refuge places. Dead trees, under our conditions, are extremely valuable, and without them we might have to do as European fish culturists (and some American ones) do, namely, to stick flat boards in the mud, or supply tile, or lattice work, or other artificial shelters. Granting that all this may not be directly applicable to game fishes, there is, at least, a side other than the one you mention.

I have opposed clearing flowages in the Wood County Hunting Ground (publicly-owned) because of the adverse effect of such removal upon waterfowl.

As to logs which remain submerged, you are correct that decay is extremely slow. Alternate flooding-drying (as in the reservoir), on the other hand, accelerates decay. On this, I speak from personal observation on my own land.

- (5) Potential Fishing. To an ever-increasing extent, our fishing is "managed", or to apply an erroneous term, "man-made". I believe there is no good reason why competent fish culturists cannot devise ways and means for making Mead Reservoir satisfactorily productive of game fish. It is my belief that fishing will be much better than in the Wisconsin because here you have lake conditions, not stream conditions, more shallows, and a quite different environment. The area of the lake at lowest draw-down will be 10.3 square miles (data from Engineering Department of Consolidated) and not the much smaller area claimed by Woerpel. If the reservoir is too great a challenge for our fisheries technicians (for example if they do no better for fish than the game men have done for Prairie Chickens) it will not be, in my opinion, because the appropriate methods are unknown, but simply because of lack of interest on the part of those who control the policies and the purse, poor supervision, or because someone wants to prove that "reservoirs are no good for fishing". The fishing potential is very high, in my opinion.

- (6) "Consolidated must have all the water should occasion arise". I am told that this is both untrue, and impossible, since the draw-down is limited by the elevation of the dam sill. I think

your statement is factually in error, and also unfair in that Consolidated never has used "all the water", and has furnished water at critical times to the cranberry industry. All water is paid for, on a toll basis.

Incidentally, the water made available to cranberry marshes, for reservoir use, is an important factor favoring Sandhill Cranes, Sharptails, and Prairie Chickens, and the contribution of the cranberry units to all three species is, in my belief, far greater than that of Mead Reservoir. (I have a paper in progress that covers this for Sandhill Cranes over a period of years, based on my own observations). The major increase of Sandhills has come in and near cranberry reservoirs, and the flowages on my own property (the greatest nesting Sandhill concentration in Wisconsin), and those on public lands in the main Central range. Wisconsin River water is important to the marshes east of the Yellow River. Use of this water helps to perpetuate the cranberry reservoir system, and to postpone, or eliminate, the day of direct pumping from the ground, or from streams of smaller size. Whatever perpetuates the cranberry reservoir system is of real importance to prairie grouse and to many other species. In comparative numerical terms, I do not attempt to approximate the gains and losses (Mead vs. Wood County) but it could be done.

(7)

Who owns the water? One thing you may not understand is that the WVIC was set up by legislative action in 1907. Its control of the Wisconsin River is unique in Wisconsin, and the law is much different from that applicable to other streams. This will probably answer your uncertainty as to who owns the water, since the public, by law, granted the corporation the right to use the water, and to charge a toll for its use by mills that benefit. You may not like this legislation, but all legislatures since 1907 have respected it, and it is the basis for the major industrial development along the Wisconsin, which development is in a rather special class in Wisconsin. The public has a "recapture clause" permitting public acquisition at cost after 30 years of use, but no such reversion has been urged primarily because, I think, the legislature and public have been satisfied that the WVIC has done a pretty good job, and perhaps a much better one than the public agencies would do if they took over.

(8)

Southern Competition. The press badly misquoted Bill Thiel in his remarks about the paper industry "moving to Georgia". I heard his comments, and they applied solely to expansion, and your understanding of what went on in this respect is in error, to my own personal knowledge. Whether this was a "scare" remark or not, I have seen some of the mills in the South, and the very rapid progress of the South, and if you still believe that

everything south of the Mason-Dixon line is "cheap labor", or "unskilled", or backward, you ought to take a trip down there and see for yourself. I have the greatest respect for the New South that has arisen, and anyone who does not know that the South is a real competitor in paper, timber, dairying, beef, and a dozen other things, is, I am afraid, not up on this enormous and bountiful country of ours. Not only that, but people down there still know how to work, and many of them have real pride in their work, and we are losing quite a lot of that spirit in our complacent North. While I appreciate that the types of paper are different, I think that if a Wisconsin mill has a few million to invest in expansion, it might very easily decide on Georgia instead of Wisconsin. Maybe that is good, and maybe it is bad. But the State as a whole is crying for "new industry", and is not too sympathetic with the form of hostility for private enterprise that has become quite common in certain places in Wisconsin, among very radical elements. In the end, a lot more people are interested in jobs, than in hunting, or as a means that will permit their hunting.

The problem is so formidable that the Legislative Council is studying it, and I understand that it is proposed to set up a special agency both to encourage new Wisconsin industry, and to try to keep what we have. Wisconsin, of course, is in 10th place nationally, as to industrial output -- we are no longer a rural state with a farm economy alone. Whether you personally wish Wisconsin to be an industrial state or not, you cannot avoid the impact of those (unquestionably the great majority) who do.

Turning now to the quotations you take from my writings, (which is a novel and most interesting experience), every word that you quote from me, is just as true today as when it was written, and every word of it I believe as fervently as I ever did.

"Man has the duty to conserve Nature wherever possible" --. Let's stop right there. I have tried to impress upon my CNRA friends that it is not possible to conserve Nature everywhere, and still expand the human population. We will have our hands full to preserve even decent samples of Nature, as things are going. When "any category of living things or of natural scenery" is about to be "blotted from the face of the earth", we must, indeed, rally our forces. Such is not the threat at Mead Reservoir. And you will notice that I said category, and I assure you this word was used deliberately, with this very thought in mind.

"The wisest of wise uses is this ---- inspiration". This I believe, but life is not all inspiration. A substantial part of it,

(as has been said by others) is perspiration. I do not think any life, devoid of work, is inspiring, or that being inspired is ever a continuous and uninterrupted process. If inspiration were the only use of natural resources, you would never again fire a gun, never sell another order of paper, never build a house, and never again eat dinner. My language cannot be successfully cited, as you attempt, to claim that I am against all use of resources other than for inspiration. You do violence to my writing and to common sense in the attempt.

"The true conservationist cannot perform his duty unless he is, sometimes at least, aware of the beauty --- of Nature".

Neither is your citation of this proper in the way you use it. Man is man, and he cannot, simply be lost perpetually in "beauty", or in "Nature" and I never said that he should. You know my meaning as well as I do.

My quotation about hunting and fishing getting us out in the open is still true, and I have not changed since Wausau. You, as a trophy hunter, may be quite exacting in your needs, and so you may go to Canada or to Mexico to more sparsely populated areas. Many people also gain valuable contacts at a much lower level of experience, and I believe some will do so at Mead Reservoir. For you, I am quite sure the area will decline in interest. It may rise for others.

"I do believe that the benefits from such pursuits can be vastly increased if we pay less attention to getting our bag limit and more attention to the things around us". My conviction that this is true, grows. Before and since Wausau, (and again since reading your letter in fact) it occurs to me with even greater force that there should be a zero bag limit on Prairie Chickens in Wisconsin, and that until all of us have insured the permanent survival of this species, we ought to forego their hunting entirely.

"Conservation should teach us humility, wonder, appreciation, and personal responsibility".

Of these, humility is the most difficult of attainment. Conservation should teach it to us, but very often none of us remember it. In controversy, we all tend to forget humility. I am certainly no exception. As to personal responsibility, I feel this keenly, and it is my belief that responsible conservation work cannot oppose everything, as I have fully outlined. If I have not practised what I preach as to personal responsibility to and for wildlife, then I can honestly and humbly say that I do not know of anyone who has. I am sure that you do not know all of that story, but I have no desire to go into it at this time.

I have not written this long letter in any hope that I will change your position on Mead Reservoir. I have written it to attempt to clear up what I believe to be misapprehensions on your part as to where I stand, and why I stand there, and because I know you are genuinely troubled, and very sincere.

I might mention that the opposition to Mead Reservoir was unable even to carry a resolution against it in the Conservation Congress, which is composed of many men vitally interested in hunting. The vote was 34-29 against the resolution.

The letters I have received suggest that a substantial majority of the CNRA Council agrees with my stand, and that there is no disposition to attempt to place the organization on the other side.

I fully appreciate that the loss of your hunting grounds is a severe blow to you. Despite this, I sincerely hope that you will bear me no resentment for any small part I may have in attempting to defeat the opposition to Mead Reservoir.

Your stand on the Flambeau Wilderness Area is gratifying. All but one who have written me, oppose the prison camp in the Wilderness Area. We appear to be nearly unanimous on this issue.

Hazel and I are happy with you and Jolly over the news of the impending great event at your home.

I wish you could make it up here on the 21st, but I appreciate fully why you wouldn't dream of being away at that time. We will certainly miss you.

With all good wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Wallace Grange, Pres. CNRA

WG:dg