Guy Brandborg: —their house when they left home. Ed would subscribe to the *New York Times.* I told you that.

Mavis McKelvey: Yeah, sometimes.

GB: Yeah. I know I came home a couple years afterward and Ed asked me if I hadn’t kept up my subscription to the *New York Times* and I told him I hadn’t. Well he said, “I’ll subscribe once more and then you keep it up.” And when I discontinued the *New York Times*, I had the notion to write the *New York Times* and say that I, you know, how long a subscriber and how it came about. So I got interested and I wasn’t reading the news as much as I was reading the editorial page of the *New York Times.* I’d always pick out the editorial page in the *New York Times* and read that first. So, I think, and then...

MM: How far in school did your father go?

GB: Well, I don’t think he went very far. I don’t think my father or my mother were graduates of even high school.

MM: But it’s unusual for a Minnesota farmer to be reading the *New York Times*.

GB: Oh, yeah. That’s the kind of people they were.

MM: So somewhere along the line, the intellectual that he was asserted itself.

GB: My father came from aristocracy, you know. His mother was, yeah, came from aristocracy and she married...I could let you read the [unreadable]...I have a brother that prepared a—what do you call it?...a genesis of the...no, a genealogy. A family tree, and he put all that stuff down. She married an engineer and I think her family always thought that that was below her dignity. So anyway, I think that’s what caused them to migrate from Sweden because of this—one of the reasons—this relationship that wasn’t very good. I think that was it. And I think my brother touches on some of that. But this old gal, I can remember her. My grandfather had passed away and she used to come to the house and she used to try and impose the same thing on her Chuck—[unreadable] she used to call him—that is, Charlie, my dad, that he had married below his dignity. So that was a sort of...That existed and for that reason she never stayed. She came to visit from southern Minnesota up to northern Minnesota to visit but she never stayed because Mother wouldn’t tolerate it.
MM: That’s interesting, because that era is alive with this kind of attitude. In my family, the Irish had all sorts of scales of hierarchy. There were shanty Irish. [laughs] If you looked like a Kennedy, you obviously were shanty Irish. And then there were the lace curtain Irish. And always this discussion of who was marrying beneath whom. It was fascinating.

GB: That’s right. That’s the way it was.

MM: You don’t hear that much anymore.

GB: No. Well I know that was...And I think this genealogy...I think brother Warner...I talked him into doing this. He was a druggist and retired and didn’t have anything to do, and I talked Warner into doing this. And I’ve misplaced ours, but I still have a niece that tries to keep in touch, and Stewart does this, you know, our son. He’s the only one of the whole pride that tried to keep alive this [unintelligible] communicate with members of the family. But the rest of them don’t. They’ve written the whole [unintelligible].

MM: They must be just all over the place.

GB: Oh, all over the place. My God.

MM: All those children having children having children.

GB: Oh they’re all over the place, from one coast to the other.

MM: And there was seven boys, were there?

GB: Yeah, eight boys. I was the seventh son. And two girls.

MM: So the name Brandborg is all over the place.

GB: Yeah, Brandborg is all over the place. My father...Every place Stewart goes, just to illustrate, he looks in the phone book to see if there’s a Brandborg. He went to Oklahoma City to make a talk and found the Brandborgs. He called them up and it was, I suppose, my great grandfather’s...the brother of my great grandfather. Later we heard there was a woman right in this town had gone down there and she said to me, “Do you have any relatives in Oklahoma City?” I think it was Oklahoma City. Well this fellow ran the TV station and they got together and they established the fact that they were [unintelligible]. You could tell it by his characteristics, too.

MM: The Swedes. Was George Perkins Marsh’s book Man and Nature the bombshell that it’s supposed to be among average people? Or was this strictly a select group of people? Because he was really, as far as I can tell, the first one who said what are we doing here? Well, maybe not the first one. But seeing that the...back in about the Civil War times of war, seeing what was
happening to the land and seeing how the push was on to supply for a war machine for that many years and so on. To stand up against that kind of mobilization took a great deal of courage. As far as I can tell, he’s the first one who verbalized on land use and what we were doing to the land at a time when we still had vast resources.

GB: I think you’ve got to go back farther than that. I think if you read the Constitution, as I have, so many times, I think the founding fathers identified this for us. I think the founding fathers identified this...what you’re getting at. I think there were a lot of people that picked it up later. But I think it all stems from earlier. You know, you think about our Constitution when they inserted in that that if government...They provided provisions for us to make the change we want today if we want to do it. But no one in position of leadership wants to change it. And they emphasize right in the Constitution, didn’t they, that, after all, people were the masters of government. And our elected representatives are our servants. But I think, too, apathy of people and appreciation of what democracy means, that those kinds of things have never been imprinted. That’s all I see to it.

MM: Well you said that when Marsh became a congressman in the 1840s sometime, one of his fellow congressmen was a former president, John Quincy Adams. And Marsh attributes a great deal of his thinking and influence on John Quincy Adams, who really believed in the public domain, for a preserved public domain, not, as Andrew Jackson did, a give-away public domain.

GB: That’s it, that’s it. They had to struggle and I read quite a [unintelligible] about Shoup. This wasn’t our Shoup. This was Senator Shoup from Idaho. They have a rotunda there, a capital named after the statue of Shoup. And every time I go by it, it’s sort of touchy because of the defense that those western statesmen came to when they wanted to dispose of public lands and wanted to do this thing. And if it hadn’t been for their support, the things that you read in the paper Sunday about increasing by 75 million acres—and Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot did that. They had the support of those western congressmen and senators [unintelligible] state.

MM: I was trying to see, because there is a thread that runs through this that I think we can call upon. Sort of a tradition. Someone, as we said the last time, traditions are very important when you’re trying to find a direction. If you have a tradition of populism and you have a tradition of individuals asserting themselves, then you can rely on that at a time when, as we have right now, when the screws are really turning in terms of our own expression about what we think is wrong. If you look through Marsh and then Carl Schurz, the Secretary of Interior under Lincoln, and then John Wesley Powell, and then Pinchot and Roosevelt, these people...There has to be a thread that runs through there.

GB: Oh, absolutely. I think, as I see it, it was a thread of ethics and it was a thread of responsibility.

MM: It goes in and out, doesn’t it?
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GB: It goes in and out. And I think it was a thread of ethics and responsibility that we have lost in our political structure today.

MM: Well, between Roosevelt and Pinchot, there was a period of time until the second Roosevelt came along and added some more lands to the public domain, when nothing happened. Well, in the 1920s, when we had what we’re having now.

GB: Yeah, during a period of crisis it seems to me it’s the only time that those kind of people act. I realize that, for instance, the Shelterbelt Program was criticized. There was nothing better than the Shelterbelt Program. When you go drive through eastern, central Montana like we did just a few days ago and see what those shelterbelts did to the comforts of those people, you know, there again, here’s what happened: no sooner had the administration changed till the Shelterbelt Program became sort of a laughing stock. I knew the director of it and he worked here after he had been director of the Shelterbelt and the political structure changed and there was so much criticism of the Shelterbelt and the other land use things that were developing during that period.

MM: Why was the shelterbelt criticized?

GB: I think it goes back again to that thread we were talking about. They didn’t realize what it meant to people.

MM: That one is such an obvious one. It keeps the soil from blowing, it keeps farms...

GB: Yeah, just around the house. Just think...I saw shelterbelt after shelterbelt that the houses had been taken down; the shelterbelt was still standing there. Instead of tearing up the shelterbelt, you know, those farmers must have had respect for those trees.

MM: Well, all over Nebraska and eastern Colorado, you see that 1930s along the roads and those trees that were planted in those days. Now they put a little rest stop under those big trees now.

GB: That’s right. Here’s another thing in this same connection. When Roosevelt...The leaders in the Forest Service, here again...And Secretary Brandon was Secretary of Agriculture...They said that here are these abandoned lands in the south. Let’s purchase them, let’s establish purchase units. And I suppose they had to go through the process of going through FDR for this. And he said go ahead. There was no opposition to the Forest Service or any government agency purchasing these lands and putting them under administration.

MM: Does that come under the Weeks Act. I was reading about the Weeks Act, in 1911, that was for eastern forests that already had been cut over once so technically weren’t new forests but needed the preservation of the federal government.
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GB: That’s right. Needed financial help to get them back into production. But there again, as soon as the economic conditions improved, believe me, tremendous opposition developed to the purchase, Forest Service land purchase programs. And all the lands in eastern Montana before that’s still under Forest Service jurisdiction were [unintelligible] [crashing house] We get one of those every...

MM: You can almost set your watch by it. Yeah, we do too. There were some things in the beginning that I was interested in because they were early influences. And one was when you went into the Flathead River, the middle fork of the Flathead, and you said that you stayed there for three summers or three periods of time and you said that that was a story in itself and you wanted to expand a little more on the trap line man, Griff Jones. Do you want to tell me exactly what Griff Jones, well, the kind of person he was and why he had such an influence on you.

GB: Yeah, I think it’s very appropriate and I’m glad you brought it up because the kids wanted me to report and so does Ruth. The first summer—no, the second summer—I was on the Lewis and Clark and I was transferred up to Dupuyer and the ranger was Stanley Sanderson. They used to assign one person to the big river country. In the big river country, you had to cross the divide either up the Teton or up Birch Creek. Usually the Teton Divide was more difficult to get across than the Birch Creek Divide, so I used to go in that way. This E. A. Woods that I had mentioned—Useless Woods—had told me about this man and he said, “You stop there sometime,” you know, at his place. I don’t know, I was sort of reluctant to stop because they had told me some things about him.

But I went back into the Big River and at the head of the Big River there’s a meadow. I looked back, I would say it’s 100 acres. Someone had started a Forest Service camp, somebody prior to my coming. Part of my instructions were to work on this cabin at odd times and complete it and then I was supposed to cut out trails and so on and so forth. Well, E. A. Woods had told Griff Jones that there’s a kid back there on the Big River: “When you go back to pick up your stuff, your traps, you look him up.” Well, it just so happened that I was camped in the lower end of this meadow and one night I was just cooking supper and I saw my horses throwing their heads up. [unintelligible] up the meadow that was abandoned so I thought, “Well, there must be somebody up there.” And I was sure pleased because I was getting to think...Well, I had a girl outside the mountains too, a telephone operator, and I was thinking about her and getting [unintelligible]. Want to go, leave, quit.

As I was...I can remember this very well...I was stirring up my flour in a sack like they used to do out of the top of this (?) making the dough. And I was doing this, here came, and E. A. Woods had described this man to me. And he said, “When you see Griff Jones, you’ll know. He’s a tremendous man, a large man. He’s got a big white flowing mustache. And man with the longest arms you’ve ever seen.” Well, here came Griff Jones and he had a liver in his hand. He killed a deer [unintelligible]. I’d been out that day and come back to the cabin and I don’t know
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if he killed the deer after he made camp of not. But E. A. told me that this man kills meat and he saves his meat and they were trying to arrest him and so on, the Game Department was. But he said, “Whatever you see, you just overlook it.”

So he came in and introduced himself and so he saw me. I was cooking over a campfire. Nothing was said and I went and when the coals that I was cooking on at that time and when the coals were ready I put the biscuits in the—covered them up, you know, like you do to cook them. Griff had cut the liver and it was ready to fry. Never said a word, he just went and got a skillet and put the skillet in the fire and fried the liver. And boy was that wonderful. So he asked me that night, he asked me what I was doing, so I explained that I was chopping off trails and supposed to work on this cabin. He said, “Tomorrow morning I’m going out to pick up some of my traps. Do you want to go along?” So I said yes. And he said, “It’s a walking trip.” And of course I’d have gone when there’s skunk. [laughs]

So we struck out and he wasn’t too much for talking. I asked him a few things going up the trail but everything that was nothing related to what the situation there [unintelligible] anything else. So presently—I think he’d gone maybe a mile or so—he turned around and asked me what I’d seen. I didn’t know what he was talking about. So he said, “Did you see this? Did you see that?” He told me what he observed walking up that trail. Well I thought that was funny. And certain signs. That was the end of that and we walked on, picked up a few more traps and laid them in the trail and was coming back down and that’s when I tapped him on the back. And the next place [unintelligible] just a tremendous trail coming off the mountain going down into this sort of a little pothole, slough. And he said, “Have you ever been out to that elk lick?” And I said no, I hadn’t, I didn’t know that it was an elk lick. He kind of thought that was kind of funny. He said, “You’ve got to look at these things and find out what they mean. Let’s go down there because I’ve been there many times and I’ve always caught elk in this lick and it’s a wonderful place to get up to. We can hide beside some big walls [unintelligible].”

So we went down to the elk lick and sneaked down. We weren’t from here to that apple tree from those elk in that lick. They were fighting flies and fighting among themselves and licking on this lick. Oh I think we laid there maybe an hour looking at these elk. So he said, “Let’s get up and spook them.” We jumped up and started hollering and I didn’t know what he meant by spooking them but I found out and that’s what we did. So after the elk had left the lick, we did go further. But then he started [unintelligible] and he really was laying it on me because of all the interesting things and here you can observe them and so on and so forth. So he stuck around with me, or I...

MM: Was he a trained naturalist or was this something he had acquired?

GB: You ask me about the book. Anyway, every place he went, as long as he was in the country back there picking up traps, I was with him. And I just learned so much about living in that kind of an environment that it gave me an entirely new concept. And even the telephone operator—I had to think about her once in a while. [laughs] I learned so much about fishing and things like
that and how to do things. Really, I was sort of a greenhorn when it comes to mountain living. I had spent one summer in Glacier Park, but when it comes to going up there alone. As a result of his association on that trip, I sensed something came over me that I could live in that environment by just being an explorer. He’d tell me the story, you know, he’d relate about people that had come across the plains, the early-day trappers and so on and so forth. He did for me what I guess Churchill did for his people, if you get what I mean. Well then, after that… I could go on relating this, but I never saw, I don’t think, ten people back there during the summertime. I finally got so I liked to see him, but I wasn’t yearning to see him as I was when Griff Jones walked into the camp. But when he… He’d moved. He’d picked up his camp and came up and camped with me where this cabin was. Here he had the deer, you know. When he got ready to leave, he packed up and threw a (?) over the deer, over the pack, and a leg was sticking out. I commented on it and he just give me a scary look. He didn’t care if the leg was sticking out, he had meat and that was it. Well I caught onto that when he turned around and looked at me.

I used to stay… I made it a point to stay with him a lot. In the late fall, we had work around the mouth of the canyon, you know, trail work, after we got snowed out. I stayed back there. The instructions were to come out ahead of the last storm, if you could anticipate it, over the pass. I had difficulty once—I stayed too long. Anyway, I used to stay with him. Talk about a library. Books and things of that kind. He was a scholar. There was always a mystery about Griff Jones, how a man of his, you know—Bud, I think, would tell you the same thing. I think Bud knew Griff. But any of those old timers would—how he happened to drift out there, how he happened to become a trapper, and where he came from. There was nothing ever said. I used to ask him and I never got any information from him, like a young fellow would be inquisitive. But I never got any direct [unintelligible] But people told me afterward that there was some mystery connected with Griff, where he came from. He was a pretty rough old guy. He’d go down and get drunk, you know, but at the same time, I think he had, as far as me becoming what I became… Appreciation of the mountains, I acquired it from Griff. Got me on the [unintelligible].

MM: Opened your eyes.

GB: He opened my eyes.

MM: He must have been a naturalist by...

GB: He was a naturalist. He was a naturalist. He had a lot of books on various things that he used to call to my attention to look at and read.

MM: In those days, there were people…I was thinking of John Burroughs, who sat in his little, whatever, how many acres he had up on the Hudson, and just studied it inch by inch.

[End of Tape 1, Side A]
GB: —was a person that looked into it that became acquainted with Griff. And Joe was the kind of a fellow that would sit down and visit with Griff and was a great admirer of Griff.

MM: You mentioned quite a few people on that tape, and I believe you talked about the Jefferson family. There were two boys, is that right? Duff and Frank.

GB: Yeah, Duck and Frank.

MM: And they seemed to have an influence on you. You said it had to do with forestry in terms of fire protection.

GB: There folks had a horse ranch on the Sun River and they were great horsemen. They were tremendous horsemen. And Duff especially taught me a lot about horsemanship. In fact, he and I roped a bear once. [unintelligible] But anyway, I did get a lot from the Jefferrson and we stayed together by this way: we went to this ranger school at Missoula together. We moved into that. If you could go and interview Red Stewart about us—do you know Red Stewart?

MM: I don’t think so.

GB: Well, now, you interview Red. [unintelligible] experience with him. We met one night in the Elks Club. And then when I was transferred to...

MM: Brandy, I can’t resist asking you what happened when you roped the bear. It had nothing to do with anything, I’m just curious, [laughs]

GB: Well, we got into the same difficulty you read about Russell. The story about the man roping the bear. Well we got into the same kind of a mix up. I got the rope on the bear first and I got him around the neck and I’d no sooner got him around the neck that my horse started to buck. And if hadn’t have been for the bear, me dragging the bear, and the saddle behind me and that rope hit me right here in the groin. That horse was bucking all over the [unintelligible]. And Duff was hollering for me. You know, he was a real cowboy. He was hollering, “We need to pull it,” and everything else, which I did. But finally the horse quit bucking. I guess dragging the bear didn’t help him much, you know, he wasn’t as free as he thought he was. [laughs] So Duff finally got the damn bear run around but I had him pretty well choked now. But he came to again. Duff was an awful good roper and he finally got a rope on the hind leg of the bear and he starts to (?) him. I had the rope on the neck and we choked him down until we just about thought he was out and then Duff went down and took my rope off his neck and just [unintelligible]. The bear laid there for a while and took off.

MM: It wasn’t a grizzly, was it? A black?
GB: Oh no. Yeah, it was a black bear. [unintelligible] we did rope more when we were on the...You know, people used to put cattle in the range. And my God, when the permitees weren’t around, we roped more calves than...[laughs] Just for practice.

MM: Did you enter any of the county fairs as ropers?

GB: Yeah, we rode at Augusta.

MM: You did?

GB: Yeah, we rode at Augusta. We had a Forest Service buckaroo outfits we’d put on, Duff and I, and there was two other fellows...Frank...yeah, and then there was a fellow by the name of Mud Townsend. Mud was good too. So we’d go down there, four or five of us, to Augusta, and ride in the [unintelligible].

MM: When you left the Augusta area, the Choteau area, where did you go from there?

GB: I rode horseback from the Dupuyer ranger station to Radersburg. This Radersburg is south of Helena, 60 miles south of Helena. That was my first ranger district.

MM: You were assigned to another ranger district after...?

GB: Yeah, I was only forest guard, what they call forest guard. I had taken the ranger examination, which consisted of a few written questions, but mostly interview on the part of the examiner, who usually was the forest supervisor or some of the staff. And then our abilities to handle livestock, if we could pack a horse. Everybody had to pack a horse. That’s kind of an interesting thing in itself. The day I was down to pack a horse, Duff told me that they’ve got a snorty horse they’re going to give you. So he kept me off. I went and caught the horse out of the corral. I roped him first and finally got a hold of him [unintelligible] saddled him and I could see he was snorting. So I led him over to where they wanted me to pack and I was wearing a jacket so I just pulled my jacket off and tied it over his eyes and head and that was all there was to it. I guess I won the medal right there, [laughs]

MM: You’d been tipped off. Eventually you went here to the ranger’s school, didn’t you?

GB: Yeah, I went to the rangers school two years and I think you could get a very interesting story out of Red Stewart about our coming in. We moved in. We’d just bring in our sheepherder beds and our camp gear, our mountain camping gear, and move into those university apartments, and that’s where we lived. Do you know where the university apartments are?

MM: Well, yeah.

GB: Yeah, they’re on the corner of...
MM: Yeah, they’re near our house. The ones near our house?

GB: No, no, no. The ones down on Main Street. We called them the university apartments. I think it’s just on the end of University. You know where you drive home on 93, when you get to the intersection, that’s where we stayed. There’s a series of apartments. And Red Stewart came from—he’s a little fellow—and he came from the East. All over tarnation, everybody there, you know, students living at these apartments. Red was waiting tables—that’s the way he got through school, waiting tables. You ask him about this bunch of roughnecks, Duff and Price and...

MM: That whole gang went to rangers school at the same time?

GB: Yeah, we all went to school, yeah. Yeah, we all went down there, Price and Mud, Duff and I and Stanley Allrich (?)...er...Stanley Sanderson.

MM: Oh, Sanderson...now he was the ranger...

GB: Yeah, he was the ranger up at...He was ranger first at Deer Mountain and then he was transferred up to Dupuyer and then...So we used to go to this rangers school.

MM: Was that soon after you were [unintelligible] as the ranger guard?

GB: Yeah, I was ranger guard. That’s right, I was forest guard. That was my title.

MM: And then how soon after that did you go down to rangers school?

GB: Well, in the wintertime, see. We’d go down there in winter. We’d go in there...I think the forest did get started right after...I’ve forgotten when it started. Yeah, I’m sure it started in December because and then it was terminated about April, about the time that everybody had to be back on the job.

MM: So what year was this, about 1915 or 16?

GB: Yeah, ’15. I would say ’13 and ’14, ’14 and ’15. I went there two years. Now let’s see if I could pinpoint that down.

MM: I have you down for 1914 Choteau as a summer laborer. You said that was when you were putting up the telephone line. And then 1915, you went up to the middle fork of the Flathead and you were there for three summers until 1918.

GB: Maybe I was only back in there two summers, because I could pinpoint that definitely by...
MM: But was it while you were up there in the Middle Fork that you were also going to school at the rangers school during the winter?

GB: That’s right. There was not much to do in the wintertime in the forest and so they would commit us to going to rangers school.

MM: So in addition to Griff Jones’ influence, there must have been some influence coming out of the rangers school. You mentioned Dean Skeels.

GB: Yeah, a tremendous dean.

MM: That was all happening too. So in the wintertime, you were...

GB: Yeah, yeah. What should I say? Indoctrinated in the same philosophy. And the staff, the members of the faculty. Not a very big faculty, but they were all imbued with the same matter of protection and preservation and things of that kind. And he would bring—I think I mentioned this before—a German lecturer that used to come. Both winters that I was there I heard these German lectures. And he liked the Dean and I suppose that’s why the Dean got him back is because of his philosophy. And I don’t know whether this German was teaching someplace, maybe Yale or Harvard or someplace. [unintelligible] But his emphasis was on preservation: the misuse of resources that had taken place in the foreign lands, and the same thing was going to happen here if we didn’t guard it, and so on and so on.

MM: Did the Forest Service send you to...Did they supply the money?

GB: No, no. We went on our own. We went on our own. And that’s the winter I know my folks sent me money to come home for Christmas and I don’t know where they got the money but they sent me money to come home for Christmas. And I think that was the Christmas that my dad took me on about the...


GB: *The New York Times.* [laughs] We went back to the Lewis and Clark when it was time to start work again, maintain telephone lines and getting out protection organization together and that’s what we did. Spent the rest of the summers on mostly protection activities. We didn’t have lookout houses in those days. We lived in tents for look out. In fact, we didn’t have [unintelligible]. That whole big territory down to Schaeffer, down from...You know, I was back there all alone. It must have been a million acres. I could never figure it out. More than that, I know it was. I was back there and I finally ran into some crews from the Flathead once. I went down the river to the confluence of the Big River with the North Fork and I ran into some crews from the Flathead. There was two fellows from there and they were in the same boat as I was: all big territories, locating trail and climbing mountains to find the best lookout peak, because
we were looking forward to a different quality of fire protection then than just riding through the country.

MM: You didn’t have fire protection, I mean lookouts, for fire?

GB: No, no. There was no...

MM: Because you couldn’t have done anything about it anyway, huh?

GB: Oh yeah, we could have done something, because we did something. If we’d have had the lookouts and the lookouts would have been smoke chasers. The success of the Forest Service, I think, in its early days, in fire suppression, was the idea of catching fires when they were small so you didn’t need big crews. That’s why a lot of the backcountry, particularly, remains green, excepting when we got into the bad years.

MM: Now up until this time, and we’re maybe around 1920 now or so, 1918, after the first World War or just the end of the first World War.

GB: Yeah, after the first...yeah, after...I came back from the Army in the spring of 1919.

MM: Oh you went into the Army in the middle of all of this?

GB: Yeah, [unintelligible] [laughs] Ask me about what happened there, me and my brother, off the record.

MM: [laughs] Okay, all right. What I was wondering about is, up until this time, the forests of the West had not been logged? I mean of the public forests?

GB: No, the national forest, very little logging in the national forest. I would say it started...when I left the Nez Perce in the fall of 1934 and came to the Bitterroot and the first sale I had ever had, excepting sales...we had sales if we were selling timber for the mines and things of that kind. But as far as selling timber for logging, they were just at little sawmills that were in the areas that were to supply lumber for the early day settlers. That’s all it was.

MM: And when does the real fire suppression date from in the Forest Service? Was that from the very beginning?

GB: No, it wasn’t. It wasn’t from the very beginning. I think in this region we had had some serious fires and there was lots of laxness in fire suppression. At the Washington [unintelligible] and at the regional [unintelligible] they realized this, and that’s why Major Kelly was assigned to this region. I think Major Kelly came here, I would say, in the middle 1920s, because I was still on the Nez Perce. And he was really an organizer when it came to getting on top of the fire protection job. We started building lookout houses. We started getting the people out of the
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tents. We went to lookout houses and we used what we called a crow’s nest. People would climb trees where they had platforms. He (Kelly) was responsible to getting the necessary funds to organize and properly equip for fire protection.

And we did a pretty good job, with the exception of bad years like in 1934 and one other bad year. But other than that, we were very successful in suppressing fires. And the bad years, like ’34, we could even handle those if we’d have had the facilities that they have today like helicopters and things like that. Everything we did was...Until the jumpers got into the picture and, incidentally, we pioneered the jumpers [unintelligible], the first jumpers. We were at [unintelligible]. Two jumpers [unintelligible]. But after we got those, then the whole field has changed. And what I think is going to happen...I don’t think the region now recognizes what can happen in a bad fire control year. I’m thinking of the years like what happened in 1910 and what happened in 1934. I don’t think the people in charge of the forest today appreciate what can happen when you have a big [unintelligible] like they had in 1910. I think we’re going to experience it.

MM: They say that they’re building up for large-sized fires because there’s so much accumulation of old timber in the woods, but in 1910, fire was still a controlling agent in forest, so it wasn’t that. That must have been a very dry year.

GB: Yeah, it was a dry year. But I don’t go for that. I don’t accept that philosophy that there was more buildup then than now because we still have the jungles that we couldn’t get through because stands had matured and fallen down, even in my time. So this stuff about this accumulation and disposing of these kind of fuels, I don’t think it’s valid.

MM: You can have them in either conditions.

GB: You bet.

MM: Eventually you went into Idaho, didn’t you?

GB: Yeah, I went to Idaho in 1924 and I came back in 1934.

MM: Were you on the Lewis and Clark the whole time you went to Idaho.

GB: No, I was on the Helena.

MM: Oh, you went to the Helena.

GB: Yeah, see Radersburg...When I transferred from Dupuyer I went to the Helena place and Radersburg was on the Helena forest. I was working on three different ranger assignments on the Helena and was appointed assistant supervisor when I was out there. I went to Grangeville as assistant supervisor and then was appointed supervisor [unintelligible].
MM: Can you date in your own mind when you became active in the community beyond taking care of your job as a forester?

GB: Yes, very, very definitely because my assignment here to the Bitterroot had specific instructions from the regional foresters, several of the staff, concerning range conditions on the Bitterroot Forest and concerning forest practice outside the national forest and concerning grazing practices outside the national forest. And the assignment was—the emphasis was, I would say—to create in the minds of the people of Ravalli County that those kind of conditions, if continued, would be to the detriment of the people of the area. And, incidentally, I got a very interesting letter at that time that I should show you. The substance of it was...It’s just like instituting land use planning today. We instituted land use planning in the ‘30s and I’ll get you a sheet, I’ll get you something interesting.

[Break in audio]

GB: —due to land use planning in the 30s...And we did it on the basis of the Lick Creek sale. The area in the Lick Creek area that former Chief Pinchot had demonstrated these various cutting practices. It was possible to take people out there and show them what constituted good forestry practices. Now, as a result of the success of that effort...

MM: Excuse me, was that the area that Pinchot visited...

GB: Yeah, let me make a note. I learned something and I think we all did, the rangers and everyone else in the forest. And after explaining the forest practices that had been established on Lick Creek, we applied the same practices to the management of grasslands outside the national forest and inside. We tried to establish the fact in the stockman’s mind that the continued overgrazing on either the national forest lands or the private lands outside the national forest would be to their detriment. So we got about ten people in the valley to handle their pastures and the Forest Service accepted the same responsibility on their pastures by grazing them at the time of the year after they—

[Break in audio]

GB: —we established these pastures and grazed them properly and in the course of very few years, it was very easy to see the results of proper land use. When I had retired, we had some pastures that we had properly managed for—

[Break in audio]

GB: —and ranchers did the same thing and in the course of a few years it was very discernable that the kind of practices that were being employed was rehabilitating the grasslands. Some of
those areas, when I retired, we had managed these pastures properly so there was no question as to what should be done.

Now, this is a sad story about here on the Bitterroot. My successor Thurman Trosper was here three years, and he was followed by I.B....Not I.B., a man by the name of Harold Anderson. He abandoned all those practices and those relationships that we had established with the stockmen.

MM: Was there a general change in the Forest Service that influenced Anderson, or was he just that kind of a person?

GB: I think there was a general change in the Forest Service and he was very much inclined to be that kind of a person. That became evident because it wasn’t long until he was put on the council of the American Society of Foresters and I think he and Rom(?) went on to the council at the same time and it became obvious to a lot of people that the timber industry had placed them on the council of the American Society of Foresters. I think that’s a part of a lot of the intrigues that I think has happened to the Forest Service, because even when I was working, the timber industry would pick up some of our best [unintelligible] and offer them employment with the timber industry because these people knew that they knew the inner workings of the Forest Service. As soon as the person became employed by the timber industry, I say one chance in 100, the Forest Service wouldn’t have taken them back and they were trapped so they had to stay and advocate the philosophies of the timber industry. It was that simple.

MM: So the real...Now, okay. When did the bulk of the timber cutting on public land really begin?

GB: Well, the bulk of it began 1935. I’d say it started in 1935. But it started in a slow way. Some of the forests, I think like the Flathead, there has been more cutting on the Flathead than I think on the Bitterroot, but I’m not too sure about that because—

[End of Tape 1, Side B]
GB: We had an application for the first sale of any consequence after I came to the Bitterroot. Now, but we must remember too that starting back in 1906, there was an application for quite a large sale on the Bitterroot up at Lick Creek, and that’s why the chief came out for the first sale. I think that was because of the high quality of timber that was in the Bitterroot, in the Ponderosa Pine type.

MM: I was reading something about Pinchot, he said that Congress attempted to exclude Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming from the states that would have national forests but before they could get a bill through, Roosevelt set aside 16 million acres in those five states so that it was done by executive order.

GB: Yeah, proclamation. He set aside, during the same period...That was in the news, that article that I mentioned in last Sunday’s paper. Before they were through, they had 75 million acres set aside in the national forest area.

MM: But the reason why they started on the national forest was because they depleted the private sector. Is that why the pressure came?

GB: Yes, and I think the Bitterroot provides a very good example of that. In 1935, the—let’s see now, I’m wrong. In 1955—wait a minute, let me get my dates.

GB: I retired in 1955 and prior to my retirement, we had been trying to impress the local people, as well as the timber industry, that their supply of timber was approaching exhaustion. Shortly after my retirement, all the private timberlands on the Bitterroot that we would consider log-able were exhausted at that time. So then there was no other alternative but for the timber industry to influence the administration and also influence members of Congress that the old growth on the national forest should be cut. So they resorted to various means to do it, but the most effective means they resorted to was to influence President Nixon while...President Johnson had increased the allowable cut, but the pressure wasn’t as great as when Nixon took over and he increased the allowable cut from 5.6 billion to 10.6 billion. In some areas, that volume was exceeded.

MM: And all this time, the private forests were so depleted that there was nothing left for them to work on, or were they concentrating on the public lands and preserving the private lands.

GB: No, it was a matter of exhaustion of timber on the small private land-holdings, but nevertheless, the large timber industries saw this coming and, of course, they had acquired vast holdings of timberlands. So they weren’t pinched as badly as the people that owned mills that didn’t have any private land to get their timber off of.
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MM: I see, so they relied totally on the public lands almost from the beginning then?

GB: Yeah, from the beginning of the, after the exhaustion of the timber on private lands, then they were dependent upon timber on...

MM: I had heard somewhere that Burlington Northern did not lease its lands out for timber harvest. Burlington Northern kept its lands in better management, say, than...and allowed that public lands could come first in terms of harvesting.

GB: Yeah, I'm sure that's true because I know that in the Pacific Northwest, that's what happened. They retained their timber on the private lands and sold timber from national...Yeah, acquired timber from national forest land. And that's been one of the big complaints from conservationists, especially the Sierra Club, why they had maneuvered things that way.

MM: Yeah. In the valley, going back a little bit. So you were supervisor for 20 years, right?

GB: Twenty years.

MM: And in that time, was the Forest Service consistently behind you in your conservation efforts, or were you beginning to feel changes?

GB: Yeah, I started to feel the changes during the McArdle regime as Chief but not as much. But nevertheless, during that same period, we received telephone instructions from the Washington office—from the regional office that had been passed on the line from the Washington office, and the regional office in turn passed it on to people in the field. The substance of the warning and instructions was that we shouldn't institute any regulatory action that would create appeals to members of the Congressional delegations. But the word was passed on and some rangers heeded it and some didn't. The people that didn't heed it—we had a case here on the Bitterroot with Ranger McDonnell that they wanted to transfer him from the forest because he had exercised his regulatory authority in managing livestock. That was a rather interesting case and Congressman Metcalf—he was still a Congressman—he came to Mack Refcuel(?) and told the regional forester to collect the trespass fees from the trespasser and he told the trespasser—this was in a conference among the four of them—he told the trespasser to pay the fee and he turned to Ranger McDonnell and commended him and said to Mack to go ahead and do his job. I think we have touched on this aspect of it, Mavis, but I think that emphasizes the support that the Forest Service had at one time from the Congress. They could expect that kind of support, if you get what I mean.

MM: Was this in the 1950s?

GB: Yeah, this was in the 1950s. I can well date it because it happened in '54 and I retired in '55 and I happened to meet Lee on the street going over to meet with the regional forester, the
trespasser, and Ranger Mack and he told me what he was going to do and I found out that evening from Ranger Mack what had happened.

MM: Was there much pressure on the forest in the Second War, I mean in the national forest?

GB: Yes, there was pressure to increase livestock, you know, number of livestock grazed on the national forest and number of sheep that were grazed, because even when I came to the Bitterroot...I overlooked this in my previous comment concerning exercising our regulatory responsibilities on grazing. The regional forester said that he thought that we should take all the sheep off the Bitterroot Forest. And I’m happy to say when I retired we took off 30 bands of sheep. I don’t know—that would be better than 30,000 sheep off the Bitterroot National Forest. There was only one small band of sheep—I think 300 or 500 head—that Ranger McDonnell still had on his district. But he had arranged with the fellow so that he would take them off within a year or two. So the sheep grazing was all discontinued from, I would say, 1935 to 1955 on the Bitterroot. And our ranges were on the comeback, but I don’t think by and large the ranges are in as good a condition today as they were in those days.

MM: When [unintelligible] to the multiple use, did the concept of multiple use...Was it a concept original to the national forest, or did it grow out of pressure on the forest? Was it a concept always there that the forester didn’t...multiple use...or was it in response to pressures for one kind of use on the forest, such as lumbering?

GB: Well I received a letter the other day from a man in California that wanted me to identify, wanted me to send materials from my files to identify when the concept of multiple use was, I would say, applied in the Forest Service. I had so many things in my files that I wrote and told him that to trace this out it would be physically impossible for me to do it, but he was at liberty to come up and go through my files and establish when that occurred. What I think, that the concept of multiple use always existed in the minds of foresters in my day because I know when other uses of the forest started, admittedly, we made quite a lot of mistakes, such as timber production, timber sales.

We were careful about managing those timber sales not to impair the fishery or game resources. We realized at that time that you couldn’t remove all the timber and still maintain game supplies and I think the question of water was foremost in our mind because the national forest had been created primarily for the protection, to provide water for the irrigate-able lands in the (?) Mountain Valley. So I was thinking about it—in fact, I replied to the letter. I said it would be a difficult thing to establish. Now, I know they passed the Multiple Use Act in 1960 and did some interesting things concerning the enactment of that Act and I have it someplace in my files where the Chief, McArdle, wanted it understood by the Congress. He got his concept inserted, I think it was, into some of the Congressional records—or, what is it?...the other thing they have in the Library of Congress?—that these five or six uses must be balanced. So that in itself indicates that the philosophy of the multiple use existed throughout, I think, right from—I wouldn’t say the beginning, but...
MM: Pinchot never wanted the forest locked up. He and John Muir apparently disagreed strongly because Muir wanted wilderness as such, land that was not used in any way, and Pinchot really believed—because, I suppose, of the influence of the German foresters when he was in France and Germany—he believed that the forest should be used, managed correctly. But the emphasis on timber cutting really didn’t come along for quite a while, did it? I mean, in any large amount. That this was a reserve of timber for emergency use or for special use, but not just opened up for the...

GB: Rapid exploitation.

MM: Yes, and in replace of private timberland.

GB: It’s absolutely that. It can all be definitely pinpointed to the exhaustion of timber on private lands and the installation of sawmills in all areas far exceeding the sustained yield capacities of the national forest, which left the timber industry with no other alternative than to over-cut the national forest. Incidentally, I just got...Somebody from Washington sent me a copy of a talk that the Chief had made over at this winter’s logging congress at Spokane. Admittedly, he’s now questioning whether this rapid cut-out of the old growth was in the interest of the people of the nation. It was very interesting. And he also questioned whether, in the years to come, that we won’t regret over-cutting as we have, because, anticipating a greater demand for timber in the future than we have had, you know, during the past years of over-cutting. Interesting bloke.

MM: Well I think the large forests like the eastern hardwood forests have been timbered and now it’s very hard to find that kind of wood for furniture—oak, these kinds of hardwoods. Now in the west, as I noticed in the article on clear cut crisis, the Ponderosa, which I guess is the better of the pines, was taken off first, wasn’t it? And the over-cutting started with the Ponderosa, didn’t it?

GB: Yeah, right here in the Bitterroot it started with the best species all over, wherever the area might have been. For instance, the fir on the west coast and the Ponderosa pine in the Ponderosa pine regions of, say, Region 1 and other regions. It was the choice stuff. Now they’re down to—well, I came through Montana on this recent trip that I took and here was just lodgepole pine that wasn’t six inches in diameter. Just sticks. They’re down to the last.

MM: These little cabins up along the Bitterroot that they’ve got all these pole places, now there really are more there now as you go up 93. There must be five or six places selling poles. One’s building houses out of poles. Those are very narrow, aren’t they?

GB: Yeah, those are lodgepole pine that they’re getting from the national forest and they’re not as good. The quality of the log isn’t as good as it used to be, but there again, I think that goes back to the bug epidemic that we had in the late 20s and early 30s that killed all the mature
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stuff, the mature lodgepole pine. Then these logs that they’re getting today are some of it from what we could term second growth today.

MM: There was something else. I was following your line of thinking and now it’s going out of my head. I was wondering about farming. Did farming and clearing of land also push timber people up into the national forest, or was this whole valley ever all timber or did it always have cleared areas that were naturally cleared areas?

GB: No, I don’t think the pressure of agriculture in any way had any relation to the pushing the people back into, say, mountainous areas. I think that pressure came, I think, was the realization on the part of the people in the valley and people that had been working as lumberjacks and so on and so forth. They’d go out and homestead lands or buy lands from the railroad company that had heavy stands timber, realizing that someday they could dispose of their timber to the timber industry and that’s what I think created the pressure that caused people to take out the forested lands. And, incidentally—if I can remember this figure—we did some research. The research department in Missoula did some research here on the Bitterroot and, if I remember correctly—I could look this up—that their findings was this: if the private timberland in Ravalli County had, from the outset, been managed on a sustained yield basis, it was their findings that 25 million feet could have been cut annually forever.

MM: And that would be sustained yield.

GB: Sustained yield. Now the same thing is true in the Bitterroot. The Bitterroot could have cut—if it hadn’t have been for this pressure that I previously mentioned under administrative directive—the Bitterroot could have easily cut, I would say, 25 to 30 million feet forever. As it is now, I think if they can cut—unless they invade the watershed lands—I don’t think they can cut five million feet on a sustained yield basis.

MM: Now one thing that’s always concerned me and bothered me is that timber, when it was used lumber years ago, made an item that lasted a lifetime or several lifetimes. A house may last for generations, several, three or four generations. Now they’re using lumber but they’re making things so flimsily. In Missoula, those Curran (?) houses that sit up there on the hill, the wind blows right through them and they probably won’t last very long. Then there’s continuous draw on the forest to replace timber that should have lasted longer. What I’m saying is that you wouldn’t need to draw on the forest as much, perhaps, even with the population growing, if things were made to last for 50, 100 years and were reused and recycled and continually reused. I mean, these chairs here are solid. They will last 100 more years, probably.

GB: I think what you’re talking about, Mavis, is our whole problem. You take this very house. This house was built in about the turn of the century and it’s just as good today as the day it was built. Okay, now, when you think of...I can give you a little illustration. I was down the other day, they were tearing down the courthouse here at Hamilton. I called up a friend of mine. They were going to start that next day to tear down the courthouse. So I didn’t need any doors or
 anything else but I’d been over to a neighbor who was adding an addition to his house and he was putting on a door, so I asked him how much the door costs with the hinges and he said 50 dollars. So here were a lot of doors that they were going to be just smashed and torn out. So I called Dr. Jellison, who is retired, and I said, “Bill, let’s go down there and take off some of those doors. I don’t know what we want the doors for, but we’ll give them to someone.” Okay, we went down there and asked to take off the doors.

GB: We were informed that we couldn’t do it. I said to the fellow, “Well, how about taking off some window casings?” This was the best lumber that was ever put into any building. He said no, we can’t take...The contractors had bought this and we can’t take anything out of here. Well, here it was all maple floor. The whole building was floored with maple and I said, “My God, somebody ought to just cut a big section of this and tear it out.” And windows. I said, “Now, there are a lot of people right here in this valley, and I can take you out and show them to you, that have got cardboard nailed over the windows because they haven’t got money to buy windows.” I said, “This is a shame to do this.” Well, we both came home without...Our pickup was empty. We had nothing.

The next—no—two days following, I went down there and here was a big crane just pounding that building to pieces, a big massive crane. And as I was standing, I walked over to a fellow that I knew, an old timer here in the valley and he said, “Brandy, I could cry,” and he pointed up to a door and here was all the electric lights, all the lights that was in that building still there and here was a door on the second floor just hanging there waving in the wind. We could see all this good stuff and they were smacking it down, tearing it up, and we were looking at the stuff that had been knocked down and I don’t think there would be 5% of that lumber that was in that building that was usable. Now the brick was the same way, but the percentage that the brick that was usable would be higher, but a lot of the brick was just destroyed. Now I’ve been in this city since [unintelligible] seen those big old cranes just hammer down buildings and not use a thing. This old profit motive of ours, instead of thinking about social needs and cultural needs and, as you said, the shortages in this country are all of our own doings.

MM: I think in some areas in the East, and even in Denver, Colorado now, in the past ten years or more, they have wrecking crews that go in but they dismantle buildings because people are now getting more interested in using old things and they take them. Either antique dealers come in first and buy off lights and stairs, old staircases and newels, so some of this is being preserved. But in Montana, Montana’s still psychologically in another era. I notice what people find of value, and it’s still, oh, maybe 20 or 30 years ago what was of value. And it’s the newest and the best and the brightest and the shiniest. That’s changing in other parts of the country, but it’s discouraging.

GB: Here was a banister, you know that was going up that step, and here was the things on the stairway that was, oh, just out of this world. And somebody that wanted to have something
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nice could have taken that banister and it would have been a real asset in any home. It was just the same old stuff.

MM: Well, in Denver people that are building houses fight over stained glass windows and old pieces of marble and all kinds of stuff.

GB: I wanted this fellow that I was standing by, I said, “Well, why don’t you write a letter to the editor. It seems to me that the county commissioners were derelict when they didn’t permit...The people of this valley had paid for this courthouse and the people of this valley should have been entitled to at least go in there and dismantle anything that they wanted.” Well, he said, “You write a letter.” I’ve been in so many hassles over this timber stuff I thought I better not do that. I did try to get two different people to write that letter. I rough drafted one for a fellow and this was a very capable fellow. He could have finished that thing in. For an economic reason, it was an economic reason, he said, “No, I don’t want to do it. I’ll get in bad with the commissioners. I’ll get in bad with somebody else.”

MM: Would Miles Romney not write an editorial?

GB: Yeah, Miles would have written an editorial. And if the lady had been running the newspaper, had been still running the newspapers that was running it in Miles’ absence, not only the editorial would have been written, but a lot of other things would have been written about.

MM: Brandy, do you want to discuss what happened in 1948 on the tape, or do you want to just discuss that off the tape?

GB: About what in 1948?

MM: Your security probe.

GB: Oh, yeah, I don’t mind discussing that on the tape or off the tape. [laughs]

MM: Well, I’d like to know how it happened.

GB: Well, you can imagine how it happened, couldn’t you? I was concerned over land use problems and I was particularly concerned about what the company was doing, cutting lands in Rye Creek.

MM: Which company was that?

GB: The ACM. They owned...The MP owned land in there and the ACM owned land in there. So they were cutting under very destructive forest practices. And the Forest Service was interested in trying to prevent it. We even tried to offer to exchange timber, give them timber on
government lands providing they would practice something near a sustained yield, manage on a sustained yield basis, with the understanding that the government, they would donate the land to the government after they had cut it all. Well that didn’t work. Lubrecht, who was then manager of the Anaconda Mill at Bonner was very much in sympathy with them. Put it up to the directors in New York and they turned them down. So, anyway, I was complaining about that and I was complaining about a few other things that were happening around here and, for some reason or another, these, well, it was during the McCarthy Era.

MM: It was a little early, even, for the McCarthy Era.

GB: Was it a little early?

MM: Well, he was in Congress, and Nixon was beginning to work on Alger Hiss about 1949.

GB: Whatever it was, that attitude existed. So the first thing I knew that I had been reported as being a communist and I had been reported as being a socialist, well, it didn’t take much in those days to get people all worked up about what you were. And there’s two persons still living right here in the valley that was instrumental in reporting me. Then I think when they start investigating you they go way back and they followed my tracks on the Nez Perce. And they hit one or two people over there that said they’d heard me say this, that, and the other thing. And nobody knew who the accusers were, of course. They were kept quiet. Anyway, that’s the kind of background...Oh yeah, and then we had a man here on the forest that had been shell shocked. He was a vet, you know. And wasn’t very stable. And I guess maybe I had...He was in charge of grazing and I guess I pushed him a little too fast and wanted to do things and we had a ranger up at Darby that was the same way. He was on the same district as this ACM cutting was going on and I wanted him to get involved and I was pushing him and he didn’t want to get involved.

Anyway, to make a long story short, I received a letter that I had been accused of these kind of things and they wanted me to make a reply. They had sent me a list of questions, damndest foolish stuff that I had ever heard of. Well I didn’t answer them very thoroughly. I sort of insultingly answered them. I didn’t know too much about it. Finally, Benny Devoto(?) and...I went to Joe Howard and told Joe what I had been accused of and Joe really got excited and so did the Attorney General Bottomly. Attorney General Bottomly I’d served with, you know, as a member of the State Board of Education. Then we had this Montana Study Board and I was one of its prime advocates. You know what the Montana study is?

MM: I heard a little bit about it but not a whole lot.

GB: It was handled under the auspices of the University. We got a grant from—I don’t know where the grant came from. I forgot that, had nothing to do with that. But Dr. Melany(?) got the grant and we had this Montana Study. The study was aimed at stimulating—analyzing first—local problems and then developing action programs. Well it was during a political year
and the special interests—anything they didn’t want, it was that kind of a state. People looking into things themselves. Well, that became involved. They were saying that was communistic and socialistic and a lot of other things that I’d been working with in the University, you know, involved in. They had some pretty good people down there—Dr. Saverey(?), Dr. Atkinson, and so on and so forth—that were digging into this, that, and the other thing.

Well, anyway, I had to go through...They sent me another letter or two about this and that and I was, as far as trying to explain it, I don’t know it would be just like me telling you you’re a communist or a socialist now. If you get it in writing, what do you do about it? The next thing I knew they said that I had to go through a lawyer here, so I did. In the mean time, Benny Devoto and Joe Howard and Dick Bottomly were advising me. [laughs] Gathering up the witnesses and so on and so forth. Finally, the [unintelligible] come off. I asked Dick, I told him I’ll have to get an attorney to defend me to [unintelligible] and he told me to go see Russell Smith and I did. I asked Russell if he would take the case and Russell said that he was so tied up with stuff that he couldn’t possibly [unintelligible]. I didn’t have much time, either. So I went and got...He suggested Mulroney. I didn’t know Mulroney. Did you know Marcus Mulroney. Well he was a tremendous fellow and a wonderful attorney—outstanding. So Mulroney took the case. Can you imagine yourself going up into an attorney’s office and having to ask somebody to defend you for this kind of stuff? Well, that I did.

It didn’t take long until we had the hearing. Who appeared as my witnesses I really should tell you. The chief justices of Montana, Hugh Adair; Lee Metcalf, who was associate justice; two retired associate justices; the attorney general Dick Bottomly; one University President, Jim McCain; Joe Howard; and some of my former Forest Service workers. So we just overwhelmed them.

MM: Do you think this whole thing was inspired by timber interests?

GB: I think timber interests...I always suspect that they had something to do with it, because of my aggressiveness over what I was doing up there. But they’re sharp. They do it in a different way. They go to a ranger and they say, “Did you ever hear Brandy say anything like this?” You know, they don’t pin it right down to their particular concern. They’re shrewd. These fellows didn’t understand and didn’t know and bought in on something.

MM: Any time you can dig up some employees who don’t like what their boss is doing...

GB: Oh yeah.

MM: That’s easy.

GB: That’s easy. So that’s as much...Sometime if you want some good reading, come up. [laughs] I showed you the document, didn’t I?
MM: Yeah, you did.

GB: There’s some interesting letters in there.

MM: How much of your life did that take out, a year?

GB: Oh, no. That damn thing dragged out for two years. You can imagine what you’re living under in those kind of circumstances.

MM: Did you feel you had the support of the Forest Service in Washington during that time?

GB: Hell no, no, no, no, no, no, no. I sure didn’t. But I had the support of Lee and Lee was elected to Congress. That was about the time Lee was first elected.

MM: ’48?

GB: ’48. I forget. But when he got back into Congress, did he follow that damn thing right down to the...Lee just took after that like a tiger, because I know Lee, you know, the whole time I was supervisor and when I first came, Lee was I think county attorney here in town, so there was no question about he knew me. Anyway, that’s the way she goes. But I stood my ground and I wouldn’t run under cover.

MM: Some of this is just picking up things that I had questions on, Brandy. It’s not necessarily in any kind of order. But you mentioned on that tape that you did while you were on the trip something about this educational program that you had in Ravalli last winter, was it? Or was it the winter before?

GB: No, it was last winter. All I did, Mavis, was to these people had signed...I had in mind that we had to do something to prevent or change the attitude of the people in the Department of Agriculture so that they would be explaining to people what’s happening to the forest resource. That was the primary reason. And I was waiting for an opportunity to find out how to implement that idea. So here again I think everything on this forestry issue that, because it’s been right, has fallen into place.

[END SIDE A]

GB: That’s when I [unintelligible] the fellows together that had been providing material to and said, “Now, let’s try to draft a letter to EPA asking for a study of two timber sales,” and they agreed. So I and another fellow drafted a letter and Rudy helped. Everyone signed it. Eleven people signed it, including the chairman of the RC&D, with the understanding...He didn’t sign, he signed as a supporter. But the fact that they had read—it’s right here, all of it, I think. Yeah, here it is, right here. This is just some of it. They read the talk by John McGuire on land use planning that he’d made at Las Vegas, Nevada, on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture and it...
was superb. It was just exactly like the instructions we received way back when during the F.D.R. days.

MM: Do you think your boss knew that he was saying this for the Secretary of Agriculture?

GB: Yeah, I’m sure he did because it was getting tight for the Secretary of Agriculture and here was another talk that was made by the person in the Forest Service by the name of Dr. Thomas C. Nelson. He was deputy chief and that was on the public involvement. Then here’s a reprint from the Department of Agriculture yearbook on how to manage water. And here’s another talk by...I don’t know who this is, but the title of it is “Keeping Up With Tomorrow.” Okay, that was some of the material. And then, I don’t know if you’ve seen the six inches of topsoil book that someone in Denver gave Cliff Merritt $2500 to distribute this book, to buy them and distribute them free, a conservationist. And I’ve got a copy downstairs. Well, it was that book and then it was this book right here, *The Last Stand*, by Daniel Barney. Dale and I toured [unintelligible] Daniel Barney. And there were two or three other books that we got them to read, you know, and other material. Anything that I saw that would create a better understanding on their part, and it worked just superbly.

When we had the hearing after we had sent the letter to the EPA, the chairman of the group received a call from Denver saying that they wanted to send over somebody to interview the group that had signed the letter. So we got together, decided who was going to handle what aspects of the whole thing. Then the fellow came and did those farmers and private landowners and everybody else did just a superb job. We told them not to exceed five, six minutes to tell this whole damn story. [unintelligible] Ruth acted as chairman and checked the time so we didn’t go over.

MM: You were all primed, you were all prepared, you had done your homework.

GB: Done our homework. One of the fellows was just pleased to no end. Now, I think...

MM: You’ve done this kind of thing before, have you?

GB: Oh yes. You just read one page while I run down and get something for you. Just read that one page. This is old, see. This letter was signed by Darby Lions Club, The Stevensville Grange, The Hamilton Chamber of Commerce, The Ravalli County Farm Union, The Stevensville Civic Club, The Ravalli County Fish and Wildlife Service, The Bitterroot Forest Service, The Ravalli County Post American Legion, and the timber industry. Way back in 1954. All you need to read is just part of it and I’ll go down and get those pictures.

[Break in audio]

GB: I told you about this Lick Crick [unintelligible] 1907 and it was defeated in 1911. The sale area comprised 1,916 acres—that was in the Ponderosa pine type—and 219 in the Douglas Fir.
and spruce type. And the age of trees was from 200 to 400 years old. The value per acre was 20,000-some feet. It was logged by shoops and horses and some steam [unintelligible]. Now, I guess that’s it. Nobody knew how to mark timber, so the chief came out here himself, took a bunch old broken down—there were no broken down rangers in those days—but he took the rangers and showed them how to mark timber via the sustained yield. Ask where sustained yield come from, now how can you pinpoint sustained yield? So some areas that they cut [unintelligible] and I can show you [unintelligible].

MM: Marsh, George Perkins Marsh was talking about sustained yields back in 1860.

GB: Yeah, 1860. Now here’s areas that have been cut differently, see, just leaving one tree. [unintelligible] And they purposely did that with the idea that they’d come back every ten years and every 20 years we [unintelligible] up until 1958 (?) When was the last [unintelligible]

MM: ’48 [unintelligible] Well and that’s...Oh, wait...

GB: Yeah, ’48.

MM: [unintelligible] ’55 [unintelligible]

GB: Yeah, the Forest Service has picked some of these up. Okay.

MM: Excuse me a minute, were these trees that are coming up in here, are those natural rejuvenation or were they planted?

GB: Yeah, it’s natural. They just didn’t have money in those days. The [unintelligible] knew how to do it. He told me afterward, “if we’d have had the money to see...I told they boys, I told the rangers that if they could come in here and scar fire...” You know what scar fire is? Well, drag something down to the woods so it disturbs mineral soil. See there’s a blanket of humus on the ground and the seed falls and if it isn’t a good, if it isn’t [unintelligible] soil, it doesn’t germinate.

MM: You disturb it, like with a rake so...

GB: He said if we had done that...He always talked about it...

MM: It would go faster...

GB: Yeah, it would regenerate faster. Now you asked me a little while ago, “Do you remember how we got people involved in good land use?” If I made one trip up to that area, with people in Montana and old Mr. Lubrecht came up here once with the regional forester and that’s how they happened to acquire the Lubrecht Forest. If it hadn’t have been for that, they’d have never got the Lubrecht Forest. Somebody ought to go through the files, the minutes of the board meeting—
MM: What was Lubrecht—he worked for Anaconda?

GB: He was manager. He worked for Anaconda. He was the big shot with Anaconda at the Bonner Mill.

MM: And was that Anaconda land that is now Lubrecht Forest or was it his?

GB: Yeah, it was Anaconda land.

MM: But he got it as a gift to...

GB: Yeah, they bought it. There were some parcels in there that they were going to buy and did buy and turn it over to the University. And Lubrecht was so pleased with this kind of stuff that he wanted the University...

MM: As an experimental forest...

GB: Yeah, to have an experimental forest and manage lands the same way. Well, the pressure came on Lubrecht like it did on others. They started cutting and they had to cut more, you know, the directors who let him manage it the way he wanted. Now, to make a long story short, after all these years, the Forest Service went in there and cut every solitary tree—big, small—down and you see those trees in the background there, the smaller ones? They’ve got about a 40- to a 60-year age class. That’s all that’s left on that whole Lick Crick experiment station, excepting 67 acres that we saved because of studies that the research department down at the University had.

MM: I think you are out permanently, Brandy, because we used both sides of that one.

GB: Okay.

MM: But this one’s still going. And I don’t have anymore. Well, tell me, this was the area that was 1,900 acres?

GB: Yeah, 1,950.

MM: And all but 67 were just cleared out?

GB: All but 67 were cleared out. And the 67 acres, they was...we’ve cut three times. And if you come back here in the summertime, I’ll take you up on the 67 acres and show you something. We continued to practice the same kind of forestry that the old chief had said, “You boys keep on doing this and you manage the Bitterroot this way.”
MM: What year was that when [unintelligible] was taken off?

GB: In 19...

MM: ’35?

GB: No, no. 1907 to 1911.

MM: No, but when they...

GB: Oh, oh. When they cleaned it?

MM: Yeah.

GB: Oh, no, it was cleaned within the last four or five years.

MM: Oh, Okay, I’ve got a wrong date down here.

GB: They cleaned it within the last four or five years.

MM: 1969 or ’70?

GB: Yeah, about 1969. In the late 60s and early 70s they cut everything that matured. Now, on the basis of that, you take a look at this chart. This chart was made on the Bitterroot. We made that chart. The purpose was to sell, to acquaint people with what land use planning meant. This was just putting ideas together that I already had. And we had a young fellow that was working in the CC camp up at Darby. He was a forester. And every time we’d have a staff meeting, we’d bring this guy down because he was sharp and he was figuring out some way to [unintelligible]. Well, this is it. And it was based upon the social and economic security and it involved management of wildlife. What are those things?

MM: Grazing, timber, water, recreation, work projects. And this is the educational part?

GB: That’s the educational part and that’s what...We did this [unintelligible]. I applied that same philosophy.

MM: I remember that map that you had at the Wilderness Association meeting in December. You have a very good presentation with that map. It was very clear as to what’s happened to the valley [unintelligible]. Well, that was then subdivision.

GB: This could be done again. We could prepare this. I haven’t been to a planning board meeting yet because [unintelligible]. I could take this and...That’s why I think it’s got to be done on an individual basis, as I said this morning.
MM: The thing that happens is that we get to an impasse and then something blows and then everybody gets stirred up and wonders how it happened, where it had been going on all along. You’ve got a planning board that’s not planning, and they’re going to get something. They’re going to get a rock. And then when they hit the rock, the whole community would be up in arms: “Why didn’t we do something about this 20 years ago?” or something like that.

GB: I ordered 200 of these, Mavis. Here’s another book. [unintelligible] Have you ever seen that?

MM: No. Seven thousand years of land use? Or bad land use.

GB: Yeah, when he left, he was assistant chief of the...I knew Loudermilk, he was in this region years and years ago. They needed that and they called this watershed scientist and they picked Loudermilk to become assistant chief of the soil conservation service. They went to Washington. But when he left Jerusalem...Read that aloud, because he was making a speech, you see, at nationals.

MM: “When invited to broadcast a talk on soil conservation in Jerusalem in June 1939, I gave for the first time what has been called the 11th commandment as follows: Thou shall inherit the holy earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productively from generation to generation. Thou shall safeguard thy fields from soil erosion, thy living waters from drying up, thy forests from desolation, and protect thy hills from overgrazing by thy herds that thy descendants may have abundance forever. If any shall fall in this stewardship of the land, thy fruitful fields shall become sterile, stony ground and [unintelligible] and thy descendants shall decrease and live in poverty or perish from off the face of the earth.”

GB: You got that on your tape, didn’t you?

MM: Yes. Tell me, in Sweden, before your family came to the United States, did Sweden have forest practices, management practices?

GB: Oh, I’m sure they’ve had management practices for hundreds of years.

MM: Now all of these immigrants who came here, lots of them didn’t seem to—not your parents—but I mean lots of people obviously came here in the 1860s and 1870s and so on from Europe, where they were already managing forests and farms in Germany, Sweden, and knew it all and yet didn’t carry over.

GB: Yeah, it did carry over.
MM: But that myth of superabundance in this country, which has been the core problem, that it was going to go forever and last forever and that what happened in Europe couldn’t possibly happen here.

GB: Yeah, because of the vastness. I tried to emphasize this with the [unintelligible]. [laughs]

MM: You should be known for your enemies, Brandy.

GB: Well, but here at this firm we had out here when the legislators came over, I tried to draw a comparison. And I said there is a difference between the early settler and the land manager today. And I said right...Stag get up and made a speech. So I said, and oh she got mad at me because to think that Stag—that’s her husband—didn’t have the same philosophy as his father. And I could go ride with his father on the range and we’d say, “Well we’ve got too many cattle. We can’t do it. Let’s do something about it.” He was always willing to do [unintelligible] work. And now, doing something for social good is a thing of the past. Our special interests, our private enterprise that has destroyed the whole damn country and the nation and will destroy us if we don’t curb it. It’s like Loudermilk said in this prayer.

MM: You know, the tragedy of the commons is such a simple concept. It’s so easy to understand. It’s this undeniable truth. What in devil makes people so stubborn that they close it out of their minds?

GB: Well, we haven’t done anything to...This experience that I...What I renewed, as a result of my doing the same thing with these people right here that I read this stuff out of. And what they read. I went up to get my...From what I thought was going to be the hardest man to work with. And he though that I had given him this book. I had it mailed direct to him from Denver from Cliff Merritt. And he was [unintelligible] and I said, “Well, Stan, that book is mine.” So I explained how he got the book. The man gave him $2500 to distribute these books. He said, “I would like to keep it. Since I got involved in this thing [unintelligible] and read what you’ve given me, I would really like to keep this book because I’m quoting from it...I’m quoting from it.”

Well, now, what I’m saying—and that’s what I said earlier to you today—I think if we could just get a few of the boys...First could get Lee (Metcalf) to do what I suggest in that letter, then if he would do what I would suggest when they call me and the question that you raised around the dinner table caused me to think. I wrote Stewart about it. They’re just like people on a green chain, if you know what I mean. So busy that you ask them to do something and, you know, they’ve got a thousand irons in the fire. But I am going to call him tonight and tell him to go down and see Ted Roe and through Ted Roe...I wrote and told him this.

MM: Yeah, because something has to break through Tom Judge’s office. And Judge is politically so insecure right now that he will welcome doing anything for me, probably, right about now since he’s politically so nervous about his future.
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GB: Yeah. And we’ll take his future away from him [unintelligible]. You know, Doris gives me hell because I’m so rough and tough.

MM: I’ll tell you something, Brandy. When we were over in Bozeman, Bob said to Doris, “You should have had Cecil Andrus as the main speaker at this meeting and shown Tom Judge exactly who in the Rocky Mountain area we consider to be an environmental leader.” And she said, “Oh, we would antagonize Judge and we can’t do that.” I said, “I don’t think you play ball that way.” I think you play ball hard...

GB: You’re goddamn right.

MM: And Cecil Andrus at that time was really exciting on the Salmon and he was going great guns and Judge was just talking as usual. But she wouldn’t do that because she thought that we’ve got to over to Helena on occasion and work with Judge. We are just weaklings. Judge doesn’t look at us twice. The only time he looks at you is when you’ve got clout.

GB: You’ve got clout. Were you there the night that they got clouted(?)?

MM: In Great Falls?

GB: Yeah.

MM: I wasn’t at Great Falls. That was that land thing.

GB: Yeah. You should have heard what I said to him.

MM: I heard indirectly some things that you said to him.

GB: [unintelligible] tape. [laughs]

MM: Now that land use—I was going to ask you about that—that land use seminar that the inter-governmental whatever thing set up around the state, did you feel that was beneficial?

GB: I thought it was just tremendous. Just tremendous in laying background, but the people that should have been there from the Department of Agriculture were afraid to attend those meetings because they had received...And I don’t know if I’m even broken through to you with this [unintelligible]. I haven’t broken through with Doris. I haven’t broken through with...Doris was the one that refused to sign that letter. We had a meeting and she was a member of the hard core. You know, there was 10 to 12. There was about 15 altogether, and the wife of one of the fellows in the Forest Service was a member of it too. I could understand her not wanting to sign it. I wouldn’t have signed if I had been in her place either. But Doris said no, she wouldn’t
sign it, and I never asked her again. I was out there for...This is just between...You can take it off the record.

[Break in audio]

MM: —whatever we’ve got left on it. You know, I went to the part that was down on the Bitterroot [unintelligible] that evening, and as far as I can tell, it was an uninformed opinion on the whole. There were a lot of people there who had informed opinion, but then you had the other kind that said, “Well this is the way I like it and I’m not going to do anything about it and nobody’s going to tell me what to do,” and so on. And I just wonder whether those kinds of meetings are beneficial or do you just come out there feeling an impasse.

GB: No, I was given a shot in the arm when I attended the meeting. [unintelligible] We attended the conference at Great Falls and I sensed right from the get go that here was the same element that you’re talking about trying to divert the tension from the basic and fundamental thing that that conference was about. That Jerusalem lady and the other people that participated in the conference kept their eye on the ball and just kept hammering at it and that comes back to what we were doing here this winter. Ruth and I and Doris—Doris got in with me on this distributing the book—so between Ruth and I and Doris, we planted at least 75 of those. You could write to Cliff Merritt and get it, the book. You’ve got his address? 4260 [unintelligible]. But those are the kind of things that still could be done by enough people and you could leave this planning board just sitting there in this town. As a result—

MM: But you see, what you did last winter with this little seminar you put together was that you had people willing to inform themselves and then get around and talk and disagree or agree, however, you know. But from something beyond just a gut reaction or [unintelligible]. That’s why I wasn’t so sure about that land conference because [unintelligible] I thought it was downright dangerous in some respects because you had so many people turning out for that who were opposed to any land use [unintelligible]. All Tom Judge has to do is take a reading on Kalispell, Missoula, and the other places around the state and hear—it was all taped—and hear this and he’ll say, “Oh, well, we better go slow on land use because...”

GB: Well, but they did take a reading on it. Did you see the final results of the reading?

MM: The final report? No, I didn’t see it.

GB: Oh, yeah. They presented it at the...And it was overwhelmingly in favor of land use planning. Only place that they ran into opposition...See, it got so obvious...

MM: Well, there were some places they wouldn’t even play the Guthrie film.

GB: Just at one place. And that was at Miles City. I could understand. They went down there and organized against it. Typical. That’s what I’d have done if I’d have been a part of the special
interests. I’d have gone down and done exactly what they did. They got them there and they wouldn’t even let them play it.

MM: But don’t you feel sometimes in these kind of open, unstructured meetings—and that was really pretty much that way; after the film and a few words, then everybody got up and said his peace—that that’s a kind of straw vote type of procedure and those things scare me. I don’t like the straw vote. Coburg and I disagreed very strongly on this because I said straw votes are tricky. Number one, you probably have a lot of people who never vote any other way except by somebody calling them up and saying “Do you like this style of movie?” or something like that. I don’t feel that people can just talk off the top of their heads and be considered seriously. That’s what I consider dangerous.

GB: Yeah, but see we’re not accompanying it by informational efforts for this reason: the Department of Agriculture had been free to act all during this period. It’s only you and I and the Ruths and the Dorises. Doris hasn’t got on to distributing the reading material. I ordered 200 copies at least and they’re out of print. I’m going to put 200 copies in this and I’m going to write to the Secretary of Interior. I’m just about to write because I started last fall asking on the local basis to get these and I’m all the summertime and they’re still not published so I’m going to write to the Secretary of the Interior and tell him what I’ve done and ask him if this is being republished. I’m going to write the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service. That’s who I’m going to write to.

MM: Yeah, we don’t have an Interior Department chief. I think what may seem...You see, as you say, there’s no education going on right now. If I had to go out and do a poll on somebody as to what Exxon is doing with its off-coast outer continental shelf drilling, I would probably get some kind of an absolutely fantastic response on how great a job they’re doing because everybody has seen the Exxon ads on television nightly on the news and the lovely music. And that’s the kind of education that’s going on. There’s no countering that education. We’re getting to—and this sounds very un-democratic in a way, in a large way, perhaps—but when [unintelligible] used to get out to vote, and then we decided that when we got out to vote it went against us. [laughs] So we stopped getting out the vote because, “Doggone it, if somebody wants to get up and go out to that polling booth, he probably knows more than these people that we’re scrapping off the sidewalk and getting them just to vote because we’re in a democracy and they should vote.” I think the informed opinion usually vote. In Missoula we have very good votes coming out like on school bonds and people on the school board and things like that. They’ve got to be somehow informed. And the delegation that went to Helena. [unintelligible]

GB: In a way, I wonder what happens if we [unintelligible] Missoula is that perhaps what is going to have to drain off drains off. [unintelligible]

MM: I was sitting next to a man and a woman, I don’t know where they were from. But one guy kept making comments, you know, [unintelligible] type of comments [unintelligible]. “I ought go get up there and tell those pinkos...” and he did, he was one of those loudmouths back in the
back of the room there that kept saying that land use planning is communistic, that we couldn’t
tell him what to do with his land, that he was a free American and all that kind of stuff. And he
got a lot of applause. And I’m [unintelligible] trembling.

GB: Yeah, but see we don’t stop to consider that we’ve been living under a controlled press in
Montana for so long and I think the only way to change it under a democratic process is by
providing people information and letting them figure it out themselves. And they’ll figure out
I’m not a [unintelligible].

MM: I’m with you 100%. If people will read and digest and they can then I think disagreement,
fine. Okay. As long as we both read the same thing and have been exposed to the same thing,
then maybe there’s room for disagreement, obviously. But when you get that uninformed mind
that says, “Yes, I would like Missoula to remain a nice little small town,” and that “Yes, I would
like to see the mill expand. Yes, I would like more employment.” They all are mixed up and they
don’t know what they’re talking about because they can’t have all these things at the same
time.

GB: You’re absolutely right, but as long as we continue as we are...I think a group of us could set
up a program without any question that...My God, Mavis, if I’ve spent one dollar I’ve spent
5,000 dollars from this goddamn [unintelligible]. I can’t afford it. My telephone bill was just
exorbitant. But what the hell else is there to do but keep trying. If that [unintelligible]

MM: What? Which one?

GB: [unintelligible]

MM: I handed everything back to you.

GB: Well, it’s around here some place. Well, anyway, that’s—

[Break in audio]

GB: —the need for coordination on the part of somebody like [unintelligible], someone like you
and I talking it through, agreeing upon certain things, and then developing a program based on
those kind of concepts. And we know that we could gather up the people in the [unintelligible]
Department. We know we could gather up the people in the Governor’s Resource Department.
We know we could gather up a lot of people in the Wildlife Federation. We know that the
Montana Wilderness Association is oriented that way anyway. So all it would take is people in
our respective communities doing what we tried to do here last winter. But the aim of that:
land use planning as the solution.

MM: You know, there’s a group in Missoula called the Montana Tomorrow group—you’ve
probably read a little bit about it—that John Badgley is putting together and they’re trying to
talk about population resources, language, the whole ball of wax. And they started up by joining [unintelligible] and businessmen from the area, Danny Lambros, among other people. That really didn’t work at all. There again, you had the same thing, that people weren’t reading anything. They were just gathering together and sodding off about, “Well I like having four cars in my garage,” and “I don’t see why technology can’t solve all of our problems.”

GB: Yeah, but just let’s leave that people alone. We could just, you know...

MM: When you said people who are willing to inform themselves, that’s the key.

GB: That’s the key, right there, I know it is because I was raised that way and all the way through the Forest Service we had some [unintelligible] that were the best.

MM: Tell me, you pricked my curiosity when you talked about Olis Murey and that group of people. Now, when did they come into the Montana scene?

GB: Well, Bob Marshall worked here in the region and they came into the scene, oh, I would say 35 years ago. They organized the Wilderness Society. It dragged along for years until Soneiser (?) got in there and advocated enactment of a wilderness law. Well that gave it stature. That was a tremendous fight. Kim [unintelligible], he works for [unintelligible] and that’s when they got into the act and they’re still in there some of them. That council and that Wilderness Society should just tend the council and [unintelligible]. My God, talk about scholars. They’ve got them. And they see the very thing we’re talking about. The Wilderness Society now has got 100,000 members. 100,000 members aside from the people that say they’d like to be in the Montana Wilderness Association. A lot of them [unintelligible] but that’s immaterial, they don’t care about that. The thing they care about is that they’re not reaching them.

MM: Is Montana the only state that has a Wilderness Association separate from the society?

GB: Yeah. The only state that the other organizations have got the same thing but in a different way. On a state level they’ve got the different [unintelligible]. Now you take...Did I ever show you the memorandum that I sent to Baucus?

MM: Yes.

GB: Okay, here’s what he did. You saw what he did. He organized a van. Well there isn’t anybody on that damn van. You could send Don Aldrich around the state. Don could do more—

MM: Doris and I tried. We talked to Baucus last November on this very issue and we reinforced it in December and we kept hammering away even before he went to Washington. Don Aldrich is exactly...Now I don’t know even if Don would do it. But we said, “He is the guy who would really know and understand this district and he knows the problems. He’s not a kid.” Bacchus
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has too many young ones. I mean, it’s all right to have young ones but he’s got too many and I think he doesn’t have the background therefore. He’s got too many greenhorns.

GB: Yeah, but if that van ever comes to Missoula, I would like to go down.

MM: It’s not supposed to come to Missoula because Missoula has its own office.

GB: Oh, I see.

MM: In the federal building he’s got permanent offices in the federal building. So does Melcher. They both have permanent offices in the federal building. In fact, Don...I didn’t know you could do this, but Don goes down and calls Washington out of those offices and he can talk free because they’ve got a hotline. The next time you come up to Missoula, you should go to Baucus’ office.

GB: Why don’t you go down there tomorrow and call up Ted Roe and tell Ted that you saw that I, Brandy, sent you a copy of this letter and if you’d follow through on that and call me and ask what I had in mind. He does that [unintelligible] clears it and then Ted carries it out.

MM: Does Lee have an office down in the federal building? He doesn’t, does he?

GB: Oh, no, I don’t suppose...This would be...Well, I suppose you could use their hotline, couldn’t you?

MM: Don says that it’s a line between the two offices. They can pick it up and they’re just connected like that. I can find out.

GB: You find out and if you of some way to do it and I’ll [unintelligible]. And Bill and I were having a meeting just like you and I have, you know, how to do some of these things. Telephone line? [unintelligible] Stewart call a meeting. Something had come up back there and he wanted to know the scoop. So when I got through I said...No, Dale said [unintelligible] I talked to Dale and I sat and talked to Stewart and they said to me, “Talk to him.” So what Dale wanted to do was he said, “I’m coming back and trying to get some money to fly back to testify in the Big Bear area.” [unintelligible] the money. I had told Dale that day, I said, “Why don’t you write Lauren Crack (?), and tell Lauren to pull the leg on some of the people around Kalispell and get the money.” Well, Dale said, “I think I can get the money but [unintelligible].” But he said, “I can’t afford to spend those 40 dollars. How about moving up to your house instead?” So Dale is staying out there still. That’s what you do. Now [unintelligible] got enough friends back there. They appreciate in Washington. A lot of those hard cores that are just citizens around Washington, D.C. know how hard it is for people to get in there. A lot of people would just say, “You can come on in. You go and get a taxi cab and come out stumbling in here drunk or any way you want to, anytime, come to our house and [inaudible].”
MM: Yeah, Bob has stayed with people from the Environmental Policy Center when he’s down in Washington.

GB: Sure, that’s what they do. That’s [unintelligible] bring them in. Then there is this. It’s too bad. In the same [unintelligible] as Stewart and Scott. I don’t know if it was Roosevelt when Teddy or [unintelligible]

[End of Interview]