



Environment & Society Portal



The White Horse Press

Full citation: Bennett, Brett. "An Imperial, National and State Debate: The Rise and Near Fall of the Australian Forestry School, 1927–1945." *Environment and History* 15, no. 2 (February 2009): 217–44. <http://www.environmentandsociety.org/node/3377>.

Rights: All rights reserved. © The White Horse Press 2009. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism or review, no part of this article may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, including photocopying or recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission from the publishers. For further information please see <http://www.whpress.co.uk>.

An Imperial, National and State Debate: The Rise and Near Fall of the Australian Forestry School, 1927–1945

BRETT BENNETT

*Department of History
University of Texas at Austin
Garrison Hall 1.104
1 University Station B7000
Austin, Texas, 78712-0220, USA
Email: brebenne@mail.utexas.edu*

ABSTRACT

A variety of debates that surrounded the opening of the Australian Forestry School at Canberra in 1927 illuminate the divergent beliefs about forestry education and conservation policy that many British imperial and Australian foresters and politicians held during the 1910s–1940s. A controversial English-born forester, Charles Edward Lane Poole, lobbied for the School's creation and headed it for many years. The Commonwealth Government supported the School throughout the 1920s–1940s amidst a variety of financial hardships and state criticisms. Many leading foresters throughout the British Empire who were born outside of Australia supported the School. But many professionally trained foresters and Australian politicians who had been born in Australia were more ambivalent or critical of the School. This article traces these contentious debates throughout the years leading up to and following the creation of the Australian Forestry School.

KEYWORDS

Forestry, Australia, British Empire, Conservation, Canberra, Australian Forestry School, Charles Edward Lane Poole

INTRODUCTION

A commentator on Australian politics in 1936 wrote that, 'Australia is still a country of competing loyalties. The State, Commonwealth, and Empire all command allegiance'.¹ Nowhere were these competing identities more evident than in the beginning years of the Australian Forestry School at Canberra from 1927–1945. The Bruce-Page led Commonwealth Government (1923–29) provided the initial funding and support for the opening of the federal Forestry School at Canberra in 1927. Charles Edward Lane Poole, a controversial forester born in England, most actively lobbied for the creation of the federal School based upon his British imperial and European conceptions of forestry education. This paper argues that more than any single person, Lane Poole helped create the Commonwealth funded Forestry School in Canberra, but almost paradoxically, he hindered its success. A variety of Australian foresters and politicians, who were loyal to their states and different educational backgrounds, fought against many of Lane Poole's nationalist and imperial oriented policies. A confluence of imperial, national and state events led to the creation of the Australian Forestry School, but state resistance, especially from Victoria and New South Wales, helped lead the School into political and economic problems during the 1930s and early 1940s.

The historiography on the Australian Forestry School is minuscule; there is not even one scholarly article or a full chapter written about the School. The one popular book that has been written about the School was published for a reunion and was framed within a professional and national perspective.² This corresponds to early nationalist interpretations of the School. Most Australian forestry and conservation historiography before the late 1980s emphasised Australia's national distinctiveness.³ Australian professional foresters who were usually loyal to their collegial, national and professional affiliations wrote the preponderance of Australian forestry histories.⁴ During the same period historians outside of Australia failed to take notice of the School because the subject of Australian forestry remained primarily of national interest. Scholars during the late 1980s and early 1990s increasingly framed the history of Australian forestry within an imperial and global context, emphasising Australia's contact with British India, South Africa, New Zealand, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.⁵ Historians have yet to substantially re-integrate the history of the Australian Forestry School within this global framework.⁶

CREATING THE AUSTRALIAN FORESTRY SCHOOL IN THE IMAGE OF EMPIRE

One cannot understand the Australian Forestry School only from a national or state perspective. The opening of the Australian Forestry School in Canberra in

1927 was undoubtedly a result of the wider expansion of forestry conservation laws and science, often described as 'empire forestry', which spread around the British Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁷ Forestry became a popular British colonial state programme throughout the British Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries after the India Office, with the help of German foresters, enacted the 1865 and 1878 Forestry Acts, founded the Indian Forest Service and established a forestry school at Royal Engineering College at Cooper's Hill in 1885.⁸ British imperial forestry programmes borrowed many of their central scientific, legal and political tenets from European forestry: most British imperial foresters stressed a federal forestry policy, advocated sending foresters to national forestry schools and tried to create an *esprit de corps* among forest officers.⁹ British imperial governors and foresters influenced by German and French forestry management systems sought to manage forest 'resources' through the 'rational' scientific application of silviculture and short and long-term economic calculations to maximise the yields of forests.¹⁰

Foresters who worked in the British Empire learned these European beliefs about forestry as students at a variety of European and British forestry schools. The vast majority of forestry students who worked in the British Empire during the early twentieth century studied at one of three colleges: *L'École Nationale des Eaux et Forêts* in Nancy, France, The Royal Engineering College at Cooper's Hill and Oxford University. Students at Cooper's Hill and Oxford received a similar education. A German forester, William Schlich, taught nearly every forestry student of the India Office who graduated from Cooper's Hill and Oxford University between 1885 and 1918.¹¹ Schlich believed that forestry laws and conservation programmes should be national, forestry should be profitable as well as sustainable and forestry science was the application of universal economic and scientific rules to particular conditions. Empire foresters who studied in the French tradition, such as D.E. Hutchins or Lane Poole, sought the nationalisation of forestry policy based upon the Forest Code of 1669, favoured an abstract and universal view of scientific forestry and stressed a rigid social hierarchy among the various ranks of foresters.¹² German, French and British schools taught students to strive for uniformity and probability, which the state could then use to manage its environment and populations.¹³

The differing political, social and economic conditions of the British colonies that started forestry programmes during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century led to the creation of a variety of forestry laws and departments that were often vastly different from the academic ideal.¹⁴ Many Europeans and non-Europeans rejected and resisted the attempted appropriation of the choicest forests by forestry departments.¹⁵ Indians and the Burmese frequently resisted forestry laws by burning forests and disregarding grazing and collecting laws.¹⁶ Nigerian and Gold Coast indigenous landholders effectively resisted the attempts by colonial officials to implement a forestry legal system based upon

the example of India between 1870–1916.¹⁷ Great Britain finally implemented a conservation programme based upon colonial models, the Forestry Act of 1919, after the end of World War I.¹⁸

Controversy and resistance also marred the creation of forestry schools throughout the British Empire. These debates often reflected the divide over foresters who sought to ‘professionalise’ forestry by emphasising theory over practice and foresters who believed that experience and practice were more important to foresters than abstract knowledge. Dietrich Brandis’s proposal in 1865 to send British forestry students to Europe before coming to India drew heated debate from Indian civil servants who believed that foresters needed to learn about forestry in the forests of India, not in the books and forests of Europe.¹⁹ Foresters in India continually disagreed with foresters in Britain about the best educational methods throughout the early twentieth century.²⁰ Other debates reflected political and institutional rivalries. Many foresters and university and government officials complained about the creation of the Oxford University forestry programme in 1904 because they wanted it to remain at Cooper’s Hill or move to Cambridge University.²¹ The Australian Forestry School proved to be as equally divisive as its British and Indian counterparts.

Australia did not fit perfectly within the empire forestry ideal espoused during the early nineteenth century: it lacked a national forestry policy, had no national forestry school and any esprit de corps that existed among foresters was more often regional than national or imperial in its allegiance. The condition of Australian forestry was a product of Australia’s distinct geography and social and political history. Historic and geographic conditions of Australian settlement led to the formation of six distinct colonies with their own regional identities.²² The economies and politics of each colony depended largely upon their unique climates, ecologies and geographies.²³ State Governments and local business elites controlled access to forests, which were more often seen as ideal areas for settlement and the establishment of agriculture than as long-term forest reserves.²⁴

The possibility for federal unity in forestry policy during the 1910s and 1920s remained limited. The Commonwealth Government received the powers of controlling taxation, foreign relations, military, currency and foreign immigration for the states, but forests inside of states remained in the control of the states.²⁵ States shifted forestry laws and jurisdictions from department to department because of the lack of federal coordination.²⁶ But the delayed development of forestry conservation schemes in Australia did not necessarily mean that Australians cared less about forests than in other British colonies: Australians discussed conservation schemes for climatic and economic purposes similar to other British colonies.²⁷ Australia had no federal forestry programme because it lacked the stronger federal control that had allowed India, Burma and South Africa to create national forestry policies.

The year 1916 witnessed the beginning of a sustained critique on Australian forestry by two British-born foresters, David Ernest Hutchins and the aforementioned Lane Poole. David Hutchins was an influential British forester who studied forestry at Nancy, worked in India, travelled around as a forestry advisor for the Colonial Office in British Africa and Cyprus, and visited Australia in 1914 on behalf of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.²⁸ The subsequent publication about his visit, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry With Special Reference to Western Australia*, offered a strong critique of state forestry policies for the Australian states. He suggested that Australia needed a federal forestry policy and a federal system of forestry education. Hutchins confidently predicted the creation of a national forestry school: 'In the natural course of events a Federal Forestry School will be established in Australia'. In reality the creation of the Australian Forestry School turned out to be anything but 'natural'.²⁹

Lane Poole arrived as the Conservator of the forests of Western Australia that same year. The Western Australian Government hired Lane Poole upon the recommendation of Hutchins after his visit. When Lane Poole arrived in Western Australia in 1916, he brought with him his experience as a forester of the British Empire. After successfully passing a Colonial Office exam, he earned a scholarship that allowed him to study forestry at Nancy, from where he graduated in 1906. Upon graduation, the Colonial Office assigned him to work as a forester in South Africa under the guidance of D.E. Hutchins. After working in South Africa, Lane Poole soon quit his job because the recently elected Prime Minister General Louis Botha appointed Afrikaners that Lane Poole believed were unfit foresters to his posting at Woodbush in the Transvaal, and because Poole felt that Botha was more interested in creating plantations than conserving existing forests. Lane Poole then transferred jobs through the Colonial Office to British Sierra Leone, where he wrote reports, collected botanical specimens and built up a small forestry department. Because of the tropical climate, Lane Poole lived apart from his recently married Irish wife. When in 1916 he received an offer from the Western Australian Government to be the Conservator of Forests, he jumped at the opportunity to move to the more salubrious Australian climate where he and his wife could live together.³⁰

THE FOUNDING OF THE AUSTRALIAN FORESTRY SCHOOL AT CANBERRA

Lane Poole began lobbying for the creation of a national forestry policy and a corresponding national forestry school soon after he arrived in Western Australia in 1916. He agreed with the beliefs of his mentor, Hutchins, that Australian forestry policy should be coordinated at a national level when the states proved 'unable' to manage their forests in the ways scientifically trained foresters deemed

fit.³¹ A national forestry school was the centrepiece of Lane Poole's plan to create a national policy. Representing the Western Australian Government at the 1916 inter-State forestry conference, he suggested that Australia should create a national forestry school in New South Wales, the state with the widest variety of forest types within close proximity.³² His national forestry school proposal was not new.

Australian foresters had been discussing the creation of a national forestry school before Lane Poole's arrival. As was the case throughout the rest of the British Empire, foresters in Australia sought to create a forestry education facility that would train foresters who could help develop Australia's forests for economic growth and, to a lesser degree, to protect forests for climate control.³³ Norman Jolly, then the forestry lecturer at the University of Adelaide, first introduced the possibility of creating a national forestry school at the 1911 Inter-State Conference on Forestry.³⁴ Conference attendees at the First Inter-State conference agreed that Australia needed a higher quality system of forestry education. But the somewhat grand ideals of state fellowship became bogged down in a myriad of problems: who would pay for this school, where would it be situated, who would teach, who would study at it and what would be taught there?

Australia had two state forestry schools in 1916. Creswick Forestry School in Victoria opened in 1910 and aimed at training 'practical' forestry rangers, not 'theoretical' forestry officers.³⁵ This School supplied the bulk of forest rangers and officers that worked for the Government of Victoria. The University of Adelaide provided a more theoretical and research oriented forestry education. In 1911 the University of Adelaide funded a lecturer of forestry who helped educate the majority of foresters for South Australia and many of the other states.³⁶ Lane Poole and Hutchins believed that neither of the schools provided adequate resources for the development of a national forestry school. D.E. Hutchins bluntly told Australians: 'neither Adelaide nor Creswick have it in their power, at present, to impart a first-rate forest training'.³⁷

Lane Poole and Hutchins sought to re-create the empire forestry model of forestry education in Australia. But their vision of education was not a wholly new revelation to Australian foresters: a number of professionally foresters lived in Australia when Lane Poole arrived in 1916. Many leading Australian foresters, such as J.G. Roger, H.H. Corbin and S.E. Kessell, studied forestry at Oxford before and after World War I. The Rhodes Scholarship provided the funding for a number of leading Australian foresters to study forestry at Oxford.³⁸ Roy Lister Robinson (who stayed in England, was knighted, and headed the British Forestry Commission), J.H. Chinner and Norman Jolly all studied forestry at Oxford with the help of the Rhodes Scholarship. Jolly proved to be Lane Poole's closest ally throughout Lane Poole's time in Australia. Jolly studied forestry at Oxford University and had worked as a forester for two years in Burma before coming back to Australia to work in a variety of key positions.³⁹ While many of these



FIGURE 1. University of Adelaide Archives, Prince of Wales Building, University of Adelaide – 1901.

professional foresters helped Lane Poole, an equal number of them disagreed with many of his ideas, especially his overtly national and imperial ones.

The issue of how forestry education could lead to national and imperial forestry policies was also a subject of discussion for foresters and colonial officials throughout the rest of the British Empire. Following World War I, the British Government created the British Forestry Commission to inquire into ways to create an imperial surplus of timber in case of future wars or economic hardships.⁴⁰ The Forestry Commission began holding Empire Forestry Conferences in 1920.⁴¹ Although the officials and foresters who attended the conference did not hold the same opinions on forestry conservation and education, at the end of the conferences the attendees voted on resolutions and produced a single opinion on a subject that was then printed and distributed around the Empire. Lane Poole attended the 1920 conference on behalf of the Western Australian Government. One of the suggestions made at the conference was for the creation of an imperial forestry centre at Oxford, an idea that Lane Poole supported.⁴² The conference would lead to future meetings of foresters, but Lane Poole had to go back to work in Western Australia, far away from his colleagues who agreed with his imperial beliefs.

Lane Poole continued trying to push through his forestry reforms in Western Australia to centralise the forests into the hands of the Forest Department during the early 1920s. But he sought to push political and economic elites too quickly. A variety of economic, political and cultural conditions worked against Lane Poole's plans.⁴³ Finally Lane Poole quit his job in 1922 in a fit of anger after seeing the Forest Department's plans to reserve and manage the forests in Western Australia continually disregarded.⁴⁴ He quickly garnered the attention and employment of the Territories Administration for the Commonwealth Government, which eagerly tried to stake an economic claim to its new League of Nations Mandate, New Guinea, to stave off perceived Japanese encroachment from the north.⁴⁵ He set off to the north and northeast part of the Mandated Territory of New Guinea, the island of New Ireland, the northern tip of the island of New Britain and south-eastern Papua near Port Moresby and Kikori to write a report on the forest resources and the possibility of setting up a forestry programme for the Commonwealth Government. Two and a half years later, Lane Poole wrote his report about the forest resources of the islands and the best way of managing them.⁴⁶

In 1924, after his return from the islands, the Commonwealth Government acted on the advice of the National Senator from Western Australia, Walter Kingsmill, and appointed Lane Poole to the newly created position of Forestry Advisor for the Commonwealth Government because of his work in Papua and New Guinea, his support of the Commonwealth Government and his standing among influential empire foresters outside of Australia.⁴⁷ With this position, Lane Poole helped lobby the Home and Territory Minister George Pierce to promise to find Commonwealth finances to pay for a national forestry school, with the location and oversight being undetermined.⁴⁸ He also set out to write a report about the condition of Australian forestry. In February 1925, Lane Poole submitted a report on forestry to the Commonwealth Government. In the report he criticised the inability of the states to create a forestry school in Australia and suggested that only the Commonwealth could create the school: 'Cooperation between the Governments of Australia has failed, and the remedy lies now with the Federal Government'.⁴⁹ He suggested that the school should not be located at a university, and instead a new institution should be created.⁵⁰ He warned against state jealousy and argued that, 'there is only room for one good school in Australia'.⁵¹ The report did not directly discuss the expansion of the federal oversight into state issues, but he suggested that the states consult with the forestry advisor for advice.⁵² The door to federal forestry was conveniently left ajar.

The Prime Minister, Stanley Bruce, agreed openly to support Lane Poole's plan after the publication of Lane Poole's report. The Bruce Government used forestry as a means to expand the Commonwealth's powers over the states and to integrate Australia within the larger British Empire for trade and defence and

emigration by linking ‘men, money, and markets’, as in Bruce’s famous slogan.⁵³ Scientific and industrial development was high on national and imperial economic agendas during the 1920s.⁵⁴ Bruce himself emphasised the importance of science in his first speech as Prime Minister, and throughout his campaigns he stressed the importance of forestry for the national and imperial economy.⁵⁵ During his tenure Bruce brought in imperial scientists to testify on the consequences of possible changes in national scientific research programmes.⁵⁶ Forestry was one of the many areas of industry that Bruce wanted to place under the scrutiny of state scientists.

The Bruce Government also sought to create a department to oversee the Commonwealth’s forests and Forestry School. Bruce told an election audience at Dandengong in 1925:

Recognising the importance of Forestry to Australia, the Government has established a Commonwealth Forestry School for the training of foresters. It also proposes to establish a Forestry Bureau to advise and assist the state Governments in matters relating to the development and utilisation of timber resources.⁵⁷

The Commonwealth Forestry Bureau would oversee the running of the School, conduct national forestry research for economic and industrial development as well as advise states on forestry subjects if necessary.⁵⁸ Lane Poole presided over the head of the Forestry Bureau since the government had, upon his return, appointed him as the Commonwealth Forestry Advisor.

With his newfound position, Lane Poole pushed for the creation of a Commonwealth Forestry School at Canberra. Canberra was Lane Poole’s favourite location for the Forestry School. It had a variety of forests within a day’s drive. He could also control a Commonwealth School in Canberra better than one in Adelaide or Melbourne. But this ideal had to wait. The government researched the possible costs of building and running the Forestry School before it made a final decision. The Forestry School resided temporarily at the University of Adelaide. During this time, the Australian Inter-Universities Conference and South Australian newspapers sought to persuade the Commonwealth Government to keep the School at Adelaide.⁵⁹ But South Australia’s lobbying never paid off. On 9 May 1925, Prime Minister Bruce officially announced that the Australian Forestry School would be established in the Federal Territory at Canberra, not at Adelaide University.⁶⁰ Syndicated newspapers around Australia wrote that, ‘The decision to establish a National Forestry School at Canberra under Federal auspices had met with general approval’.⁶¹ The London based *Empire Forestry Review* praised the School as ‘one of the most significant and promising events in the recent history of Empire silviculture’.⁶² It seemed that the Federal School at Canberra was a popular success at home and abroad.

THE GREAT DEBATE ABOUT THE AUSTRALIAN FORESTRY SCHOOL

Bruce's glowing statement came as a shock 'without warning' to many foresters and politicians, because Bruce had not discussed it with them.⁶³ A variety of states rebelled against the proposed plan. South Australians denied fervently that his decision was popular. Adelaide proponents argued that putting the Australian Forestry School at a technical university devoid of humanities and science faculties was detrimental to the education of foresters. Sir Douglas Mawson, a Lecturer in Forestry at Adelaide University, argued that universities offered a better home than technical colleges for foresters to develop character, learn sports, and debate.⁶⁴ Some argued against the proposed School because they believed that Australia needed more forests, not foresters.⁶⁵ Others found a more insidious reason for the placement at Canberra. Samuel Dixon, an environmental scientist and leading proponent of national parks from South Australia, believed that Lane Poole manipulated the press by helping to distribute the fallacious idea that Bruce's proposal 'met general approval'. He also thought, like other South Australians, that Canberra offered a worse environment for the Australian Forestry School than Adelaide:

The Prime Minister's announcement that the proposed National Forestry Board at Canberra meets with general approval is certainly surprising. The originator of the idea appears to have been Mr. Lane Poole, whose supercilious, ill-founded objection to the Adelaide school was that South Australia had no forests... The bleak, cold situation and scanty rainfall of the federal capital does not at all fit it for teaching forestry...⁶⁶

South Australia held out longer than any other state, not sending forestry students until right before the School opened.⁶⁷

Queensland initially offered resistance because it had already installed a plan to send foresters to Oxford University.⁶⁸ Yet Queensland's plan met criticism from many foresters, even some who had trained at Oxford. In 1916 Hutchins had argued that Australian foresters needed to study in sub-tropical climates, such as Australia or South Africa, not in Europe.⁶⁹ Australian foresters continued this argument. Stephen E. Kessell, the Inspector of Forests for Western Australia and a graduate of Oxford University discounted the idea that Oxford University would provide an ideal centre for an Australian foresters education: 'Referring to the Queensland proposal to send men to Oxford for training in forestry' he argued: 'it would provide a leavening of skilled men, but it would produce a larger number of half trained men'.⁷⁰ The different environmental conditions and the distance of England made it an expensive and less beneficial method of education than creating an Australian Forestry School. Because the Commonwealth paid for all students sent to the Australian Forestry School, and

the Queensland Government paid for any students sent to Oxford, Queensland eventually quit their plan and started sending students to Canberra.⁷¹

Victoria, which had formerly supported the creation of the Australian Forestry School, criticised the plan because the Government argued that it already had a plan in place to educate foresters at Creswick and Melbourne University.⁷² Victoria was also wary of the expanding Commonwealth Government, which was moving its capital from Melbourne to Canberra. Prime Minister Bruce, himself a Victorian, laboured to alleviate any fear that the Commonwealth might shut down Creswick. He explained in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 'It was not intended that this school should supplant existing schools under the control of State Forestry Departments'.⁷³ Many Victorian foresters who studied at Creswick criticised the Australian Forestry School for being overly theoretical for the needs of Australia. But Bruce subtly argued that Australian forestry demanded professional and general foresters: 'Firstly the specialised training that was necessary to equip an expert technical forester and secondly, the general training for every member of the service'.⁷⁴ The Government of Victoria finally decided to send its students after receiving assurances that the Commonwealth Government had no intention of trying to close Creswick.⁷⁵

A NATIONAL AND IMPERIAL SCHOOL

The Australian Forestry School opened in April of 1927, shortly before Canberra opened as the official Australian capital. When the students arrived, they stepped into a School that was designed with national aspirations in mind. Lane Poole and Jolly decided to construct the School wholly out of Australian timbers.⁷⁶ The use of Australian timber presaged the construction of the Imperial Forestry Institute building at Oxford University in 1950, which was built with timbers from all around the Empire.⁷⁷ The flooring at the School included jarrah, Victorian mountain ash, spotted gum, teak, blackbutt, giganitis, Tasmanian myrtle, cyprus pine, and tallow wood. The doors were made of maple and Victorian ash. The panelling was cedar, Queensland walnut, maple, and blackwood. The blackboards were made from red cedar (Figure 2).⁷⁸

The School would also be part of a larger imperial network of forestry. Bruce inaugurated the Australian Forestry School at Canberra in 1928 by telling a crowd about the forthcoming Empire Forestry Conference:

The Empire Forestry Association, which had held its first meeting in London, and its second in Canada, will hold its third meeting in Australia next year. It was a good thing that Australia would be able to offer hospitality to those engaged in the consideration of imperial forestry matters. Forestry was an imperial matter as well worthy of that great name.⁷⁹



FIGURE 2. NAA A3560 #3743, Entrance Hall to the Australian Forestry School
– 1927.

Those who supported the School agreed with his imperial sentiment: the pro-Commonwealth crowd in the dusty, small town responded warmly to the lecture, proclaiming: 'Hear, hear'.⁸⁰

Bruce, Lane Poole and Pierce continued to argue that the Commonwealth could best manage Australia's forests. A 1926 *Melbourne Argus* article that quoted the Commonwealth Minister for Home and Territories, Senator George Pierce, mirrored these earlier arguments: '...he [Pierce] considered that forestry was necessarily a Federal responsibility, or that at least it should come more within the Federal sphere'.⁸¹ A Royal Commission on the Constitution of the Commonwealth in Canberra in 1927 also confirms that leading Commonwealth foresters and officials wanted to gradually expand the powers of the Commonwealth to encompass the possession and management of state forests.⁸² The Commission conveniently opened up an inquiry into the possibility of transferring forestry lands from the states to the Commonwealth.⁸³ The Commonwealth could only gain from such a question, and the states could only hold their ground or lose it. Lane Poole offered his usually colourful opinion about the failure of the states to create adequate forestry programmes: 'Summing up the situation regarding the states, it may, I think, be said that democracy has signally failed in the matter of forestry'.⁸⁴ But Lane Poole braved his opinion alone. Other state foresters disagreed with this interpretation, arguing that the Commonwealth might help finance state projects, but the management should come from the states, not the Commonwealth. In the end, the Commission did not comment upon the forestry questions, although it suggested that the Commonwealth should extend its powers where federal policy seemed necessary.⁸⁵ Lane Poole wanted a national forestry policy, but Australian foresters – professional and lay – wanted to maintain strong state control. Lane Poole then turned to the Empire for the support of his plans.

Lane Poole and the visiting foresters at the Third Empire Forestry Conference in 1928 wanted to link together Australia to the British Empire through the School. Conference attendees decided to endow money to award a gold William Schlich award yearly to the Australian forester with the highest test scores to remember the famous Inspector-General of Forests in India and professor of forestry at Cooper's Hill and Oxford University.⁸⁶ They also sought to increase the connection between Australia and the Imperial Forestry Institute at Oxford, a school that educated foresters throughout the British Empire.⁸⁷ Foresters at the Third Conference suggested 'that the lecturers [at the Australian Forestry School] should... [take]... a refresher course at the Imperial Forestry Institute thereby keeping themselves informed of the developments of forestry practice'.⁸⁸ Non-Australian empire foresters suggested that Australia follow other British colonies and import trained foresters, such as Western Australia did with Lane Poole: 'For the time being, the importation of qualified men should not be ruled out...'⁸⁹

Lane Poole felt that it was important to instil a sense of national and imperial esprit de corps among foresters at the Australian Forestry School as well as throughout the Empire. He hoped to do so through the Empire Forestry Conference. An author in the *Australian Forestry Journal* praised the value of these meetings: 'In meeting foresters hailing from every part of our mighty Empire, the students were singularly fortunate, and the lasting value of such contact, lies just in the direction of stimulating *esprit de corps*'.⁹⁰ 'Esprit de corps' essentially amounted to a professional and personal link between foresters of a similar educational background. Sports were considered an important part of this process. Caused in part by fears of industrial decline, Baden-Powell and Matthew Arnold, among other cultural icons, stressed the need for boys and young men to play vigorous sports amongst each other as a way to build masculinity and friendships.⁹¹ Lane Poole explained to the students at the Australian Forestry School the tradition of the Cooper's Hill Cup, a tennis match that existed between the foresters at Cooper's Hill, before introducing it as a regular event between foresters in the School to tighten the imperial bond between the Australian Forestry School and the British Empire. The *Australian Forestry Journal* noted how Lane Poole: 'stressed the importance of the link with the old School at Cooper's Hill, the



FIGURE 3. A2087/1 #21, Esprit de Corps of the Australian Forestry School Students – 1927.

great traditions of which might well serve the students of the youngest Forestry School in the Empire as a model and an inspiration'.⁹²

'Professionalisation' was an equally important aspect of the international identity of British imperial foresters. For a job to become a profession meant that to do the job, one needed special training, certification, and approval of a group of experts. Law, medicine and science became professions that commanded immense economic, social and political power in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries throughout the British world.⁹³ In this vein, Lane Poole and some empire foresters tried to make sure that the Australian Forestry School in Canberra was the only 'legitimate' and thus 'professional' forestry school in Australia. Many imperial foresters outside of Australia supported Lane Poole's attempt to make the Australian Forestry School the only 'professional' school by passing a resolution: 'That the higher training of Australian forest officers be recognised for the Canberra School only, and the training of overseers, foreman, and similar grades as a matter for each state'.⁹⁴ The conference also sought to close down all other Australian forestry schools, including Creswick, a point that angered many foresters in Victoria who had once been assured that Creswick would remain open: 'We are, therefore, unanimously of the opinion that one of the existing schools should be abolished and the resources of both concentrated at one centre'.⁹⁵

THE TROUBLES OF THE 1930S

On one hand, the Australian Forestry School seemed like a success in 1928 because of the support it earned from the leadership of the Nationalist-Country Government, the positive resolutions at the Third Empire Forestry Conference that supported it, and the continual influx of students from the states. At the Inter-University Conference that same year Victoria, Western Australia, South Australia and Queensland officially allowed for the creation of a four-year programme – two at a state university and then two at the Australian Forestry School.⁹⁶ On the other hand, the School continued to face strong criticism from foresters and newspapers in Victoria, the state with the most developed forestry programme. In early November 1929, the Government of Victoria threatened to create a lectureship in forestry at Melbourne University that would replace the Australian Forestry School, in blatant disregard for the findings at the Third Empire Forestry Conference.⁹⁷ In response to Victoria's threat, the newly elected Prime Minister James Scullin supported the Australian Forestry School by reminding Victorians: 'The Empire Forestry Conference was of opinion that there was room for only one school'.⁹⁸ Even with this support, the success of the Australian Forestry School was by no means guaranteed.

The 1930s witnessed a slow decline in enrolments and financial support of the Canberra School, revived criticism from New South Wales and Victoria and

the creation of an antagonistic society of foresters. The global economic depression almost threatened to close the School and the Commonwealth Forestry Bureau, handicapping the School's growth.⁹⁹ The financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the states during the 1930s continued to lead to political tensions. Critics of the Commonwealth characterised it as 'a foreign government seeking to impose its will...' and many states were characterised as acting under the assumption: 'when in doubt, blame the Commonwealth'.¹⁰⁰

Victoria's foresters continued to criticise the Canberra School for its overly theoretical brand of forestry. The Government of Victoria finally quit sending its forestry students to the Australian Forestry School in 1930, creating the first major fracture in the Commonwealth's hegemony of national forestry education.¹⁰¹ Jolly disagreed with these sentiments: 'in most other countries...forestry was regarded as an important profession' that deserved more respect.¹⁰² The Commonwealth Government continued to support the School. The Commonwealth Minister for Affairs attacked the longstanding argument that theory precluded practice, declaring that, 'the fallacy that academic training could not be practical still existed in many quarters'.¹⁰³

The depression and attacks from Victoria almost led to a disaster for the School. While the depression raged, state and Commonwealth officials sought retrenchment in the government. The Commonwealth Auditor General and the Public Service Board condemned the School's high costs and suggested that it failed to achieve its intended economic stimulation.¹⁰⁴ The Commonwealth Government chose to ask the Premiers at the Premiers Conference of 1931 whether or not to close or maintain the School. Perhaps the School might close? The Premiers from Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales all supported keeping the School open.¹⁰⁵ The School was saved from closure for the first time.

Empire foresters from outside of Australia continued to support the Australian Forestry School. Richard St. Barbe Baker, a British forester in Kenya and the later creator of the Men of Trees society visited the Canberra campus in June 1931 to give a speech about global deforestation. To solve the problem of deforestation in Australia he told the audience, 'you must have highly trained foresters'. But Australians, he felt, did not support the necessary institutions that produced these foresters: 'You have the facilities for training such men at the Australian Forestry School at Canberra. I cannot help but feel that this valuable training ground for future foresters is not being given the support it deserves'.¹⁰⁶ Lane Poole's friends in the Empire continued to give him support, but it was the states that decided to send students and the Commonwealth Government that paid for the School. Moral support from lone empire foresters could not help the School to succeed.

After the Premiers saved the school, it maintained its enrolments. By 1934 New South Wales sent fourteen students to the School, South Australia four, Queensland 17, Victoria six, Western Australia ten and Tasmania four.¹⁰⁷ But

the numbers proved deceptive, showing the birthplace of a student, but not where they were nominated from. Some students signed up themselves and were accepted. Seven of the New South Wales students came from outside of the state because they were not nominated. Two Victorians joined the School under similar circumstances.¹⁰⁸ Queensland maintained the most consistent relationship with the School, South Australia the least continuous and Victoria the most turbulent.

1935 witnessed another cleavage between national and state forestry education. Victoria finally broke entirely from the recommendations of the Third Empire Forestry Conference when in October 1935 the Government of Victoria announced that it would grant its own diploma of forestry at Melbourne University.¹⁰⁹ In objecting to Canberra, the *Melbourne Herald* criticised Canberra's elite scientific education of officers: 'Canberra specialised in the training of officials, or officers trained for well-paid positions...'¹¹⁰ In contrast to Canberra, Victorian foresters argued Melbourne University and Creswick offered more 'practical' degrees, 'aimed at training intelligent, well informed practical foresters'.¹¹¹ Commonwealth supporters still utilised the report of the Forestry Conference.¹¹² Senator Sir George Pierce, an initial supporter of Lane Poole's Australian Forestry School, 'vigorously condemned the state jealousy and non-cooperation...'¹¹³

That same year Australian Forestry School graduates formed Australia's first society of professional foresters. In 1935 some graduates of the school created the Institute of Foresters of Australia and barred membership to anyone who did not graduate with a Bachelor of Science degree or forestry diploma, creating an atmosphere of tension between 'professional' foresters and 'non-professional' foresters, such as woodcutters, that lasted until the 1970s.¹¹⁴ The Institute of Foresters of Australia helped solidify an inchoate professional identity of 'Australian' foresters that began with the 1911 Inter-State Forestry Conference. It published an influential journal of forestry, *Australian Forestry*, which featured the publications of foresters who supported national education, such as Lane Poole and Norman Jolly, throughout the 1930s.

As soon as Victoria quit sending students to the Australian Forestry School, New South Wales followed suit and stopped sending students in 1936. In 1937, only South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania sent students and the School enrolled five students, less than its average of 7.4.¹¹⁵ Questions about the continuation of the School arose, but the Commonwealth Government assured that it would open if the states provided the students.¹¹⁶ The Australian Forestry School almost closed its doors after graduating 63 students. The Institute of Foresters of Australia tried to intervene with Victoria and New South Wales to keep the School open. The Institute helped prompt the Premiers of Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania to support the Forestry School, largely because their states did not have the funding themselves to support their own forestry schools.¹¹⁷ But New South Wales disliked the 'academic' forestry programme at

Canberra and favoured creating a school that would 'lend itself to an economic mobilisation' of forestry.¹¹⁸ The School remained open – just barely – but other states also offered differing visions of forestry education and were willing to pay for it themselves.

The refusal of New South Wales to send students to Canberra frustrated Lane Poole and led him to contact the New South Wales Premier, Alexander Mair, directly. Lane Poole believed that E.H.F. Swain, the Commissioner of Forests in New South Wales, was attempting to undercut the foundations of the School. Swain had always disagreed with Poole's overly theoretical and elitist forestry education, and he instead sought to make forestry pay woodsmen as well as professional foresters.¹¹⁹ Swain sought to create a system of Australian forestry education and economics free from British or European influence.¹²⁰ In response, Lane Poole created a large file critically examining Swain's career and writings, identifying his close ties to timber companies, his lack of technical training and his inconsistencies of testimony. Lane Poole sent this file with a letter to Mair in which he bluntly told Mair that 'E.H.F. Swain is the *one person* primarily responsible for the possibility of the temporary closing of the Australian Forestry School'.¹²¹ He also laid out his personal feelings about the reasons behind the failings of the School:

The School...has not been a success, and its ambitions have brought it into conflict with some of the State Forest Services which complain of its efforts to proselytize State trainees towards Forestry unification, and to teach State trainees an academic English estate forestry which is the antithesis for instance of the modern forest development policy of New South Wales, whose basis and background are economics'¹²²

But the letters did not change the opinion of Mair or the New South Wales Government, which continued to refrain from sending students to the School until 1941.

With competing models of education in Victoria and New South Wales that directly opposed the imperial and pro-Commonwealth School, Lane Poole's plans for creating *the* National Forestry School of Australia had failed. Lane Poole's assessment for the failings in the letter to Mair proved correct: the states rejected the policy of the School because it sought to inculcate an elitist, national and imperial professional identity among foresters, which might lead them to eventually push for a single Commonwealth-led national forestry policy. But he failed to mention another reason for the School's failures: his strong personality made him as many enemies as it did friends.

WORLD WAR II AND ITS AFTERMATH

After World War II the Australian Forestry School maintained its national and imperial affiliations and also became increasingly global in perspective. World War II and its consequences changed Australia's political and cultural relationship with Great Britain. The fall of Singapore, and Churchill's admitted inability to protect the British Empire's Pacific interests without America, helped prompt Australia's swing towards America and away from Britain.¹²³ The School barely remained open for World War II, and the limited amount of students who studied left promptly to fight in the war after graduating. After the war ended in 1945 the School began functioning regularly again, and its graduates took jobs back in forestry. That same year Lane Poole retired, marking the end to the first era of the Australian Forestry School. Lane Poole was the last leading forester in Australia to have been born in Great Britain. Maxwell Jacobs, an Australian forester educated at the University of Adelaide, Oxford University, *Forstliche Hochschule Tharandt* in Germany and Yale, became the new Principal of the Canberra School. He integrated the Australian Forestry School with Australia's Pacific and Indian Ocean neighbours, helped push forward Lane Poole's



FIGURE 4. A5823/1 #A1, Third Empire Forestry Conference Group Picture – 1928.

nationalist ideals, while still remaining outwardly loyal to the British Empire through the Empire Forestry Conferences.¹²⁴

Lane Poole's professional elitism made a lasting impression upon the identity of professional foresters in Australia that lived on for years after his retirement and Australia's drift away from the British Empire. The embrace of the Empire slowly began to weaken in regards to economics, science and identity in Australia during the 1950s through the 1970s.¹²⁵ Post-War identities of foresters – professional or otherwise – became primarily state or national, not imperial.¹²⁶ Yet the elitist traditions that Lane Poole instilled remained strong among Australian Forestry School graduates until the School merged with the Australian National University in 1965. John Dargavel notes how the graduates from the Australian Forestry School continued to hold 'conformist and rightist set of beliefs and values which were to prove remarkably resistant to change' well into the 1970s.¹²⁷ 'Bush' foresters and non-professional foresters remained resistant of the Canberra graduates. One logger, Steve Williams, was quoted, 'A lot of those new foresters come from Canberra and they have it drilled into them over there that the average bushman is ruining the forests...When they come out here, they get officious...'¹²⁸

The vision that Lane Poole and other empire foresters had for the future Australian Forestry School did not categorically fail or succeed. The goal to make the School at Canberra the only forestry school in Australia had failed. The Australian Forestry School was just one of a number of other Australian colleges and universities that taught forestry after World War II. But the Australian Forestry School did remain the elite institution for forestry education in Australia. Many Australian Forestry School graduates bridged inveterate state divisions between 1927–1945 because Lane Poole succeeded in inculcating a professional identity based upon national and imperial associations. Yet this national and professional identity came at a cost – many foresters, politicians, and woodsmen throughout Australia well into the 1970s disliked the School, its graduates and most especially, Lane Poole.

The Australian resistance to British imperial forestry educational methods in the 1910s–1940s reveals that the controversy surrounding the elitist empire forestry model resonated just as loudly in a democratic, white dominion as it did in British India, Africa or Southeast Asia. In fact, studying the resistance to colonial forestry systems in the settler colonies of the British Empire offers new possibilities for understanding colonial conservationism that are not as easily possible in many of the formal colonies of the British Empire. Australia, a fiercely democratic society, offers a different and new case study to examine a variety of resistances to the elitism of colonial forestry programmes. The people and political parties that fought against empire forestry policies in Australia were able to more freely and loudly voice their concerns through legitimate national medias and politics than in India or Africa, where democratic criticism against British rule was less acceptable. But in the end, the growth of colonial

conservation during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century – whether in the white or non-white colonies of the British Empire – was often a process of erratic growth characterised by adaptation, resilience, and often, as in the case of the Australian Forestry School, near failure.

NOTES

I would like to thank Gregory Barton and Bruce Hunt for reading multiple drafts of this article. The two blind reviewers and the editor of *Environment and History*, Georgina Endfield, provided much valuable advice about style, argument, and sources. This paper has also benefited from the comments from panelists and participants in the First British Scholar Conference and the 2008 Pacific Conference for British Studies. I must also thank John Dargavel – who I have not met, but am grateful towards – for making much of the source material available on the National Archives of Australia website and on the *Uncommon Lives* website: <http://uncommonlives.naa.gov.au/>. Unfortunately this article was accepted for publication before Dargavel's biography of Charles Lane Poole, *The Zealous Conservator: A Life of Charles Lane Poole*, and his co-authored article on forestry education in Australia and New Zealand in the November, 2008 issue of *Environment and History* were published. Consequently, my endnotes omit these important publications. Any mistakes are entirely my own.

¹ H.L. Harris, *Australia's National Interests and National Policy* (Melbourne, 1938), 3.

² L.T. Carron, *A Brief History of the Australian Forestry School* (Canberra, 2000).

³ The most detailed discussion of the history of the Australian Forestry School is L.T. Carron, *A History of Forestry in Australia* (Canberra, 1985), 258–70. Carron provides an ample analysis of the national origins of the Forestry School, but he misses the imperial context of the School because the book looks at forestry from a national and state perspective.

⁴ *50 Years of Forestry in Western Australia* (Perth, 1969); N.B. Lewis, *A Hundred Years of State Forestry: South Australia, 1875–1975* (Adelaide, 1975); T.C. Grant, *History of Forestry in New South Wales 1788–1988* (Erskineville, NSW, 1989); Peter Taylor, *Growing Up: Forestry in Queensland* (Brisbane, 1997). Also see J.M. Powell, 'Historical Geography and Environmental History: An Australian Interface', *Journal of Historical Geography* 22 (1996): 253–73, 263.

⁵ A brief listing of Australian environmental history with global connections include: Ian Tyrrell, *True Gardens of the Gods: Californian-Australian Environmental Reform, 1860–1930* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1999); Ian Tyrrell, 'Acclimatisation and Environmental "Renovation": Australian Perspectives on George Perkins Marsh', *Environment and History* 10 (2004): 153–67; Thomas Dunlap, *Nature and the English Diaspora: Environment and History in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand* (New York, 1999); Thomas Dunlap, 'Australian Nature, European culture: Anglo Settlers in Australia', *Environmental History Review* 17 (1993): 25–48; Stephen Pyne, *Burning Bush: A Fire History of Australia* (New York, 1991).

⁶ Two other authors have briefly discussed the School in books that take a more global approach to Australian environmental history. See J.M Powell, *An Historical Geography of Modern Australia: The Restive Fringe* (Cambridge, 1989), 168–9; John Dargavel, *Fashioning Australia's Forests* (Melbourne, 1995), 73–4. Although Powell and Dargavel frame Australian environmental history in a global context, they still discuss the Australian Forestry School within a national perspective.

⁷ This article uses the term 'empire forestry' to describe the spread of state forestry laws and scientific forestry conservancy throughout the British Empire beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. See Gregory Barton, *Empire Forestry and the Origins of Environmentalism* (Cambridge, 2001). The usage of 'empire forestry' originated at the Empire Forestry Conferences, first started in 1920 in London. See *First Empire Forestry Conference* (Perth, 1921).

⁸ Barton, *Empire Forestry*, Ch. 4, 'Environmental Innovation in British India', 62–93.

⁹ Ravi Rajan, *Modernizing Nature: Forestry and Imperial Eco-Development, 1800–1950* (Oxford, 2006), 56–107.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 35–54.

¹¹ R.S. Troup, 'Sir William Schlich', ed. J.R.H. Weaver, *Dictionary of National Biography 1922–1930* (Oxford, 1937): 751–2.

¹² For a discussion of the French Forest Ordinance from the perspective of a British forester, see John Croumbie Brown, *French Forest Ordinance of 1669 with Historical Sketch of Previous Treatment of Forests in France* (Edinburgh, 1883). Also see J.L. Reed, *Forests of France* (London, 1954) for a wider treatment of forestry education at Nancy; and S. Pincetl, 'Some Origins of French Environmentalism: An Exploration', *Forest and Conservation History* 37 (1993): 80–89.

¹³ James Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, 1998), Ch. 1, 'Nature and Space', 11–52.

¹⁴ For an analysis of the divergences of forestry policy in Southeast Asia, see Peter Vandergeest and Nancy Lee Peluso, 'Empires of Forestry: Professional Forestry and State Power in Southeast Asia, Part 1', *Environment and History* 12 (2006): 31–64; Peter Vandergeest and Nancy Lee Peluso, 'Empires of Forestry: Professional Forestry and State Power in Southeast Asia, Part 2', *Environment and History* 12 (2006): 359–93.

¹⁵ On the theme of resistance, see William Beinart and Lotte Hughes, *Environment and Empire* (Oxford, 2007), Ch. 16, 'Resistance to Colonial Conservation and Resource Management', 269–88.

¹⁶ There is a vast amount of scholarship examining resistance to British Indian forestry laws. A few salient examples include: Raymond Bryant, *The Greening of Burma: The Political Ecology of Forestry in Burma* (Honolulu, 1997), 43–156; and Ramachandra Guha, 'Forestry and Social Protest in British Kumaun, c. 1893–1921', *Subaltern Studies* 4 (1983): 54–100.

¹⁷ Richard H. Grove and Toyin Falola, 'Chiefs, Boundaries, and Sacred Woodlands: Early Nationalism and the Defeat of Colonial Conservationism in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, 1870–1916', *African Economic History* 24 (1996): 1–23.

¹⁸ A. Joshua West, 'Forests and National Security: British and American Forestry Policy in the Wake of World War I', *Environmental History* 8 (2003): 270–94.

¹⁹ See 'Facilities to Forest Officers for Studying Abroad, and Training of Young Men for Forest Officers', in Charles Bagot Phillimore (ed.), *Accounts and Papers: Thirty Seven Volumes (No. 16) East India – Forest Conservancy – Session 9 February to 21 August 1871, Selection of Dispatches and Their Enclosures to and from the Secretary of State for India in Council on Forest Conservancy in India, Showing the Measures which have been adopted, and the Operations which are going on in the several Presidencies and Lieutenant Governorships, from the 21st May 1862 Part I* (London, 1871): 314–432.

²⁰ For one of many debates between foresters in India and Great Britain, see 'The Journal of Forestry and Estates Management', *Indian Forester* 7 (1882): 333–336.

²¹ See *East India (Forest Service) Correspondence Relating to the Training of Forestry Students: Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of His Majesty* (London, 1905).

²² Geographic interpretations of Australia's history are a subject of historical debate. For an overview of the historiography before 1980, see Ronald Lawson, 'Towards Demythologizing the 'Australian Legend': Turner's Frontier Thesis and the Australian Experience', *Journal of Social History* 13 (1980): 577–87; also see Deborah Bird Rose and Richard Davis, *Dislocating the Frontier: Essaying the Mystique of the Outback* (Canberra E-Press, 2006), http://epress.anu.edu.au/df/mobile_devices/index.html.

²³ See Beinart and Hughes, *Environment and Empire*, Ch. 6, 'Sheep, Pastures, and Demography in Australia', 93–111.

²⁴ Powell, *An Historical Geography of Modern Australia*, 14–18. For an economic analysis of the ideal of agriculture, see W.A. Sinclair, *The Process of Economic Development in Australia* (Melbourne, 1976), 175–81; also see P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism 1688–2000* (London, 2001), 496–497.

²⁵ M.J. Detmold, *The Australian Commonwealth: A Fundamental Analysis of its Constitution* (Sydney, 1985); J.B. Hirst, *The Sentimental Nation: The Making of the Australian Commonwealth* (Melbourne, 2001).

²⁶ For New South Wales, see Carron, *A History of Forestry in Australia*, 1–10. For Victoria, see S.M. Legg, 'Debating Forestry: An Historical Geography of Forestry Policy in Victoria and South Australia, 1870 to 1939' (PhD thesis, Monash University, 1995). I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for this citation.

²⁷ Dargavel, *Fashioning Australia's Forests*, 60–76.

²⁸ For a description of Hutchins's influence on forestry programmes throughout the British Empire, see Barton, *Empire Forestry*, 102–128.

For Hutchins's specific recommendations for Australia, see D.E. Hutchins, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry With Special Reference to Western Australia* (Perth, 1916).

²⁹ Hutchins, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry*, 140.

³⁰ For brief biographical sketches of Lane Poole, see John Dargavel, 'From Exploitation to Science: Lane Poole's Forest Surveys of Papua and New Guinea, 1922–1924', *Historical Records of Australian Science* 17 (2006): 71–90, 72; and 'Charles Lane Poole in the transition from Empire' in Michael Calver (ed.), *Proceedings 6th National Conference of the Australian Forest History Society Inc* (Rotterdam, 2005): 65–74. Dargavel, the leading expert on Lane Poole, is in the process of writing a well-awaited biography of Lane Poole and his wife.

³¹ Hutchins, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry*, 195. Lane Poole sought a national policy and also agreed with Hutchins early recommendations; see Lane Poole's 'Preface' to *A Discussion of Australian Forestry*. The clearest expression of Lane Poole's belief in a national forestry policy came nine years later in C.E. Lane Poole, 'Federal Forestry Policy,' *Australian Forestry Journal* 8 (Aug. 1925), 284–97. But his earliest expressions of this sentiment were in 'A Forest Policy For Australia,' *Australian Forestry Journal* 2 (Oct. 1919): 306–11; 'A Forest Policy For Australia Part II,' *Australian Forestry Journal* 2 (Nov. 1919): 338–43; 'A Forest Policy For Australia Part III,' *Australian Forestry Journal* 2 (Dec. 1919): 372–6.

³² N.W. Jolly 'Education in Forestry and Forestry Research', in *Fourth Inter-State Forestry Conference* (Perth, 1918), 58–60.

³³ Powell, *An Historical Geography of Australia*, 160–68.

³⁴ N.W. Jolly 'Forestry Education in Australia', in Commonwealth Forestry Bureau (ed.), *Third Empire Forestry Conference* (Canberra, 1928): 677–82, 677.

³⁵ Lindsay Falvey and Barrie Bardsley, *Agricultural and Related Education in the Victorian Colleges and the University of Melbourne* (Melbourne, nd), <http://www.landfood.unimelb.edu.au/dean/book2/index.html>, Ch. 7.

³⁶ There is no article or encyclopedia entry about the Forestry School at the University of Adelaide. See Carron, *A History of Forestry in Australia*, 258–60. Also see Lewis, *A Hundred Years of State Forestry*.

³⁷ Hutchins, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry*, 284.

³⁸ For a more general discussion of the international influence of the Rhodes Scholarship, see ed. Lord Elton, *The First Fifty Years of the Rhodes Trust and the Rhodes Scholarships, 1903–1953* (Oxford, 1955); ed. Anthony Kenny, *The History of the Rhodes Trust 1902–1999* (Oxford, 2001).

³⁹ For a brief biography on Jolly, see N.B. Lewis, 'Jolly, Norman William (1882–1954)', in Bede Nairn and Geoffrey Serle (eds.), *Australian Dictionary of Biography Volume 9* (Melbourne, 1983): 504.

⁴⁰ West, 'Forests and National Security', 272–3.

⁴¹ J.M. Powell, "'Dominion over Palm and Pine": The British Empire Forestry Conference 1920–1947', *Journal of Historical Geography* 33 (2007): 852–77.

⁴² *First Empire Forestry Conference*, 125–129.

⁴³ Patricia Crawford and Ian Crawford, *Contested Country: A History of the Northcliffe Area, Western Australia* (Perth, 2003), 44–127.

⁴⁴ Forests Department, Western Australia, *Report 1921–22* (Perth, 1922).

⁴⁵ See 'Australia and the German Colonies in the Pacific during the First World War' and 'The Beginnings of the Mandates System of the League of Nations', in Wm. Roger Louis, *Ends of British Imperialism: The Scramble for Empire, Suez and Decolonization, Collected Essays* (London, 2006): 185–204; 251–279.

⁴⁶ Dargavel, 'From Exploitation to Science: Lane Poole's Forest Surveys of Papua and New Guinea, 1922–1924', 71–90.

⁴⁷ Dargavel, 'Charles Lane Poole in the transition from Empire', 70.

⁴⁸ N.W. Jolly 'Forestry Education in Australia', 677.

⁴⁹ C.E. Lane Poole, *Forestry Position in Australia, Report With Summary February 13th, 1925* (Melbourne, 1925), 7.

- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 10.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, 10–11.
- ⁵³ L.M. Cumpston, *Lord Bruce of Melbourne* (Melbourne, 1989), 40.
- ⁵⁴ See George Currie and John Graham, *The Origins of CSIRO: Science and the Commonwealth Government 1901–1926* (Melbourne, 1966), Chs. 6–7, 106–156.
- ⁵⁵ Alfred Stirling, *Lord Bruce: The London Years* (Melbourne, 1974), 232.
- ⁵⁶ For example, Bruce invited A.G. Gibson and Sir Frank Heath, two British-Indian scientists, to comment upon the re-structuring of the Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry. Gibson and Heath both agreed with Lane Poole’s proposal to centralise forestry and forestry products into one single division. See *Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry: Recommendations for the Reconsideration of the Institute, Parliamentary Paper Vol. 5* (Canberra, 1926); A.G. Gibson, *A Forest Products Laboratory for Australia, Pamphlet No. 9, Commonwealth Institute of Science and Industry* (Melbourne, 1928).
- ⁵⁷ C.E. Lane Poole, ‘The Commonwealth Forestry Bureau’, *Australian Forestry Journal* 10 (Mar. 1928), 3–7, 7.
- ⁵⁸ C. Lane Poole, ‘The Commonwealth Forestry Bureau’, *Australian Forestry* 2 (1937): 41–44.
- ⁵⁹ Sir Douglas Mawson, *University of Adelaide Commemoration Address 1925, Some Aspects of Forestry in South Australia* (Adelaide, 1925), 27.
- ⁶⁰ ‘National School: Training at Canberra’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 June 1925; ‘School of Forestry: Federal Proposal Welcomed’, *Melbourne Argus*, 2 June 1925.
- ⁶¹ ‘National Forestry School. Biggest Move Forward’, *The Western Australian*, 2 June 1925. A number of other syndicate newspapers printed the same words: ‘Training at Canberra’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2 June 1925; ‘School of Forestry: Federal Proposal Welcomed’, *Melbourne Argus*, 2 June 1925.
- ⁶² ‘Miscellanea’, *Empire Forestry Review* 4 (1925): 7–8, 7.
- ⁶³ Mawson, *University of Adelaide*, 28.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.
- ⁶⁵ ‘Foresters But No Forests’, *Adelaide Register*, 5 June 1925.
- ⁶⁶ Samuel Dixon, ‘National Forestry School’, *Adelaide Register*, 5 June 1925.
- ⁶⁷ C.E. Lane Poole, ‘The Australian Forestry School’, *Australian Forestry Journal* (Nov. 1928): 90–4.
- ⁶⁸ Lane Poole wrote a report about Swain and sent it to New South Wales and South Australian political leaders discussed later in this paper. See National Archives of Australia (hereafter NAA) 1975/142, 9.
- ⁶⁹ Hutchins, *A Discussion of Australian Forestry*, 139–40.
- ⁷⁰ ‘Queensland Proposal Discounted’, *Melbourne Argus*, 19 Aug. 1925.
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁷² Carron, *A History of Australian Forestry*, 210.
- ⁷³ ‘Federal Forestry School: Prime Minister’s Explanation’, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 16 June 1925.
- ⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

- ⁷⁵ 'Federal Forestry School: Victoria Sends Students', *Melbourne Argus*, 3 Mar. 1926.
- ⁷⁶ Memorandum for Mr. Courtney, Federal Capital Commission, 19 August 1926, from H.W. Ronald, NAA CP689/29, 340.
- ⁷⁷ Peder Anker, 'Ecological Communication at the Oxford Imperial Forestry Institute'. I thank Professor Anker for distributing an early draft of this paper to me. See Niklas Thode Jensen and Karen N. Oslund (eds.), *Colonialism, Postcolonialism, and the Environment* (forthcoming through the German Historical Institute in London).
- ⁷⁸ Lane Poole, 'The Commonwealth Forestry Bureau', 42.
- ⁷⁹ 'Opened at Canberra: Evils of Timber Destruction', *Melbourne Argus*, 25 Nov. 1927.
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁸¹ 'Teaching of Forestry: Federal Ministry's Duty', *Melbourne Argus*, 22 Feb. 1926.
- ⁸² The suggestion that the Commonwealth might expand its power to incorporate New South Wales forests was also raised in House of Representatives by Mr Manning to Prime Minister Bruce, *House of Representatives Australia* (Canberra, 1927), 5416.
- ⁸³ Royal Commission on the Constitution, *Report* (Canberra, 1929).
- ⁸⁴ Royal Commission on the Constitution of the Commonwealth, *Proceedings and Minutes of Evidence* (Canberra, 1929), 127–38, 129.
- ⁸⁵ Royal Commission on the Constitution, *Report*, 300–303.
- ⁸⁶ *Third Empire Forestry Conference* (Brisbane, 1928), 347.
- ⁸⁷ 'The Imperial Forestry Institute at Oxford', *Science* 60 (26 Sept. 1924): 286.
- ⁸⁸ 'Forestry Education,' *Australian Forestry Journal* 11 (Sept. 1929): 67–75, 72.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 72.
- ⁹⁰ 'The Australian Forester (Vol. No. 1): "Magazine of the Australian Forestry School Association"', *Australian Forestry* 2 (1937): 107–108.
- ⁹¹ Kevin Hannam, 'Utilitarianism and the Identity of the Indian Forest Service', *Environment and History* 6 (2000): 205–228.
- ⁹² 'The Cooper's Hill Challenge Cup', *Australian Forestry Journal* (Dec. 1928): 117–118.
- ⁹³ Harold Perkin, *The Rise of Professional Society* (London, 1989); *The Third Revolution: Professional Elites in the Modern World* (London, 1996).
- ⁹⁴ 'Forestry Education', *The Australian Forestry Journal* 11 (Sept. 1929): 67–75, 68.
- ⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 74.
- ⁹⁶ Draft of Lane Poole's Speech to the 1934 Inter-State Forestry Conference, NAA A2430, 30.
- ⁹⁷ 'Training Forest Experts', *Melbourne Age*, 14 Nov. 1929.
- ⁹⁸ 'Mr Scullin Attacks Premier: Opposes State Forestry School', *Melbourne Herald*, 16 Nov. 1929. Also see an editorial review supporting the decision of the Empire Forestry Conference, which Lane Poole or Norman Jolly likely wrote, 'Forest Education and University: To the Editor of the Argus', *Melbourne Argus*, 3 Nov. 1929.
- ⁹⁹ The budgets for forestry in the states also diminished between 1929–32. See *The Battle of the Plans: Documents Relating to the Premiers' Conference, May 25th to June 11th, 1931* (Sydney, 1931), 104–5.

AN IMPERIAL, NATIONAL AND STATE DEBATE

- ¹⁰⁰ R.G. Casey, *Commonwealth and State Financial Relations* (No place of publication, 1936).
- ¹⁰¹ Forests Commission, Victoria, *Report 1931–2* (Melbourne, 1932).
- ¹⁰² ‘Canberra School Essential: Carry On!’, *Adelaide Daily Telegraph*, 4 Sept. 1931.
- ¹⁰³ ‘Practical forestry: Minister’s Advice’, *Melbourne Age*, 4 Sept. 1931.
- ¹⁰⁴ Lane Poole, NAA A2430, 39.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 40.
- ¹⁰⁶ ‘Our Forests Need Expert Care, National Problem, Visitor Supports Canberra School’, *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, 23 June 1931; ‘Australia’s Timber, Markets Unexploited, Tribute to Forestry School’, *Melbourne Argus*, 24 June 1931.
- ¹⁰⁷ Lane Poole, NAA A2430, 33.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.
- ¹⁰⁹ ‘Diploma in Forestry To Be Awarded in Victoria’, *Melbourne Argus*, 12, Jan. 1935.
- ¹¹⁰ ‘Canberra’s Forest School Is One Too Many’, *The Melbourne Herald*, 14 Jan. 1936.
- ¹¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹² ‘Forestry School: Possible Closing’, *The West Australian*, 11 Feb. 1936.
- ¹¹³ ‘Another Blow at Forestry’, *Melbourne Argus*, 15 Jan. 1936.
- ¹¹⁴ Dargavel, *Fashioning Australia’s Forests*, 74.
- ¹¹⁵ Carron, *A History of Forestry in Australia*, 266; 31.
- ¹¹⁶ ‘Forestry School: Questions of Continuance’, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 May 1936.
- ¹¹⁷ ‘Higher Forestry Education in Australia’ *Australian Forestry* 1 (1936): 14–17.
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 16.
- ¹¹⁹ Carron, *A History of Forestry in Australia*, 16.
- ¹²⁰ See E.H.F. Swain, *An Australian Study of American Forestry* (Brisbane, 1918), 3–7.
- ¹²¹ C.E. Lane Poole to Premier New South Wales Alexander Mair 13 Dec. 1939, NAA1975/142, 8.
- ¹²² *Ibid.*, 7.
- ¹²³ See David McIntyre, ‘Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands’, in Judith Brown and Wm. Roger Louis (eds.), *Oxford History of the British Empire: Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1999): 667–92, 674–6. For the situation surrounding the fall of Singapore, see David McIntyre, *The Rise and Fall of the Singapore Naval Base, 1919–1942* (London, 1979).
- ¹²⁴ L.T. Carron, ‘Jacobs, Maxwell Ralph (1905 – 1979)’ in John Ritchie and Christopher Cunneen (eds.), *Australian Dictionary of Biography Volume 14* (Melbourne, 1996): 591.
- ¹²⁵ Whereas the Australian identity grew more national in the wake of World War II, trade and monetary policy between the Commonwealth of Nations, especially the former white dominions and the United Kingdom, remained important for British and Australian policy makers throughout the 1950s. See John Singleton and Paul Robertson, *Economic*

Relations Between Britain and Australasia 1945–1970 (London, 2002), 26–98; and Cain and Hopkins, *British Imperialism*, 632–7.

¹²⁶ Stewart Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal* (Melbourne, 2001), 15–20.

¹²⁷ Dargavel, *Fashioning Australia's Forests*, 74.

¹²⁸ As quoted in Ian Watson, *Fighting Over the Forests* (Sydney, 1990), 50.