Michigan's first Director of Conservation concluded a six-year term of service with the observation that "Conservation was like a wheelbarrow. It moved only when pushed." He wisely left the relation of the pushee and conservation's devious course to inference. Land classification, it appears, has developed under the influence of similar stimulants and controls.

The record of "bar" killings that Dan'l Boone left on the beech trees of the Ohio River watershed has endured, but the verbally reported land classification that he took back to the land hungry settlers of the seaboard colonies has been lost.

Indian fighting was not the lure that sent the pioneer scouting expeditions through the gaps of the Appalachian ranges. They fanned out through the western wilderness to classify land for the migrant tide of settlement that was to follow.

The Government Land Survey and the Hayden, Powell and Wheeler exploratory surveys were among the early and more systematic official attempts at land classification.

Somewhat later on, technique in land classification was still further advanced by the work of the U. S. Geological Survey in several western states, and the classification that was carried on in the newly created National Forest Reserves.

The soil survey that was initiated with the turn of the century gave us a serviceable system for identifying, charting, and correlating the soil character of land areas. That in itself was an outstanding achievement, but its principal value for land classification arose from the fact that the soil mapping provided a reference frame to which the findings of the agricultural experiment stations and the experience of practical farmers be related, and consequently used in determining the suitability of land for agricultural production. The measurements that the recent years have brought into soil classification and mapping simply served to enhance the serviceability of this tool for land classification.

Under the stresses that followed the World War, our social-economic fabric was so strained in its weak spots that the land problems which had been incubating here and there for some time began to show quite plainly, and the manner in which several states went about determining the extent of the damage, its nature, and the remedies that could ameliorate it led to notable improvements in methods of land inventory and classification.

The recent depression has given great impetus to land classification. Generally, the pre-depression conditions that had been urging land classification still exist. In addition, a number of new agencies have been charged with responsibility for attention to one phase or another of our growing land use problems and respectively implemented with an action program which it is their duty to implement as intelligently as possible into present and more fertile seed bed for new developments in land classification could hardly be imagined and, as might be expected, schemes, systems, and programs for land classification have sprouted so fast that I doubt whether any one of us has casual acquaintance with more than a fraction of the work now underway. Certainly, much good must come out of all this activity about land classification.

In view of the broad scope of the work that is now going on under the