Bill LaCroix: So this is November 22, 2013, looking at the Wilderness Society reports and minutes. 1964 annual meeting of the council.

Stewart Brandborg: Well, this report...this compilation of materials for the 1964 meeting of the Wilderness Society council represents...

BL: I just flagged that. Was that Chief Justice William O. Douglas?

SB: Yes it was.

BL: That’s cool, that’s one of my favorite hikes. Olympic National Park, the coastal strip.

SB: I’m looking for the report material of the annual meeting at the Cheff Ranch, August 8 – August 15, 1964.

[Break in audio]

SB: [Reading] “The 11th business meeting commencing on August 7th at the Cheff Ranch brought together the council, the first formal session of the governing board in the absence of Howard Zahniser.” I think it was a time of great concern on my part, Stewart Brandborg, as we proceeded to plan the year ahead. I noticed there were extensive reports at the meeting on the Montana wilderness areas’ pending reclassifications and my report to the council on the Wilderness Act and what we anticipated in the years ahead. That would be a preliminary assessment because the tremendous volume of work to be completed under the review procedures of the new law was yet really determined in any methodical assessment. I was just getting under way in looking at the dozens, if not hundreds, of units that would be reviewed under the procedures of the act, taken in separate pieces of legislation for authorization by the Congress to include areas in the wilderness system.

The treasurer’s report reflects that in 1957 annual income had been $31,700. In the current year, ’63 was reported, the previous year, it was $104,000. The reflection here is the initiation of the direct mail campaign, in which I was given responsibility, first to make my annual salary
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of $8,000, but to ultimately realize the great increase in the financial resources for purposes of
the society’s educational campaigns, particularly those in support of the Wilderness Act that
was before the Congress.

BL: So your annual salary in ’64 was $8,000?

SB: I was hired at a rate of $8,000 per annum. The treasurer’s report shows that including the
Robert Marshall fund contribution, the total operating income of the society was $194,188.94. I
was focusing some of my time, a significant amount, in the direct mail campaign effort, which
was highly productive. It enabled the society to get its feet on the ground and really broaden its
programs. In the report to the council, I, as acting executive director, allude to the conclusion of
the hearings in the House Public Lands Subcommittee, April 26 of 1964 and make the point that
this was the 18th congressional hearing on the wilderness bill between those in Washington D.C.
and at various places with the field hearings. And I allude to my report to the council to the
extended delays in gaining consideration of the wilderness bill by the House Committee on
Interior and Insular Affairs. This of course was the steadfast opposition of Wayne Aspinall, the
chairman of the committee, to the wilderness bill. And he remained in opposition. We were
blessed by the intervention of John F. Kennedy, who had spoken Wayne Aspinall, indicating, as
the quote is remembered by me, “Wayne, I want that Wilderness Act to come out of the
Congress.”

BL: Was he a Democrat?

SB: Wayne Aspinall was a Democrat from the west slope of Colorado. And I note here that the
price was Aspinall’s demand that there be affirmative action of the Congress in adding National
Forest primitive areas and units of the national park and wildlife refuge systems to the national
wilderness preservation through separate authorizing bills.

BL: So everyone had to have an act of Congress?

SB: Everyone had to have an act of congress. And that was his price, along with an amendment
that required the extension of mineral activities in national forest and wilderness lands for 19
years after the date of enactment. There weren’t any major significant losses of wild country to
the latter provision through mining.

BL: They still have inholdings.
SB: Inholdings to this day are a great challenge. Privately held lands. No effort was made to treat them or take care of them. They remained without being taken up by the law. If you had an inholding before passage it continued.

BL: What was Kennedy’s interest in it? Was he an outdoors guy? Was it political?

SB: I don’t know. I don’t believe he had any personal leanings to the wild country, but he was progressive in response to some people and we were able to reach him to get his expression of support to Aspinall. I don’t have any feeling for, and I have no recalled experience of Kennedy’s statement of a heartfelt nature that wilderness was important to him personally.

My summary to the council in the annual report points out that Kennedy had called Chairman Aspinall just a few days before his death to urge that the wilderness legislation be reported for consideration on the House floor before the holiday recess. However, it was not until early December that Chairman Aspinall announced the schedule of field hearings for January 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 in Olympia, Denver, Las Vegas on the measures before the public lands subcommittees.

BL: That was after Kennedy was assassinated. What was the mix then, after that happened? Did it go through on its own inertia because of his support?

SB: I don’t get your question.

BL: Well, did the chemistry change at all in Washington, D.C., like with Aspinall, after Kennedy was assassinated? He told him before that he wanted it through and then after was there any...

SB: I recall Lyndon Johnson’s concerted leadership with much that Kennedy had rejected in all areas of legislation. Lyndon Johnson picked up on that whole platform with vigor and pragmatic drive. His master of the legislative process as Senate Majority Leader was well established. He knew the art of congressional politics. And when he picked up as Vice President the many programs that Kennedy had launched, it was a matter of thorough, effective advocacy. He knew what he was doing, had the experience and the depth in the congress that Kennedy, of course, did not have the advantage of. Lyndon Johnson was a hard driver. He got stuff done. And he didn’t show any lessening of that push in terms of the wilderness bill.

[Referring to his report to the council]: Here I indicate that I had taken last push trips to the west to whip up support for the bills and the extensive mailing to the state wilderness committees, which we had organized. Grassroots circles of wilderness advocates that we’d built over the country were intensified to make sure that the house committee was reassured that
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the enactment of the wilderness bill was a vital priority. A trip to Denver, other Colorado communities, and also to Phoenix, Santa Fe...” Local leaders assume the initiative in mobilizing leadership for this educational effort for the purpose of presenting a factual information base about the bills to the public.” And then I spoke of my meetings with newspaper editors, radio and TV outlets in Denver in Phoenix. The proselytizing never ended. And in the essence of Zahny, I was faced with a need to cover as much of those fronts as I possibly could.

[Referring to the report again]: I make the point that the subcommittee hearings that came in January found preponderant testimony in support of the wilderness bill. Some 60 – 70% of the more than 300 witnesses who appeared were advocating enactment of a measure that incorporated the strengthening provisions of the Saylor bills. Those were our best versions with the stronger language that was central to the preservation need. And then I make the observation in the report that had become apparent in the course of these hearings that many former opponents of the wilderness bills as well as members of the House subcommittee and Mr. Aspinall, the chairman, were accepting the need for effective wilderness legislation. In other words, Aspinall was yielding to the mass of mail that he had received, the committee had received, the concerned public had written in support of the legislation.

[Break in audio]

BL: Gracie Post, she was an old Penny Cliffs, Dworshak dam supporter. As was Frank Church.

SB: Was he?

BL: Yes, as it turned out.

SB: Gracie Post, I believe, chairperson of the subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, one with whom I had a friendly relationship, and one, with her aged husband, I had rather frequent informal visits. As the tons of mail accumulated through the years of wilderness bill advocacy, Gracie remarked to me that the Congress, in the history of the United States, had received more mail on the wilderness bill than on any piece of legislation in its history. I took that as a significant indicator of our success in mobilizing the American people. Of course, we had worked every angle for outreach to the public, outreach to the media, and the result was that after 7 years there were tens of thousands of people who read the ads, responded to the calls for action, calls for mailers, thousands of people who responded by writing a letter to their congressman or to an appropriate leader of the Congress. What fun we had had, what hellish work we had done over all those years, saying “Please, if nothing else, let your congressman know we succeeded in a big way.”
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BL: Was anyone doing that to that extent before?

SB: No, it hadn’t been done to that extent. Similar technology was used, however, and this went into the training of Zahniser, his indoctrination of the defeat of the Dinosaur National Monument Dam and an encroachment for a bureau of recommendation in Dinosaur National Monument, an invasion of this unit of the National Park system. Mass mailings had been encouraged through the massive media campaign that Zahniser and David Brower of the Sierra Club had led. They had the benefit of money provided by one donor that enabled the placement of full page ads in major newspapers describing this dam, the first ever to be built as a precedent within the National Park system, as a tremendous threat, which it was, to the integrity of the National Park system. “Mail your congressman” – and that flood of mail eventually brought defeat of the Dinosaur dam as a precedent, the first time a bureau of reclamation damn would have been imposed on the National Park system. That is a story in itself, the success of which is due to the never ending, relentless work of Howard Zahniser and his colleague in arms David Brower of the Sierra Club. They gave it their all and that immediately preceded the long effort on the wilderness bill. Zahniser was consumed by that fight. The minute it was done he went about finishing the drafts of the wilderness bill and gaining their first introductions by John Saylor in the House and Hubert Humphrey in the Senate.

BL: Would it be fair to posit that the modern environmental movement was started with Dinosaur, more or less? It was called “conservation” in those days, but maybe you could call it a precursor?

SB: I think you hit a vital point. In the years before I came to Washington D.C., there had been legislative proposals to turn grazing lands of the National Forests over to the states, where they would be subject to sale to private interests, mainly ranchers. Those had mobilized citizens in large campaigns, and those threats were met by campaigns that compared to that which Zahniser employed with the Dinosaur campaign. But the direct mail campaign, utilizing full page ads and media onslaughts was uniquely intensified and refined by Zahny and Dave Brower when it came ot the defeat of Dinosaur. So you are correct, it was a new stage of environmental activism, using the media cleverly and effectively with a strategic team of Zahniser and Brower.

BL: So the grazing push was like ’30s and ’40s, is that correct?

SB: No, later than that. There had been others but it was the ’50s primarily. There was a bill introduced in the Congress to make timberlands impacted by dam construction available. A major defeat, and I am failing to get the name of the congressional sponsor, but that was a
significant victory of conservations in 1957 or ’58. These inundated timberlands were to provide timber for sale.

BL: Would it be fair to say that the Dinosaur campaign could be described as the evolutionary step between traditional conservation campaigns and modern environmental movements, using the modern media techniques and political activism that we take for granted today?

SB: I think it was a major breakthrough, the use of media and full page ads, and the retention of New York media firms. Zahniser had the council and the expertise of a New York media firm on the Dinosaur campaign. And some of the money that came from an affluent outside contributor went to the full page ads that helped defeat the Dinosaur dam. It was a coming of age, a maturity, in the environmental movement. And I reflect on the fact that this was excellent indoctrination for Zahniser in the world of the media. He and I became aware of how much could be accomplished with the exploitation of media opportunities. He, being the writer that he was, was acutely sensitive to these. And I, as a relative newcomer to the scene, and my early affiliation with the National Wildlife Federation, saw this happening. It was a major escalation and it was the first time we came out of our corners, so to speak, and blasted the other side with a media outpouring. People writing, up in arms, for the wilderness bill, against Dinosaur, as they never had before.

BL: So you just stepped into Washington D.C. in the midst of postwar liberalism. I mean, that’s pretty complex, but you know what I mean? Things have changed.

SB: Things have changed. There was a progressive move, a tidal wave as you look back on it. All the legislation after the enactment of the Wilderness Act, the land use, wild rivers, air pollution, measures that swept through the Congress. It was a new day for the environment.

BL: I don’t imagine there’s any kind of excitement like that in D.C. now.

SB: We do not see the marshalling of the public with that effectiveness in today’s congress. I can’t explain fully what’s happened to our national organizations. As you know, I personally am very fearful that they do not speak as strongly as they must on behalf of our natural resource base. That’s the subject of another conversation, I believe. In this report to the council, I have a lead in my report, the beginning and not the end, and that of course was projecting the fact that the Aspinall amendment to the act, a price for getting it out of his House Interior committee, was the special authorization of National Forest areas beyond the primitive areas, the National Park system and wildlife refuge system, each area had to be brought into the wilderness system under separate authorizing legislation. In my report here I make it pretty
clear. I am quoting, “The Wilderness Society should assume a role of leadership in working closely with the state wilderness committees, which we built in most wilderness states.”

Because of the Internal Revenue Service regulation interpretations, I could not write candidly in my report to the Wilderness Society council, or indicate publically how much the initiative for the wilderness bill depended on the Wilderness Society. The principal driver was the Wilderness Society, the principal architect was Zahniser, the principal work agent this side of Zahniser was Brandborg. We lived and breathed getting the bill through the Congress. Secondly, when they said all this work had to be done subsequent to passage to round out the wilderness system, that became our task. While the Sierra Club and global groups were immensely helpful and instrumental in rounding out the wilderness system, the master push, the coordination, the grassroots effort to activate teams fell on us, and that was the job that I faced upon passage. Having me look at my whole card, as though playing poker, whether I had a deuce or an ace in the hole, the ace proved to be the grassroots people across the land who would rally if we went to them indicating the opportunity of the wilderness law to have the areas undesignated in their state from the three public lands systems. Later we were able to get the Bureau of Land Management jurisdiction under the law. This was a tremendous task and this was the monumental work that we had to complete.

Most people across the land, with the passage of the act, felt we had achieved our goal. Well, we had just established a major beachhead in the process for gaining protection for what we now have some 104 million acres protected within the wilderness system. That grassroots work was ours. And I faced the challenge in the fall of ’64 of how to get it done. And that resulted, as I will probably point out too many times, by going to the field. First trip from Montana to Arizona, stopping in every community that Frontier Airlines served. I had a $100 ticket. I believe I started in Great Falls, visiting the members at every stop, calling ahead with the membership cards to make contact with the members, a few of whom I had known through the wilderness bill hearings, most who were contacted for the first time in their lives by my phone call. I proceeded town to town at every Frontier Airlines stop, calling ahead saying who I was, I represented the Society, and I would be in your town tomorrow for breakfast, lunch or dinner. I would like to meet with you and other Society members to talk over the work that had to be done to add, and I would name the areas in the state that were on the review schedule. The people were very sweet, generous. I don’t remember a rebuff. I would always call a few or several to see if we could meet and we would lay out the job ahead. To my great satisfaction, my first trip from Great Falls to Tucson ended with the names of people that had met with me, indicated they would join working circles to go ahead, and get the admission of these areas to the wilderness system. I met inspired, wonderful people, they had no axe to grind, their hearts were pure, they valued wilderness, they grew to the challenge, and many became lifelong
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friends. Of course, many were asked to come to Washington to testify at later stages at House and Senate hearings for the inclusion of these areas in the wilderness system. So it was a wonderful opportunity to meet some of the finest people you can encounter in this country. A great experience.

I culminated my first trip in Arizona with a man named Ted Steele who ran the Arizona Inn, for affluent people. It was a city block surrounded by a 12-foot adobe wall. Well, Steele made me a home, gave me the luxurious accommodations of the inn, we brought people from Tucson together to anticipate the work ahead, laid the framework for the Arizona wilderness committee. We called these informal groups “wilderness committees.” It was a conscious decision not to demand membership from these people, to ask them to just join us in this collaborative effort, no remuneration, volunteer work. Of course many over time became members of the Society, but they were the dearest, closest collaborators that one could find, giving of themselves to this great work. Very, very satisfying.

The beginning, not the end, then, was getting these people entangled in the laborious task of implementing the wilderness law. Well, I’m looking at this report to the council in 1964 and I speak of the growth in membership and, as indicated earlier, coming from the exposure at the National Wildlife Federation to their immensely successful direct mail campaign, I was having a field day building membership for the Society.

In advocating the wilderness bill, Zahniser pulled a stunt unequaled, and I think unreported. [Zahniser], with the first draft of the bill, printed by John Saylor at government expense, roughly six by four leaflet, I have copies, put them in franked envelopes – that is, postage paid by the Congress of the United States – of John Saylor, later by Humphrey. But back and forth between these two. He developed a program for direct mail distribution. Well, the Wilderness Society with a membership of 10, 15, 20,000 – that was all right, but that was a limited audience. So Zahniser, with his gentle, sweet approach, went to the lead officers, the working conservation teams of the National Wildlife Federation, the Isaak Walton League, the National Parks and Conservation Association, the Autobahn Society, and maybe a dozen or fifteen other organizations and asked them if they would provide labels for the franked envelopes. So, beginning in '56 with the first introduction but successively, as the bills were drafted, submitted in subsequent mailings, the wilderness law became known to some 4 to 5 to 600,000 people. He rounded up all these labels, stuck them on the franked envelopes, and found money through the Robert Marshall Wilderness Fund to get the printing done. Conservation minded people, starting in that first year of introduction by Saylor and Humphrey, were on a mailing list showing the bills, the committee reports, the progress of this legislation. So the wilderness bill, despite the fact that water pollution and other important majors being advanced by the
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conservation movement, the wilderness bill assumed number one importance in the minds of
many conservation-minded people. It had never been done before, it will never be done again,
but it was pulled off by Howard Zahniser and the wilderness bill became number one in the
legislative priorities of tens of thousands of people. Unprecedented. Bold creativity,
imagination of the Wilderness Society. Now all of this work gathering the lists of people,
processing them...I remember at one point hearings in mail sacks in one of the circular rooms at
the terminus of the railroad that connected the old Senate office building to the Senate. That
room was filled all the way around it with wilderness bill hearing reprints. It got to be a problem
of some concern, when one of our friendly sponsors said “We are having a problem, the powers
that run the Senate are saying get that mail out of here.” So we shipped those things down to
the over-crowded Wilderness Society and I don’t know where else, maybe a mailing house. It
was a necessity to get the names on them. They were in the franked envelopes, but literally
hundreds of mail sacks with these documents waiting to be mailed. That is a story that, I
believe, is unreported. It’s these things coming out periodically when Zahniser and one person
in the Wilderness Society office that care of this program of distribution, Michael Nadel,
assistant executive director to Howard Zahniser, and a very faithful, effective warrior in this
long campaign in sustaining the Wilderness Society when Zahniser was preoccupied with
legislative objectives and strategies in the Congress.

(pause)

BL: Continued.

SB: Same book?

BL: Well, if that’s what you want. Seemed like you were waxing pretty eloquent on memories
there. If you want to call it good we could do that, too. You were going to mention how
Zahniser was writing speeches for these guys too.

SB: Yes. The introductory statements of the members of Congress placing the wilderness bill in
the congressional record were contributed to by Howard Zahniser. His eloquence as a writer is
reflected in the comments of John Saylor and Hubert Humphrey and some of the other
wilderness bill sponsors. I am hesitant to claim authorship by Zahny of some of that material,
but I know he contributed significantly to it. Particularly the accuracy: there were invaluable
sources of help at staff level within the offices of Senator Lee Metcalf. I think of Vic Reinemer, a
great friend, who had wonderful journalistic experience, went to work for Metcalf as a number
one aid. These were accomplished, skillful writers. Sometimes, the ability of Zahniser would be
used by the other sponsors. I really was not privy to how much Zahny wrote for these people or
drafted at preliminary form. He was skillful at casting himself in the role of an author for whom
he was doing work and getting the job done about just right. So I’ll leave it at that. Same thing went for professional writers in the trade. If he could, he loved to see copy. Many times of course you can’t, sometimes you can. And whenever possible, he would do a job in reading over something and adding appropriate editorial remarks.

One of the unsung heroes of the wilderness bill effort through all of the years was Benton Strong. [He was] employed by different offices in the Senate, finally as an aide to Congressman John Melcher of Montana in the House of Representatives. Ben was in Senator McGovern’s office, in the office of the Senate Interior Committee. If there were one person this side of Zahniser who offered comment on every aspect of the wilderness bill, who gave not only the best editorial assistance in the drafting, the refinements, but in every strategic consideration we faced, Ben was privy to the workings of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the members of that committee, and was quick to recognize those who would give help to advise Zahny and me where we could provide complimentary information, support, or get the demonstration of support for their leadership in sponsorship and/or advocacy of the bill. In other words, if a given member needed to hear from people in his constituency, Ben would so advise us. So, a member could develop some enthusiasm and contribute through his office and staff in proportion to the words of encouragement from constituents who had written or called, thanking a given member for being a part of the campaign or the effort to get the wilderness bill through.

BL: What was his background?

SB: He had been an Iowa newspaperman and he was described by us as having two loves. Somehow, he was devoted to the wilderness law and all that it epitomized in terms of the wild country and the other was the farmers of Kansas and the prairie. He had advocated in his years as a journalist in, I believe it was Kansas, it could have been Iowa...but he was our man. He owned the wilderness bill, he owned the ups and downs in the House and Senate committee, he advised, he prepared us for the committee hearings, he monitored the friendly and not so friendly members, he was a guiding force throughout. And some place, some rushing river, we’ve got to memorialize Benton. Because he was there, and after Zahny passed, he was there for me. I remember him taking me for lunch at the Washington Press Club, which was the place that journalists gathered. He said, “Now, we’re going to get this wilderness bill through.” Of course that was my life. He let me know it was a part of his life. And our collective appreciation of Zahny made that our aspiration, to see it through. And indeed he did. Where the House conferees met with Senate conferees to iron out differences between their bills, Benton was my principle adviser. No Zahniser, so he advised me on the priorities and what we needed to get in the final law. Somewhere you and I have discovered the copy of that bill, which is marked

Stewart Brandborg Interview, OH 459-002, Archives and Special Collections, Mansfield Library, University of Montana-Missoula.
in different color pencil and ink those priorities that we needed to get at all cost, number two if it were very important, number three if it were feasible, number four give it away as trading stock. And I provided those marked up copies to Saylor, Church, and other friendly members of the committee.

BL: Now is that your handwriting? You wrote that down under Stong’s guidance?

SB: This is Anna Vee’s writing on the margin.

BL: Was she looking over it too, at the time?

SB: Oh, she was helping me. But here’s one...page 3, right margin, under “Definition of Wilderness”: “5,000 minimum acreage figure added here which is not in Senate 4. This is an important feature of the definition that has application in park and wildlife areas.” We finally got that changed to say 5,000 acres or any ecologically identifiable unit that could be recognized as a unit. So if you had a duck pond – a marsh, let’s say – or a butte on top of a plateau, that was much less than 5,000 acres, ecologically definable, you got it in the system. So we have some dandy little areas that now are part of the wilderness system. We out strategized them. “This definition is significant,” and there is some stricken language here, “This stricken language makes clear that although the legislation may allow nonconforming uses that might be interpreted as destroying the wilderness involved, it nevertheless is declared to be wilderness for the purposes of this legislation.”

Isn’t it great to find her handwriting? From freshman year in college...I took a mapping course and when it comes to taking an ink loaded pen and making beautiful marks on beautiful parchment, I could always mess it up if I moved the ruler the smear would go across the page. I said “Anna Vee, you’ve got to save me.” So that drafting she completed and I think we got a B in mapping. And she never quit. She was always there to save my bacon. And in these anxious times, where you were concerned about things and sitting there at the dining room or kitchen table, here came Anna Vee. Here are all her comments on this bill.

Well, anyway. I am referring to HR 9070 in which the strengthening amendments are written in red and explanatory comments in different color ink for different editions and explanations of the bills that were in House and Senate conference where the provisions of the two wilderness bills were ironed out. I could probably sit, and I know damned well I could sit with that and resurrect all of the fine points of refinement that came out of the conference committee.

BL: Well, here it is. We’ve got it pulled out. This is probably one of our significant documents.
SB: That one should be emblazoned.

BL: We’ll put it under glass at the Ravalli County Museum.

SB: (laughs) That’s it! [The wilderness bill should not be discussed] without mentioning Ben Strong. You know, Ben passed in my later years in Washington and I went to his funeral. There was no way that I could speak to his widow with sufficiently meaningful terms. I tried, I’m sure, but to let her know that he was the one and only...we would not have succeeded in getting the wilderness law had Ben not been there. At least Zahny would want to...he wouldn’t have wanted to make us dependent on anybody, even himself. His life ended at the conclusion of the House subcommittee hearings on the wilderness bill. He had dinner with old friends at the Cosmos Club, I believe, on the day of that conclusion, drove home fairly late, set his shoes on the steps going upstairs to their bedroom, retired, had a seizure in the night, and died. There was funeral in Hyattsville where he had lived and where his home was located. People gathered at my house. I remember Benton MacKaye and the old gentleman Anderson, both old men, sitting at 108 Lesley Court where we resided the afternoon of the funeral, both out on the front end of the living room with the big windows, leaning on their canes, visiting. They were both old and every once in a while they’d nod off. And I, as the guy who was inheriting the job of directing the society, was keeping these two old birds, in their 90s, company between snoozes. I won’t forget that scene. Anna Vee always noted it with some amusement. The old men, me included, reflecting on Zahny and what a prince of a person he had been.

[End of Interview]