



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

About the Institute

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

January 25, 1944

Mr. J. W. Eastham,
Court House, Vancouver,
British Columbia, Canada.

Dear Mr. Eastham:

I have had your letter of Jan. 4 and the package of specimens, and more recently your hand note of Jan. 9 and the single specimen of unmounted No. 12,216. Because of other pressures, I have been slow in getting these finished and hope it has not inconvenienced you too much.

I inclose a combined list of determinations for both mounted and unmounted specimens, and hope that this will not bother you. For my own convenience (selfish) I have arranged the specimens in botanical order of the Sections of the genus, and the species alphabetically thereunder. This also will make you more work in locating them by number.

I just have not the time at the moment to check these against the herbarium material and collection lists to determine if any of them represent extensions of range. Probably some do.

I am worried about the heights given for No. 11534, *S. myrtillifolia*, and No. 11532, *S. pseudomonticola*. They would fit better if reversed. Of course, *S. pseudomonticola* had to be 2 ft. high before it could be 5 ft. high but it should not flower at 2 feet high, unless the plant was an older one which had been injured by previous grazing or ice effects. If you can make any suggestions I will greatly appreciate them.

The packs of mounted sheets has been carefully packed and addressed and will be mailed as soon as I can get to a postv office (Our Dept. P.O. is overloaded and undermanned, and cannot handle packages going thro customs inspection. I have signed and affixed the declaration you sent me and hope that it helps get it thro.

I greatly appreciate your generosity in giving me this set of unmounted material. As I explained on Dec. 14, last, you do not need to do this in order to get determinations. Where duplicates can be spared I am exceedingly grateful for them as they have made my collection the best in America and therefore useful to many who collect.

With all good wishes for the new year, I am

Cordially yours,

Carleton R. Ball
Collaborator

P.S. Note your comment of "Dr." and "Prof." There is no necessary misfortune in in not having titles. The main point, I have always found, is what we can do with our talents and not with our degrees. My doctorate is honorary.

I am arranged to go on a collecting trip with a western man who is a wonderful natural-history collector and readable publisher. After we had been together a day, he confessed that he had been afraid of the "great man" from Washington. He did not know that I was a farm boy and later cow-puncher in the very area in which we were collecting and that I feel like one yet.

DISTRICT OFFICE
Court House,
Vancouver, B.C.



4 Jan. 1945

Dr. Carleton R. Ball,
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Ball,

I have to-day sent by parcel post a package containing 25 herbarium sheets and 26 numbers of unmounted material. The mounted sheets, of course, I should like returned, but may keep all the unmounted material. I did not send them earlier as I thought it would be best to avoid the Christmas mail congestion.

All localities on the labels are in B.C. unless expressly stated to the contrary. At the moment I do not recall any such.

Our Customs Service is very officious and sometimes irritating these days, partly no doubt because it needs all the money it can get, and partly also because it has to make use of a good deal of raw and half-trained help under present conditions. I enclose a label which if signed by you might, if affixed to the return parcel, get it through without the necessity of someone going to the Customs Office to clear it, or one of your own Dept. might do as well.

With all good wishes for the coming year,

Sincerely yours,

J.W. Eastham
J.W. Eastham
Plant Pathologist

(- neither Dr. nor Professor)

DISTRICT OFFICE

Court House

Vancouver, B.C.



5 Nov 1945

Dr. Carleton R. Bell,
Extension Service,
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Bell,

Under separate cover I have ^{to-day} sent a few specimens of *Salix* for identification. All are duplicates which you may keep. I was late in getting away this year and was not able to find many willows in flower or fruit.

Yours sincerely,

J.W. Eastham

J.W. Eastham
Plant Pathologist

4569 West 1st Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.

6 Dec 1948

Dr. Carleton Ball,
3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.
Washington 15, DC.

Dear Dr. Ball,

Your letter of Nov. 29 arrived today. With all the material you probably receive it is not surprising that some gets mislaid for a time. When these two numbers turn up you can send them to the Division of Botany, Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Can.

I have written G.A. Hardy at the Provincial Museum in Victoria, asking him to look up any material he has of S. amygdaloides. I am afraid the chances of finding out the basis of Henry's record are very slight. I know he was a correspondent of Schneider, but his herbarium does not exist.

Henry was not on the Botanical Dept. of the University, but a professor in the English Dept. and this may have led to some jealousy between him and the curator of the herbarium—at any rate there was a feud between them. When Henry retired, therefore, he did not give his herbarium to the Univ. but took it with him to the outlying village where he settled. After his death his widow went to live with relatives and the house stood empty for a year or more. When his nephew came to look at the herbarium it was decayed and crawling with insects and he burnt it all in the furnace. This is exceedingly unfortunate as many species have been divided or re-classified since his day, and we do not know what plant was the one on which Henry's record was based. This is particularly true in Carex, which I have studied rather carefully.

For this reason I am particularly glad that the collection I made has been deposited in the University herbarium, as it is to a considerable extent the basis of my supplement to Henry's F.

I notice, however, that both Rydberg's F. of the Rocky Mts. and Abrams Ill. F. of Pac. States, vol. 1, credit S. amygdaloides to B.C. The genus Salix in the latter of these was ~~worked~~ contributed by yourself as to text, but whether this includes distribution I do not know. Both these works were published after Henry's and Henry's statement may have been accepted. Osoyoos is located in an intrusion of Upper Sonoran which extends some 40 miles north of the International Boundary at this point, but Henry gives "East Kootenay"—a large area, but Arid Transition at most, extending from Creston to the Rocky Mts.

Yours sincerely,

J. R. Eastw.

4569 West 1st Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C.

15 Sept 1949

Dr. C. R. Ball,
3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.
Washington 15, D.C.

Dear Dr. Ball,

I was pleased to hear from you and to know you are still going strong at your chosen work. Thanks for the note on DA 15745. I will pass this on to Dr. Taylor so that he may annotate the sheet. Thanks also for sending the two nos. to Dr. Senn.

I have done no collecting this year. It is my first year of complete retirement and I have contented myself with resting, reading, exchanging the balance of my duplicates, getting out one or two papers on my recent work, and generally taking stock of the situation. Next year, however, if my health continues reasonably good I hope to get away for a month or so into some place that seems promising. Since the war "dude ranches" and fishermen's camps have sprung up in all sorts of rather remote places, where no botanist has probably ever collected, and where life is not too strenuous for a septuagenarian. You may yet, therefore, get some specimens from me. Also, if there is anything in this locality I could look out for you next spring I should be glad to do so.

I have gone through my file of separates and do not find any papers by yourself amongst them. I should be glad to have any that you can spare. All my papers, etc., will go to the University when I am through, so even if I do not have an opportunity to make full use of them at this stage, they will be cared for.

I presume your Alaska-Yukon contribution is for Anderson's Flora. I have not received any issues of this since I left the office and must look into the matter.

With best wishes, Yours sincerely,

J.W. Eastham

J.W. Eastham

4569 West 1st Ave.,
Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
22 Oct 1960,

Dr. C.R. Ball,
3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.,
Washington 15, D.C.

Dear Dr. Ball,

I am ashamed of myself in turning to the letter you so kindly wrote me re. my Rocky Mt. paper, that its date is 11 July last. I put it on one side to see if I could find more about Tobacco Plains, and as often happens in such a case, other matters supervened and it was temporarily lost sight of.

I have not been able to find anything beyond the bare statement. I tried to get one or two people with leisure, and residents of the area, to make further enquiries, but have had no response. It is rather surprising—the limited range of interest in normally intelligent folks. I suppose I should have directed my enquiry to the Office of Indian Affairs, where they may already have the record, and may do so later.

In the meantime I have found two citations of a general nature which may interest you. The first is in Catlin's "North American Indians", originally published, I think, about 1840. My copy is the Edinburg reprint of 1926 (p. 263, v. 1).

"The luxury of smoking is known to all the N.A. Indians, in their primitive state, and that before they have any knowledge of tobacco; which is only introduced among them by civilised adventurers, who teach them the use and luxury of whiskey at the same time."

"In their native state they are excessive smokers, and many of them (I would almost venture the assertion) would seem to be smoking one-half of their lives. . . . There are many weeds and leaves and barks of trees, which are narcotics, and of spontaneous growth in their countries, which the Indians dry and pulverise, and carry in pouches and smoke to great excess—and which in several of their languages, when thus prepared, is called k'nick-k'heck."

The other is from a book by a naval officer engaged with the International Boundary Survey—Lt., later Admiral, R.C. Mayne "British Columbia and Vancouver Island", 1862, p. 100;—

"Smoking has a curious effect upon them. As a rule, although they soon learn to smoke as we do, they begin by inhaling it, swallowing enough in a few minutes to intoxicate them. I have seen one pipe passed from one to the other of the party suffice to bring them all into this condition. The effect does not last long, and in a quarter of an hour they wake up from their drunken dose, looking and no doubt feeling very much the worse for it."

At this latter date there was still very little settlement in the country but I think the Hudson's Bay Company had been using tobacco as barter for many years.

I am surprised at the variety and extent of your labours. I knew your publications on cereals and their diseases when I was on the staff of Ontario Agricultural College, now many years ago, but did not know you had such intimate connections with botanical survey work in Canada. My own systematic efforts began with grasses, sedges and native forage plant weeds and poisonous plants—work which came naturally within the scope of agriculture, and gradually extended. Grasses and sedges have been my particular hobby, partly because they are so much neglected by collectors and offered an opportunity of making additions to the B.C. flora.

In 1947 I published a "Supplement" to "Flora of Southern British Columbia (J.K. Henry)" which adds, I think, about 450 sp. and vars. to those

noted for him

Professor J. W. Eastham,
4569 West First Avenue,
Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

3814 Jocelyn St., N.W.,
Washington 15, D.C.

14 December, 1950

Dear Professor Eastham:

Your fine letter of 22 Oct. came promptly and I am very greatly obliged to you for the many items of information included therein, altho this delayed answer does not look like gratitude. I am just digging out from under the biggest avalanche of willows for determination which I ever have had. Mostly from Arctic Alaska and eastward to Baffin and Greenland and Labrador (400 to 500 sheets), but with many from our western mountains also. One lot was from western Colorado at elevations from 10,000-13,000 feet, and what depauperation!

I thank you especially for the quotations from Catlin and Mayne. I want to get into the old literature on Indians if ever I can get the time. As I may have told you, I was raised with the Sisseton Sioux on the frontier and they certainly had no drug-addiction in smoking, whether tobacco or wild plants. Their use was ceremonial. We know that most youth are made sick when they first try tobacco, and doubtless the Indians had the same result. It just made them sick, not "drunk" in our sense of that word.

I was much pleased at your summary of some of the aged in botany but very sorry to hear of Mr. McCalla's accident. I'll send him a letter soon. You certainly have had a busy and useful life, and even if we cannot climb the high peaks as easily as in earlier years we can do a lot of good field work yet. I am glad to know that you have sent some material to Univ. Calif. and to our Natl. Arboretum Herbarium.

I know your Supplement to Henry's Flora but did not know that you had added so many entities to those in his edition. It is kind of you to think of my getting a copy for me but it is quite unnecessary. I have access to the Library of the Dept. of Agriculture, and through them get anything I want from the Congressional Library. So I have stopped accumulating new books. There is no one in my family to pass such works along to after my decease.

Speaking of grasses, Mrs. Agnes Chase has just finished the Revision of the Hitchcock Manual and is still working steadily at about 80, I think. Dr. Killip is out as Director of our National Herbarium, and Swallen, the young grass man, is Acting.

In your letter, you spoke of sending me separately a single specimen of willow. I have no recollection of having received it, cannot find it here, and there is no letter in your file reporting its determination. Is it possible that you did not mail it? If you did, I'll start hunting for it here. I see that you speak of it as being the only one in fruit but I can assure you again that practically all species are accurately determined from foliage alone, so in a new area, collect whatever you find. (Carleton)

Sorry that I did not have a chance to help you on the willows of B.C. The delay on the Alaska-Yukon mss. has been due largely to the 20 or 30 so-called species which have been published in the one Section Gleusae and the need for resolving them before trying to publish. Many are based on one collection, often juvenile, and some hybrid. Just now I am finishing up on *S. desertorum* Richardson, dating from 1923 and fundamental to the problem. Then I can attack the new-born "species".

With the greatest gratitude for your generosity to me, and with all good wishes for the fullest joys of Christmas and New Year in this year and in the many

Cordially yours ~~W. J. Eastham~~

Carleton R. Ball

in Henry's book, together with various emendations. I did not send you a copy as I believed you were interested now chiefly in *Salix*, and you had already seen practically everything on which my additions were based. However, I think I can still get you a copy, if you would like one. I had intended to ask you to revise this section, but about the time that I was preparing it I received the part of Anderson's *Flora of Alaska* with *Salix* omitted because you had not been able to undertake it in time. Under the circumstances I thought it would be an imposition to trouble you. I hope that you intend, however, to revise the willows of B.C. in your scheme of work. I am sure the Provincial Museum would be glad to publish it.

It is a pleasing thought, with some evidence to justify it, that botany promotes longevity. I had two short visits this summer from W.C. McCalla, whose name I see in your paper on *S. anglicorum*. He is in his 78th year, but no-one would suspect it. Unfortunately, he had a fall about two years ago, which injured his leg and arthritis supervened, which hampers him in getting around, although he still does a good deal of local collecting. John Macoun, when he retired officially, went to live on Vancouver Island, and in his middle 80s was adding much material to the herbarium in the Provincial Museum. He died at 89. Unless L.H. Bailey beats him, however, I think the palm must go to Sir Joseph Hooker (did you ever read his *Life and Letters* by Leonard Huxley?), who at 83 could say that his hand was as steady and his sight as good as it ever had been, and at that age began a revision of the large and difficult genus *Impatiens*. He published a series of papers, one the year he died, at the age of 94. I hope you may have the good fortune to rival him.

Compared with these men, I ought to feel youthful and energetic at a mere 71. I still keep my interest, but I find it too strenuous now to climb the mountains where much of our most interesting flora is. However, I made this summer two collections of about 95 nos. each, for the University of California and Dr. Archer of Beltsville, supplementing my previous sendings.

I had a brief trip into the Cariboo country the last week in August, but this is too late for willows except in the mountains. However I did find one still in fruit and am sending a specimen under separate cover.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

J. W. Eastham
J.W. Eastham

(over)