Connie, This is Paul Martin with my edits for our article on Torreya. Let me know if you need more or less. I hope it isn't too late.

I keep thinking that Torreya is hiding out in the Sierra Madre Oriental. Steve Jackson says he thinks he found Critchfield’s spruce down there. Shall I send him a copy of our ms? Also Al Traverse, retired, at Penn State.

Most if my edits are toward the back. Let me know what I missed.

Onward, Paul

TORREYA PRO Essay, Aug 6, 2004 5400 words w. refs
PSM edits 19 Aug 04 in bold and 12 size type
“Left Behind in Near Time: Why our most endangered conifer should be offered assisted migration now”
“Left Behind in Near Time: Assisted migration for our most endangered conifer-now!” (I like this)
by Connie Barlow, www.torreyaguardians.org
and Paul S. Martin, (can I use the same web site for an address?)

[first para in italics, or call it an Abstract]
We propose that assisted migration for Torreya taxifolia be undertaken immediately, such that this critically endangered conifer endemic to a single riverine corridor of the Florida panhandle is offered a chance to thrive in natural settings further north, and such that the process of assisted migration can be tested as a conservation tool. Given current climate and expected warming, the target range for test plantings of T. taxifolia would center on the southern Appalachians and Cumberland Plateau, with perhaps some sites further north. We intend to work with other volunteers toward this end, by collecting seeds from the grove of T. taxifolia at the Biltmore Gardens in Asheville, by inviting private landowners in the target areas to offer their forested properties for plantings, and by encouraging area teachers to involve their students in all phases (including long-term monitoring) of this new phase of conservation which, sadly, will become increasingly important as global warming proceeds as geoscientists (see Alley 2000) predict.
[end italics]

[Josh: You have a B&W line drawing of T. tax leaves and fruit in the 1875 Asa Gray article. I also have a decent photocopy of a lovely B&W line drawing of close-up T. tax leaf and fruit combination, taken from 1926 edition of “Manual of the Trees of North America” (Charles Sprague Sargent), if you’d like me to send it to you for publication.]

CB-I would italicize scientific names, and even T. tax, whenever they appear. PSM
In a companion essay, Torreya ((etc.)) expert Mark Schwartz concludes that assisted migration should not be attempted for this critically endangered yew-like conifer -- at least not yet. He also advises that any plan for assisting range change of a plant species or population be predicated on clear guidelines. Schwartz’s challenge prompted us to develop a set of standards (sidebar), written generically for plants, and against which we here evaluate Torreya taxifolia (henceforth, T. tax, or Florida torreya).

These standards for assisted migration were developed with the help of a score of people (including Mark Schwartz) who have been conversing via email for half a year (and some of us longer) about the merits and pitfalls of transporting seeds or seedlings (of plants in general and T. tax in particular) into natural sites remote from current range. This self-organized “Torreya Group” was initiated and networked by Connie Barlow, and it has drawn input from plant enthusiasts, naturalists, horticulturalists, and Nature Conservancy staff, as well as academic and governmental botanists, palynologists, ecologists, paleoecologists, conservation biologists, and environmental ethicists. The two coauthors of this article look forward to the wider conservation community debating and reworking the standards presented here, for discerning when it is appropriate to overcome a lack of connectivity or to supplement natural dispersal by employing this powerful conservation tool, and how assisted migration might apply to broader ecosystem concerns in a time of human-induced global warming.

Moving Endangered Plants: Easy, Legal, and Cheap

Assisted migration as a conservation tool is both fascinating and frightening for anyone focused on plants, for this reason: [begin ital] Assisted migration for endangered plants can easily, legally, and at virtually no cost be implemented by whoever so chooses, with no need for any particular expertise, and no governmental approval - provided that private seed stock is available and that one or more private landowners volunteer their properties toward this end.[end ital] This cheap-and-easy route for helping imperiled plants is in stark contrast to the high-profile, high-cost, and governmentally complicated range recovery programs ongoing for highly mobile animals, such as the Gray Wolf, Lynx, Peregrine Falcon, and North American Condor.

Another potential use for assisted migration as a conservation tool looms as well, expressed in email conversation (4/2/04) by Peter Wharton, curator of the Asian Garden of the University of British Columbia Botanical Garden: “The Torreya question is a door to immense issues relating to how we facilitate global ‘floraforming’ of vegetational zones in a warming world. It is another layer of responsibility for those of us who have a passion for forests and wish to promote the ecologically sensitive reforestation of so many degraded forest ecosystems worldwide.”
Forest ecologist Brian Keel (in press), who coined the term “assisted migration,” sums up the situation this way: “The triple problems of rapid human-caused climate change, landscape fragmentation, and habitat destruction will put many plant species at risk of extinction. For plants to survive climate change, they must either adapt to changing climatic conditions where the species is presently growing or track suitable habitats as the climate changes, that is, migrate. For plant species that cannot adapt, landscape fragmentation and habitat destruction may prevent migration, and human intervention in the form of assisted migration will be necessary to prevent extinction.”

This too from conservation biologist Anathea Brooks, assistant director of the NASA Goddard Earth Science and Technology Center: “With the advent of climate change, and the discontinuity of habitat due to our sprawling urban growth, does humankind have a moral responsibility to assist species to migrate? If so, what criteria do we use to select those who can board the Conservation Ark? After hearing [Louis] Iverson talk about the potential distribution range of tree species, and everything I’ve heard at NASA about the likelihood of major climate modifications, we need to have this discussion without delay.” (7/19)

T. tax and the Ecological Standards
(refer to sidebar)

STANDARD # 1, NEEDINESS: “The world’s most endangered conifer” is the way a Nature Conservancy pamphlet (1997) introduces Torreya taxifolia. The Florida Chapter of the Nature Conservancy, the State of Florida (Torreya State Park), a number of botanical gardens, and dispersed academic researchers are all actively involved in its recovery, guided by a USF&WS recovery plan and pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. T. tax is an evergreen conifer that historically is found only within a short and narrow stretch along the Apalachicola River of northern Florida and a sliver of southern Georgia. Despite extreme endemism, the species was once a prominent mid- and under-story member of its forest community, which includes an odd mix of north and south: towering beech and hickory next to tall evergreen magnolia, and surrounded by stubby palmetto palm.

In the 1950s, the species suffered a catastrophic decline, the ultimate cause still unexplained. By the mid 1960s, no large adult specimens -- which once measured more than a meter in circumference and perhaps 20 meters tall -- remained in the wild, felled by what seemed to be a variety of native pathogens. Today, the wild population persists as mere stump sprouts, cyclically dying back when mere saplings, such that seeds are rarely, if ever, produced. T. tax thus joins American Chestnut in maintaining only a juvenile and diminishing presence in its current range. (Digital photos of Apalachicola specimens in the wild are posted at www.torreyaguardians.org).
STANDARD # 2, LOW RISK FOR RECIPIENT ECOSYSTEMS: Mark Schwartz and others
who know the tree through years of professional engagement agree that T. tax is very unlikely to become noxious in recipient ecosystems to the north. Sharon Hermann, however, cautioned that T. tax transplanted to the north might serve as host for a pathogen that would then spread to other plants (3/1/04 email). Josh Brown (12/9/03) wondered whether T. tax might be a “highly interactive species,” following Soule et al. 2003. This prompted discussion as to whether T. tax might serve an ecological function similar to that of Eastern Hemlock: providing evergreen shade along streams and streamlets within deciduous forests. A suggestion that T. tax be evaluated as a possible replacement for our native hemlock, which is now stressed by global warming and locally extirpated by exotic insect (woolly adelgid), generated a wave of protest. Talk of finding an ecological replacement for a struggling and much-loved native conifer is as unwelcomed by some as would be talk of replacing a dying spouse or child. Overall, the ecological interactivity (for good or ill) of T. tax in recipient ecosystems will become apparent only when test plantings in natural forest habitats to the north are carried out and monitored.

STANDARD #3, IRREVERSIBLE PROBLEMS IN CURRENT RANGE.
On this point there is disagreement. Mark Schwartz and others maintain hope for recovering T. tax in reproducing, self-maintaining populations in its current range. Since 1997, staff at the Atlanta Botanical Garden have been experimentally taking healthy T. tax grown from seed at the garden and planting these trees at the periphery of the existing range and somewhat further north in Georgia. The efficacy of applying fungicides and supplemental fertilizers to these transplants is now also being tested (author, 2002). The transplants are all progeny of “potted orchards” established from cuttings taken from wild specimens in Florida in November 1989.

Another Torreya expert, Rob Nicholson (conservatory manager at Smith Garden Botanical Garden, at Smith College in New York state) participated in the 1989 salvage of wild genotypes and their propagation as clonal stock. Nicholson presents a less hopeful view of resurrecting a healthy and self-maintaining population of T. tax in its current range. This is drawn from the Torreya conservation page of Nicholson’s website:

[blockquote]“The number of mature trees in cultivation outside of Florida may number less than two dozen. At the beginning of the twentieth century, there were wild populations of Torreya taxifolia estimated at about 300,000 to 600,000. The estimated number of plants in the original habitat is about 500, which means that 99.3 to 99.6% of the population found at the beginning of the 1900s has died. Where 60-foot trees were formerly found, few individuals over 10 feet are now known. Although research into the cause of this decline is ongoing, in situ preservation appears problematic, and management efforts now include the propagation of rooted cuttings from documented wild stands to be grown in ex situ populations.” [insert web
Virtually all of us who have been conversing electronically about the pros and cons of assisted migration for T. tax agree that at some point in the future, human-induced global warming will indeed push T. tax (and all too many other plants) to the edge of viability; at that time, assisted migration will become standard practice. For reasons explained below, we believe T. tax is already at that juncture. In a 1990 article, Rob Nicholson speculated, “Is Torreya an early victim of global warming and a precursor of a new wave of inexplicable extinctions?”

We ask, as well: [ital] Why wait until a hundred species are on the brink? Rather, let us undertake assisted migration for Torreya taxifolia today, in part, as a trial run for the decades to come. With T. tax we can explore the ecological and emotional hurdles toward such a radical turn in conservation. [end ital]

STANDARD #4, SUITABILITY OF TARGET RANGE.

As Rob Nicholson has pointed out, there are very few seed- and pollen-producing specimens of T. tax outside of those that have recently matured from rooted cuttings taken from wild stock in 1989 and then nurtured in potted orchards in three botanical gardens. After all, who would think to plant Florida torreya in the north, if the tree is clearly native only to Florida? Surely the tree could not survive harsh winters.

Fortunately, in 1939 Chauncey Beadle collected about a dozen specimens of T. tax from the Apalachicola and planted these along a streamlet as part of a naturalistic, grove of open pine forest -- with a mid-story of hemlock and Torreya and an understory of shrubs -- within the vast holdings of the Biltmore Gardens, in Asheville, North Carolina (elevation ________). Interestingly, the hemlock are prominent on the north-facing slope of this slight ravine, and all the Torreya (including self-propagated saplings, probably planted by squirrels) occur and are thriving on the south-facing slope. (Digital photos of the grove are available on-line.) It is not known if the segregation of the two species was intentional or whether it emerged in the ensuing years (Bill Alexander, Biltmore forest historian, pers. comm.) As to Torreya’s cold-hardiness, Bill Alexander reports that in the winter of 1985 all Torreya specimens survived unharmed an episode of unusual cold; temperatures plunged to minus 16 degrees F.

Rob Nicholson has written: “This Florida native, as evidenced by the few healthy trees in cultivation, seems to thrive on the southern slopes of the Appalachian Mountains and is more cold tolerant than its present range would suggest.” Peter White, director of the botanical garden at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, remarked in an email (3/3/04), “Like others, I have noticed how well Torreya grows in cultivation in the mountains, and its current range seems to not represent its climatic
envelope.” Indeed, famed botanist Asa Gray, who made a “pious pilgrimage” to visit T. tax in the wild, wrote in 1875, “One young tree, brought or sent by Mr. Croom himself [its discoverer], has been kept alive at New York showing its aptitude for a colder climate than that of which it is a native.”

STANDARD #5, BARRIERS TO UNASSISTED MIGRATION
STANDARD #6, RECONSTRUCTING PAST RANGE

For T. tax, these two standards can best be evaluated in tandem. Here is where our own expertise comes into play (e.g., Martin 1957; Barlow 2001), as we search for an understanding of the near-time (15,000 years ago until the time of historical records) and deep-time story of genus Torreya. It is this attention to the past that leads us to regard assisted migration for T. tax to the southern Appalachians as not so much relocation for a plant struggling with global warming as repatriation of a once-native. It is thus a form of rewilding that uses a near-time baseline for determining native range.

First we begin with an excerpt from Hazel Delcourt’s 2003 draft background document on T. tax, which she wrote as a participant in the Torreya Group before it became clear that a pro-and-con forum, rather than a single article, would best present the issue for the readers of Wild Earth. Delcourt wrote:

[blockquote]
“Torreya taxifolia is a classic example of a narrowly endemic plant, long considered by botanists to be a relict of geologic history, surviving for millions of years in a specialized island-like habitat. The genus is a member of the ancient gymnosperm family, Taxaceae, whose ancestors were evolutionarily distinct from other conifers by the Jurassic Period.” [end blockquote]

Unfortunately, fossil evidence of genus Torreya is sparse. Because Torreya pollen is indistinguishable from the pollen of yews (Taxus) and bald cypress (Taxodium), as well as several other conifers, known fossil occurrences of this genus are limited to macrofossils (seeds, leaves, and secondary wood). There are no Cenozoic fossils whatsoever of Torreya in eastern North America, not even Quaternary fossils near where it still survives. The most recent macrofossils identified as Torreya in eastern North America are upper Cretaceous, and these were unearthed in North Carolina and Georgia. Because worldwide climate during the Cretaceous was much warmer and far less seasonal than that of today, it is not surprising that Torreya macrofossils of Cretaceous age have also turned up along the Yukon River of Alaska. In western North America, there is Cenozoic fossil evidence of Torreya in the John Day region of Oregon (lower Eocene) and variously in California (Oligocene and late Pleistocene). Just possibly Torreya remains undiscovered in the patches of mesic forest with sweet gum (Liquidambar), beech (Fagus), and yew (Taxus) in the Sierra Madre Oriental
of Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosí, and Tamaulipas in northeastern Mexico.

The genus today is highly disjunct. Torreya californica survives as a rare tree, locally abundant in a score of isolated populations within the coastal mountains of central and northern California and on the west slope of the Sierras. It favors moist canyons and mid-slope streamside environments (generally between 3000 to 6500 feet elevation), growing beneath a canopy of taller conifers and deciduous trees. Torreya nucifera is found in Japan and Korea. Four other species inhabit China. [ital] Torreya taxifolia is the only one of the seven that is highly imperiled, and we believe we can explain why.[end ital]

So what happened? And why is Florida’s torreya in such bad shape compared to its sibling species?

Near-Time Obstacles to Natural Migration

Torreya taxifolia is a glacial relict, left behind in its “pocket reserve” of rich soils and cool, moist microclimates provided by the steep bluffs and ravines along the east shore of the Apalachicola River. The current richness of North America’s deciduous forests is, in large part, thanks to this and other glacial refuges (including the Tunica Hills of Louisiana and the Altamaha River of Georgia) and the bluffs of other large rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico and the southern Atlantic coast (Delacourt 2002). For some of the repatriated plants (notably, beech) relict populations still remain in one or more of these refugia, while the bulk of the range is disjunct much farther north.

T. tax was unable to follow the other plant refugees north when the ice retreated, beginning some 15,000 years ago. Why? There are several plausible scenarios.

One possibility (favored by Hazel Delcourt, 2/11/04) is that some plants, Torreya among them, were unable to return north not just in this interglacial but in previous interglacials too. The relatively slow onset of the first glacial episode permitted warm-temperate plants to retreat to coastal refuges, but the faster pace of interglacial warmings ever after prevented them from making the return trip. Torreya’s isolation thus would have begun some 2 million years ago, with no respite in any of the glacial cycles. Delcourt also wondered whether Torreya was perhaps chased out of the southern Appalachians as long ago as the Oligocene cooling, some 34 million years ago. On this question, the fossil record is mute.

Another possibility, favored by the authors of this paper, is that Torreya taxifolia probably did return to the southern Appalachians during previous interglacials. The best proxy data for global climate during the ice ages are found in ice cores (for popular treatment see Alley 2000). As measured in the Vostok Core, Antarctica, the last interglacial, 110,000 TO 140,000 years ago and preceded by many others of equal magnitude did not peak at a
global temperature much different from that of today. If Torreya is having trouble surviving in the northern Florida now, it should have had trouble in multiple interglacials.

So what makes our own interglacial uniquely inhospitable for natural migration? There are only two significant differences between this interglacial and the previous. We shall argue that either of these differences could have posed grave problems for Torreya, and together they would have sealed the fate of the unfortunate refugee.

[ital] One difference is that our current interglacial is uniquely understocked in large herbivorous mammals, both in diversity and in numbers.[end italics] By 10,000 years ago, the mastodons, the mammoths, the giant ground sloths, and other mammals that powerfully affect the vegetation had vanished. Notably, we lost all our big browsers. Small trees would have been untoppled by elephants, saplings and shrubs gone uneaten. Overall, the landscape would have become a lot brushier, and thus more susceptible to the kind of catastrophic fires that would have ranged widely in the dry and sandy pinelands of southeastern lowlands, even reaching into the shady, moist ravines through which fire-intolerant Torreya would have been edging north.

A second difference between this interglacial and the next-to-last is that only in the current interglacial has North America been home to a creature that can make fire on demand. [ital] By the onset of the present interglacial, more commonly known as the “postglacial,” paleoindians had arrived. They were new to the Americas. Both accidentally and for many possible reasons they ignited wildfires. To flush out game, to make land easier and safer to cross, and perhaps even to favor plant species that provided food (the acorns of oaks), fires would have been ignited. As an unintended result they would have ramped up the fire hazard for migrating Torreya.

New pollen records from New York State reveal an abundance of charcoal in the fossil record after extinction of large mammals. Palynologists suspect that the end of mastodon and stag-moose herbivory favored luxuriant growth of shrubs, especially in riparian habitats. Post-extinction rebound of browse would favor fires (Robinson, G. S., 2003: Landscape paleoecology and Late Quaternary extinctions in the Hudson Valley. Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Biological Sciences at Fordham University, New York; 151 pages, ms accepted by Ecol. Monographs.)

Fires most likely to eliminate evergreen shrubs would be all but unknown prior to anthropogenic activity, “the fires of spring,” a season when natural ignitions are unusual or unknown and human ignitions would, in an especially dry spring, be a novelty. This scenario may account not only for the suppression of Torreya but also for the extinction of a recently described new species of spruce, Picea critchfieldii (Jackson and Weng
Late Pleistocene extinctions of plants, to match the devastation suffered by large mammals, are otherwise unknown.

Consider Australia's celebrated "living fossil," the Wollemi "pine" in the Auricariaceae (auricaria family.) The Australians are now planting this native endemic (Wollemia nobilis) just about anywhere they can. The sole remaining species of a genus originating in the Cretaceous (and related to the South American monkey puzzle tree, Auricaria), live Wollemia nobilis were unknown until 1994, when a grove of just 24 strange but magnificent trees were found hiding out in an all but inaccessible deep canyon in the mountains northwest of Sydney (Woodford 2000). Wollemia's brush with extinction, along with the actual near-time extinctions of several other Australian conifers (including two species of Nothophagus), have been attributed to anthropogenic fires by early aboriginal peoples (Kershaw 1984).

Kershaw and his colleagues took a wider view: "In relation to megafauna, this environmental reconstruction for Australia makes it unlikely that either climate or habitat change was the primary cause of Late Pleistocene extinction. Consequently, we consider that the most likely explanation is direct killing by people, a conclusion supported by the evidence for the demise of megafauna in the late Holocene of New Zealand" (Kershaw and others 2000). Direct killing need not all be by clubs or spears. It may also involve wildfire.

According to Woodford (2000), anthropogenic fires are suspected of playing a large part in the virtual extinction of a newly described genus of the Wollemi pine (Wollemia nobilis). Its nearest relatives are the southern hemisphere conifers, Agathis and Auricaria. Recently discovered in Wollemi National Park northwest of Sydney, the tree barely survives in two tiny populations, genetically identical, and totaling less than 50 individuals. The decline of the Wollemi Pine seen in the fossil record began long before humans and anthropogenic fires reached Australia. Fossil records based on their distinctive pollen type indicate that ancestors of Wollemi pines shrank in range two to three million years ago. The surviving trees narrowly escaped firestorms and extinction in the shelter of deep canyons tucked into the mountains northwest of Sydney (Woodford 2000). Propagation of seed stock has been achieved and seedling trees are being widely distributed.

T. tax may have been a victim of contact for another reason, too. [ital] The dispersal agents (squirrels, and perhaps also tortoises) upon which T. tax utterly depended for movement of its large, fleshy seed would likely have been severely reduced in numbers, even extirpated,[end ital] as these creatures are not only attractive foods; they are safely and easily killed -- even by children. (Martin and Szuter sp., ____Connie, your book is a better reference here, if one is needed)

If the advent of people and the loss of megaherbivores are indeed the proximate causes of Torreya's troubles, then why has the California torreya
been spared? Our answer is that California’s torreya (and presumably all four of the Asian species) were able to track climate change not by moving hundreds of kilometers north but hundred of meters upslope.

Thus we believe that topographical differences are at cause. Although we are unfamiliar with the habitats of the Asian species, we do know that California torreya resides in mountain habitats (and one of us has visited a thriving natural grove). We posit that of all seven species within the genus, Florida torreya is unique in having no nearby mountains to ascend as climate warms. A journey of 300 miles (as the crow flies, not as the ravine winds blow) would have been required for Florida Torreya to reach the southernmost Appalachians.

One final note in our “Left Behind in Near-Time Story”: Because glacial refugees in the east suffered not only increased fire hazards but also the bad luck of mountainless terrain, Torreya was not alone in its troubles. Severe endemism of the Florida yew (Taxus floridiana, also in the Apalachicola), historic extinction in the wild of America’s only big-blossomed relative of Asian camellia (sp? in dictionary, tea family), Franklinia, and near-time extinction of the once-widespread Critchfield Spruce (Picea critchfieldii) may all be attributed to the advent of the fire-makers, too (Martin, in press). Given the sequence of loss in their pocket reserves, it would seem that Critchfield Spruce was the least warm- and drought-tolerant of the bunch, followed by Franklinia, which now thrives in cultivation in the mid-Atlantic states. Next comes T. tax, followed by Florida yew, which is not yet sickly in its Florida refuge but is doing a poor job of reproducing. [[Conversely, Ponderosa and Pinyon pines have benefited from the onset of anthropogenic fires, especially the heretofore unnatural fires of spring. Thanks for adding these, but lets leave them out.]]

“Left behind in near time” may thus be a syndrome that applies to a number of extinct, imperiled, and soon-to-be-imperiled plants. For example, how do we understand all the highly endemic populations or species of vascular plants far removed from their peers? What about a cool-adapted and drought intolerant fern residing on shaded cliffs in southeastern Ohio? Might the “left behind” scenario offer insight? And if so, how does this awareness alter our conservation options as climate shifts? Surely, the stories we tell about how and why these plants came to rest in small or unusual places will play a big role in the choices we make to preserve them. What stories will we tell? Perhaps we conservationists will collectively write our own “left behind” series compelling stories that move us to reduce the toll amongst innocent green bystanders when we face an Armageddon of our own making.
[Well put; vintage CB]

Organizational Standards:

A self-organizing group, Torreya Guardians, has formed to discuss and act in behalf of Torreya taxifolia. Significant ideas and plans for action are
posted at www.torreyaguardians.org. Those who wish to volunteer their time, expertise, or their students, and those who wish to have test plantings take place on their own private lands are encouraged to contact the group through this website. We close with several thought-provoking comments drawn from the group email conversations.

[blockquote]
“I think we ought to purposefully blur the line between scientists and non-scientists. Some scientists might want to be guardians in your sense. Also, the demands of rigorous science are such (and the funding available low enough) that I doubt that science will ever do the job of large-scale assisted migration. Scientists might inform or inspire it, or do the experimental effort that tests the idea, but I don’t think conservation managers should expect scientists to be the most important movers.” --Peter White (7/17/04)

“I also have reservations about introducing Torreya to the southern Appalachians without understanding its functional role in the new ecosystems that may result from its introduction. . . Would it be prudent of us to suggest that some experimental plant ecology be undertaken in limited and controlled trials, not arboretum environments but in more natural surroundings? . . . The question of whether it is appropriate to plant it all over the southern Appalachians - just because we can - is one that I believe we all need to think about carefully.” -- Hazel Delcourt (2/24/04)
[end blockquote] Connie, lets end with the PW quote. Paul
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At 09:17 AM 8/2/2004 -0400, you wrote:
>Robbin:
>
> This is Connie Barlow. Paul Martin and I are writing a Torreya taxifolia pro-assisted-migration essay for the Fall issue of Wild Earth magazine, and wonder if you have some personal awareness of and perhaps intuitions about the Franklinia trees at NYBG. You see, we are positing that T. tax, Franklinia, and Critchfield Spruce were all, in a way, "left behind" in the pocket reserves when the glacier retreated and other plants successfully spread or moved north. Critchfield Spruce was the first to go extinct, then Franklinia in the wild, and now Torreya is threatened. What is your sense of Franklinia?
>
> How does it fare at NYBG? Does it flower well, set seed well, and are the seeds viable? Any seedlings coming up spontaneously there? Any evidence that it might be able to "naturalize" and spread on its own in your neck of the woods? What do you think about Franklinia's trajectory? What story do you weave?
> Is there a better story for Franklinia than its being left behind in a
pocket reserve down south? And why was it left behind? Perhaps
susceptibility to
paleoindian forest fires? Looking at its seed, what do you think its
dispersal agent is intended to be? I will patch in a piece of an email
Paul Martin
just sent me that shows you his thoughts on this.

For Torreya,
connie

[Email from Paul Martin]
Hi Connie,

I do not hesitate to put Critchfield's spruce, Franklinia, and Torreya from
the Apalachicola River bluffs all in the same boat - species intercepted in
their return north 10,000 years ago by anthropogenic fire, something new in
their environment. In rereading the packrat midden book (Betancourt,
VanbDevender and Martin) I realized that ponderosa pine and one pinyon,
Pinus edulis, are on the upside of the fires of spring argument. Ponderosa
is entirely missing from most of the Quaternary fossil record of the last
50,000 years, until the postglacial when it storms north to Canada from
Arizona. Yes, the details are sketchy but we know how well Ponderosa
thrives with spring fires, outlawed the last 100 years by the U. S. Forest
Service.

There is much negativer evidence in all of this and new fossil finds may
skuttle the story, or at least complicate it. The clincher for me if the
Wollemi pine story in Australia where a conifer vulnerable to fire barely
survived and two or three other species of the temperate rainforest were
wiped out and Auricaria greatly reduced in eastern Queensland around the
time 45,000 years ago when people first arrived and fire frequency
apparently increased.