Oral History Number: 413-002  
Interviewee: Guy M. “Brandy” Brandborg  
Interviewer: Mavis McKelvey  
Date of Interview: May 6, 1975  
Project: Mavis McKelvey Oral History Project

Mavis McKelvey: Well I’m not going to ask much in the beginning about the forests. I’m going to ask you more about why you think you in particular and other Montanans have decided to make a stand in this state and—I won’t say ‘at this time’ because it’s been going on for some time—but what makes this critter different from the exploiters or the ones that are out to take everything they can get? What was it in their backgrounds or what was it in their training that made them go off and devote their whole lives and their money and their efforts and so on?

Guy Brandborg: Okay, well Mavis, before I reply to that, may I ask you a question? You’ve been an activist. I would really like to identify [unintelligible] today. Now, with that thought in mind and before I develop it any more I’d just like to ask you a question: what caused you to become an activist in this? Because I think between the two of us we can trace it back to something which I think is fundamental. Now, just in a nutshell, where would you place it?

MM: It has to be...It probably grew from the time I was young, but I can’t trace it that far. I can only trace it until, say, after I was through college or something like that. An interest in birds, perhaps. Somehow, a commitment and somehow, an outrage. It could have been my grandfather.

GB: You’re putting your finger right on it. Now, I think this all comes from the family. My parents were Swedish immigrants and they came to this country, their parents came to this country, I think, for religious freedom, freedom to think, and the fact that Sweden at that time was in the same sort of shape that we’re in today as far as people are concerned. We’re overcrowded, Okay.

MM: Did they have a resource problem? Of course it was a different kind of resource problem. It was a food problem, I suppose.

GB: No, I think it was a food and a resource problem. I think their folks, their parents, urged them to get out of the nest and go to foreign lands. Okay, now, as a result of that, they came independently. They weren’t married. They didn’t even know each other in Sweden. Came from various parts of Sweden. But anyway, after they were married and took up the farm in northern Minnesota...I came from a family of ten children and everybody worked. I can recall that they were always telling us about why they left Sweden. They were looking for what I previously mentioned: religious freedom; a place to settle, which they couldn’t acquire in Sweden—the lands were gone and the resources were being well managed but they were insufficient for the number of people. Okay, now, when you wrote me the card and said how I happened to become concerned over this, that’s the same thing that I told my friend from Chicago, that if
Mother saw us throwing away bread, she said it was a sin. And if my dad saw us destroying things, breaking shovel handles and things like that in our work, he called it to our attention what those kind of things meant. Now, what I’m saying is I think we acquire this attitude towards resources and towards nature because they always impressed upon us that if we abide by the law of nature we’d be all right. Because I think I can remember when we were clearing land my dad said we’ve got to do it this way because this is the way it used to be in Sweden, you know, we did the wrong thing.

MM: I was wondering whether the attitude towards the farming was also a conservation, basically a conservation...

GB: Yeah, it was a conservation attitude and the way they managed, we cut the trees that built the houses on the place. And as far as I’m concerned, with that family training I think it can all go back and what I would like to see you do in connection with what you are doing, you trace this out with other people. Trace it with Don Aldrich.

MM: Yes, I want to. I want to find out what makes this critter different. I was reading a book last night, this man Chaffin, Glenn Chaffin. Do you know him?

GB: Oh yeah.

MM: His family settled in this Bitterroot Valley 100 years ago and they seemed decent people but they’re terribly people-oriented and everything centers more about the social customs and so on and not so much about the land and living on the land. I didn’t catch any kind of ethic in there, a land ethic, intrinsic in his grandfather that is implicit in you. I assume that they were thrifty people and they had all of the good virtues and they were honest Christians and all that, but there’s a difference running through, a thread that’s different and that...

GB: I tried to point that very thing out at that time that the legislators were here. I made a comparison between Stag Bull (?) and his father and they were offended. I never got an opportunity to explain the difference but I always sensed in his father the same attitude and ethic towards land and I named other people. Joe Bolt came to me afterwards and was just furious and said something and I didn’t pay attention to it because I get those kind of things all time. But I did write her a note and told her what I was trying to develop and I mentioned some of her neighbors at that time. This was way back in the early ‘30s with those people and we were trying to adjust grazing capacity to carrying capacities of the land. But they don’t fence it. And you’re going to find in Don Aldrich. You watch for it, because I have spent quite a lot of time with Don. I never even asked him how he became interested, but I know how he became interested because he used to tell me about fishing and hunting with his dad. The same influence rubbed off on him.

MM: We have a whole new generation of young ones in the university that seem to be trending towards a land ethic, most feeling their way because they have no background. But somehow
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they’re picking up something instinctively that they must understand about their own survival and that’s different, I think.

GB: Yeah, it comes. It doesn’t emanate from the same kind of sources I was explaining and that you mentioned about your grandfather. I think that’s where it comes. I think we establish it that way. Now in my case, this is all just by happenchance that when I left home [unintelligible] the folks just like the squirrels are doing. Mary’s going to chase those three kids off one of those days and they didn’t chase us off, they encouraged us to leave if there was an opportunity. And just by happenchance I happened to get in the Forest Service.

MM: What year was that, do you remember?

GB: Yeah, 1913. Either ’13 or ’14. I went to work at Choteau. We were building a telephone line from Choteau to Ear Mountain. We were camped, a bunch of rangers, and I was just a laborer. But I said something. They were talking about protection of the national forest. Now the reason they were talking about protection of the national forest against fire...Thinking back, there was no concept about what the national forest are going to contribute someday. There was a concept, but the important role that it was going to play in providing timber and other resources was entirely different than it is today. They had a social point of view.

MM: Well Pinchot, I understand, and Muir had those two...

GB: Yeah, that’s where it all came from. My God, all they were talking about were Gifford Pinchot and the direction and leadership that he was giving. These people were giants. These people were giants. I think until the Pinchot philosophy is revived, these kids that you mentioned, they’re still going to be floundering. But if they ever catch on to that concept that forests have a social value, which was the big thing Pinchot was advocating. He was well aware of what it could contribute from the standpoint of economics, but even in his day he could see the trend of the monopolists and that’s what he was fighting. That had so permeated the Forest Service. As I went on in the Forest Service, the emphasis that was placed on those aspects, the social implication of the contribution of this vast national forest system and other public land system could contribute to the welfare of this nation. We were lectured on that to no end. I can remember going to the university down there under old [unintelligible]. He brought a German forester out there to lecture to us. He was traveling on a traveling circuit of schools. His emphasis was all on this. He described what happened in Germany. But he always used to tell us that the materialistic man was never going to solve the nation’s forestry problems. It’s going to be the women. He came back two different years when I was down there going to ranger school. That’s the message. The dean was preaching it. The [unintelligible] were talking about it.

MM: To go back a little ways, when you started out in the Forest Service, did you feel that you were at all different from other people in the Forest Service, fellow workers? Was your attitude different, or was it a general belief in the same philosophy on that?
GB: When I started working in the Forest Service, I didn’t have any concept that they had the same concept that my folks had emphasized. I had no knowledge of that. But it wasn’t long until I could acquire that same...that they had the same sense, the same attitude, the same ethics towards resources and land.

MM: But within the Forest Service, we notice difference between foresters today and that, I assume, was that way in 1913 as well. Was it?

GB: Oh no, no, no, no, no. No I don’t think anyone, not in the ranger positions. It could have been in my status as a laborer [unintelligible]. But I suppose the reason I became a ranger because I suppose somebody said, “Well here’s a boy that I think is exceptional. Here’s a boy that seems to know what this stuff is all about. Or he’s interested in finding out what it’s all about.”

MM: So to go to the rangers’ school, you had to be chosen?

GB: No, anyone could go to the rangers’ school, but I think the attitude and the philosophy I am trying to express permeated the whole...[unintelligible] school. No question about that.

MM: So you didn’t have any men like Hawk over there? [laughs]

GB: Oh no, no, no, no, no. As I think back...I looked it up and it was emphasized by Dean Skeels. I looked up the quote and I’ll read it to you. This was the beginning. He always used to tell us Lincoln said that the government of the United States is the foster child of special interests: capitalists and manufacturers of the United States, not the true government of the people and by the people and for the people. It’s so true today.

MM: I was going to say, more so probably.

GB: More so. I just read before you came an article in the Friends of the Earth. We’re now seeing things that I think the members of the Congress are going to have to deal with. It’s the power interests versus the public interests. This nation, I think, has enough or we’ll develop enough leaders. They’ll come out of the woodwork, the people that haven’t been able to serve in the Congress because they haven’t been able to talk about the issues. If we talked about the issues they were either declared communist or socialist or something else, a radical. I think the Vietnam fracas has demonstrated this to us plainly, plainly.

MM: Also the oil.

GB: Everything else, everything else, Mavis.
MM: Well, when this country got roughed up by the oil companies, I think people lost some of that feeling of loyalty to the capitalist system because they’ve begun to see what the capitalist system...When things get tough, the capitalist system becomes a real monster. The screws come down and the people are the ones who...

GB: Pay the bill. I don’t even go to the planning board meetings. I never have attended one. The reason I haven’t is because Ruth goes and I think she has to go through what I went through years ago when we were trying to plan in Ravalli County. We had planning advocated in the late 30s under the F.D.R.’s administration and old curmudgeon [unintelligible] that we had now, but we got away with it. Now going now is just a waste of time because a lot of these people they...I don’t know what’s going to happen. The same thing, I think, that happened before: these people that think the planning is radical are eventually going to be knocked out and other people then are going to be able to reason them and see that some logic is applied to what planning means. It’s that simple to me.

MM: Someone said that Montana is such a cold climate that when you plant a seed it takes a long time for it to grow. Do you think we’ve got time to wait for all these planning seeds that have been sown to grow in their own democratic fashion.

GB: No, I think if we are saved it’s going to be from the leadership that we get from the Metcalfs and the few other stalwarts we have in the Congress. I think someone like me and a few other people back there that understand the situation, the members of the Congress are going to realize that you can’t capitalize on the ignorance of your people back home because the environmentalists and the women and everybody else have caused the people to be [unintelligible]. All politicians have ever done is capitalize upon the ignorance of people.

MM: Yesterday I went to a meeting where a man was supposed to be talking about steady state economies and no growth and that kind of stuff. And Dan Kemmis, the legislator from Missoula, is very interested in starting a seminar in exactly that subject, whether it’s possible for Montana to try for a steady state, no-growth economy without the entire country doing it, whether that’s even possible. But then another thing is they were talking yesterday about the difference between capitalism and steady state, no-growth societies could go together. They were just really working at opposites. But then in thinking of how to turn the country away from capitalism they were saying you have to work on traditions. Now what traditions do we have in this country? They mentioned populism being a tradition that was intrinsically anti-capitalist growth sort of thing. Have we had a populist tradition in Montana in the years you’ve lived here that could be built on, which would have a land ethic in it and work away from...

GB: I don’t agree with their analysis. I think that it’s going to go back to...Capitalism, I think, merits all the comment and all the criticism we can heap upon it, but I think capitalism could function if it was regulated. But the people that are selected to regulate the capitalists are the capitalists themselves. So capitalism, as Pinchot pointed out years ago to people in the Forest
Service, they are the regulators to what’s happened to the national forest is exactly what...is an easy thing to move in on.

MM: I don’t understand the economics involved, but if you regulate capital to a point where it cannot expand, can it exist as an economic system?

GB: No, I think capitalism as you and I know capitalism is done. It’s done. I think capitalism is...that’s...And you dare to even talk about it. A lot of people are afraid to mention the word. I could show you something in that drawer. I’ll bring it out. [TAPE STOPS] The Forest Service said these are the things you’ve got to talk about so people will understand. A lot of people understood. See that document? Know what that is? That’s a loyalty hearing that I went through. And here’s all the correspondence.

MM: What year was that?

GB: The hearing was in 1949...’48.

MM: That early?

GB: Yeah. But it was the product of ignorance on the part of a few people. When I had mentioned the word capitalism [unintelligible] right here in this valley. The timber industry was exploiting lands, private lands. The article that I referred to in the Friends of the Earth, they bring the same thing out. But there it is 30, 40 years later. We occasionally see the word mentioned in the Missoulian. I don’t know.

MM: You can go just so far in terms of land ethic or in terms of environment and you’ll hit that economic system square on. And then unless you do something about it, you’re really stymied. All you’re doing is putting little band-aids on the problems.

GB: That’s right, and that’s why I think the knowledge we have in the universities and the knowledge we have in even our local school system, if the teachers and the profs and the president of the university felt free to teach, these problems would be understood in a hurry. But they’re not free.

MM: Well they’ve trained young people to fit into the system. They say, “How many engineers does the system need?” or “How many...?” and then...

GB: That’s exactly it, but I don’t think they would be doing that. There are a lot of them down there. I could name you some good people down at that university that would really raise the level of thinking.

MM: A lot of them are in the philosophy department.
GB: In the philosophy department, you bet. But it’s right here. The same thing is here.

MM: Well do you think that...Because moving here five years ago from Colorado, I never noticed in Colorado, in the 15 years I lived there, the same kind of intense commitment of a large number of people—outspoken, really giants of people—who fought for the environment. Is it because the industries are so large that they, in turn, require people to match their might, or is it something peculiar to Montana that makes it different from, say, Colorado? Colorado now is getting into the environmental scene and has a good governor and so on. But for all those years, I never saw people like you or Doris or the Smiths or Don in Colorado.

GB: I’m pleased you brought it up because I can trace the history of that too. There were a few people in the agency structure, quite a lot of people in the agency structure 30 years ago, or more. And the rank and file of the people that were concerned about the management of resources. Most of it ties back to the effort of organizing the Montana Conservation Council. It was the first thing that was done.

MM: What year was that?

GB: Well, I’ve got more files. If somebody would take them I’d just like to give them to them.

MM: About what year was that?

GB: I would say in the middle 40s. There was a rancher here in this valley...

MM: After the second war or just about that time?

GB: Just about that time. Yeah, I think it was during. But I sensed, they sensed, other people sensed, a depletion of our resource base. We were farming to the limit to try and produce food. I talked this farmer into going down to see the dean of the forest school to see if he could organize the Montana Conservation Council. The idea wasn’t original to me because I think it came, a lot of it, from Joe Severy, Dr. Severy, you know, who was head of the Botany Department and is very active in Montana. We didn’t know what we were doing any more than we knew what we were doing when we set up the Montana Wildlife Extension Program. We knew that the people needed that kind of a service and that was provided through these two mediums that I mentioned, the Wildlife Extension Service and the Montana Conservation Council.

[End of Side A]
MM: What kind of people went into it? Were they intellectuals, university people, or were they people who actually did with the lands?

GB: They were people that came from the land—ranchers—and they were people from universities and they were people from business interests that had the capacity to see what Montana must do with its resources if it’s going to maintain what it...The purpose that Montana should serve in the whole structure.

MM: What kind of business interests? I’m curious about that. Small businesses, small lumber?

GB: Yeah, small...no, no, no. Not lumber. But here’s what happened to the Montana Conservation Council, and I’m going to name a few names. It became a very dynamic organization. A lot of it is attributable to no one else but Lillian Hoyt. She was the secretary. Lillian was a go-getter. In the Forest Service, during Lillian’s time, the attitudes that I said prevailed in the Forest Service during my career, they were evident in all the leaders, heads of departments down there, divisions. Lillian worked under some real top hats and was free to do it, operate. He recognized the contribution that Lillian was making as secretary of the Council. But then as soon as...It’s like everything else. It’s like the Montana Wildlife Federation today. It was infiltrated by people, by the special interest again. They started taking over. I don’t know if you know Dick Setterstrom(?). Well, Dick got into the Council. I didn’t know Dick before he came into the Council but he came. He was associated with the companies. I thought for a while maybe he has got an attitude, maybe he...But it wasn’t long until I found out why he was there and then as time went on, more of those people were elected as members of the Council. It finally got to the place where I quit because I thought, “Let them have it.” I affiliated with someone else, any outfit that was I thought playing the game square, like the Montana Wilderness Association. I have belonged to more things, Mavis, than...Well the same thing has happened to the Montana...And I think Don will tell you the same thing, Don Aldrich.

MM: The Wildlife Federation?

GB: Montana Wildlife Federation. At a national level, that’s the way the national wildlife federations run. When you get down to it, analyzing the whole thing on even a state basis or a local basis, you’ll find the same thing. You’ll find that we have still the Montana Wilderness Association, we have our environmental group headed by Toney(?). And in the process of evolution, we’ve come up with the kind of leadership that we had in this session of the legislature. That’s the way I see it.

MM: Do you feel that this Council...I mean, paralleling to western states of Colorado and Montana and finding certain qualities in one and not in the other, I don’t think that Colorado had anything like that. Colorado, perhaps the leadership was always more urban than it was rural. The strength of Montana, even though we had trouble with the rural vote in the
legislature, God knows, the strength of the state seems to be in something within the rural and I just wonder whether that’s a populism that’s lurking there, whether it’s the kind of people that settle here being from the northern tier of the United States, the Scandinavians with traditions of cooperative and coops and so on, whether that’s influenced the state. Because when you start with a council or anything like that, it could just die of borning, before it ever got off the ground. There had to be something that...

GB: But I think it was motivated by the people that had background and concepts and concerns over the management of land, resources, and water. They really had some of the same concepts that they’d acquired from their parents or some source. I don’t think it’s just...

MM: So the leadership came more from the top than swelling up from the bottom...

GB: No, it came from the bottom.

MM: But you said people in charge of organizations or were you thinking people in the federal agencies and so on, like Lillian, I don’t mean to say they were on the tip top but they were not of the masses, so to speak. They were in positions where they could do something.

GB: But I think in Lillian’s case, she represented the masses because her folks were coal miners. Lillian knew all about this. Her interest and, I think, the interest on the part of other members of the Council for, I would say, oh, 20 years throughout its early history was predominantly a mass concern instead of a—what should I say?—a concern about the economics of the problem. It was socially oriented, in other words, if you get what I mean.

MM: That same attitude now towards the development of coal in Montana, I suppose it’s somewhat similar, isn’t it?

GB: Identical. I have a tremendous lot of history on the Montana Council and I have a recorder [unintelligible] recorder. It’s just under my bed there. I turned out one tape. Look at that bunch of tapes there. That’s Tony’s (?) tapes. I brought them home and replay it. But I’ve had them for six weeks and I’ve been so busy with other jobs that people want me to do that I haven’t played...I’ve played [unintelligible].

MM: Rob still talks about—in that book Twentieth Century Montana—he talks about the stamp of subservience because the large companies were so large and the people were underneath the foot, so to speak. Every time the unions tried to organize in Butte, why Anaconda would close down and then everybody would be out of a job and of course the unions would go under because people wanted to eat first and organize second. So there is a tradition of subservience to large economic power in the state, in the legislature and so on. But there’s something turning around now where people...I don’t know how far it will go.
GB: It’s going. It’s on its way, subservience. In the Forest Service they said we couldn’t be subservient to these special interests. Now we had a role to play in serving public interests. After [unintelligible] that became chiefs of the Forest Service kept that thing alive in the minds of the people in the Forest Service. We were supposed to take a position because subservience to the corporate interest, everyone knew where that’s going to lead us. So when you took a position...I wasn’t the only one in the Forest Service that has a document like this. Don’t think that. I could tell you some good researchers that got [unintelligible]. They had faith in the democratic system. You know, if the democratic system was permitted to work and if there wasn’t a double standard of justice, you follow me? Yeah, the double standard of justice. Someday come up. I wouldn’t let this out of the house. I’ll let you read it though.

MM: I know several people who have gone through that, on in 1952, I think it was, when McCarthy was really powerful. You see, someone said yesterday, “Well, if things really get...If it looks as if there’s a broad citizen revolt against autocratic power on the parts of oil companies, coal companies...”

GB: Corporate powers.

MM: Yeah, the corporate powers. “...that things will begin to happen. The squeeze will come. Montana Power will have a blackout over the whole state just to show us that we need Coal Strip 3 and 4. And mines will close down because they can afford to do that rather than meet the demands, the environmental demands and so on. Do you think, number one, the people are strong enough to withstand that kind of pressure, because ultimately I don’t feel that we are in power yet, you know?

GB: Oh no. I think it’s going to be people like us and it’s going to be people like Doris and it’s going to be Don that are trying to get people to exercise logic and reason and the goal is going to be tough. Don’t tell me because I appreciate it right here in this town. My friends are few because I’ve taken a position. Maybe it’s my fault. Maybe I should have gone to them and said to them, “Here, you’re wrong,” but I haven’t. Any time I have an opportunity to speak my mind, I’ve said this—that the Chamber of Commerce and you boys up and down Main Street are misleading the people of Ravalli County and what you should be saying, instead of letting us ship our forest resources out of the county to Missoula for re-manufacturing, we should have the plants here. I tell them this. I said, “There was a time in the history of Ravalli County when even the bankers agreed to this. But everybody became so concerned the last, I would say, 30 years to lending money to the person that would buy a tractor or a bulldozer.” They were collecting more interest that way than they would have been if they had been re-manufacturing our materials here in the county and maintaining our resource base. But I never did go to them. I tried to go to them, not on an individual basis, but I realize the importance of that now. Mavis, I’ve always had that in mind, but I’ve never been able to get together until this year we did that through an ad hoc committee, the people that will go to the business interests, the bankers, and say, “Here, we have been making a terrible mistake. This is what you’ve got to do.”
MM: Yeah, well, I think that we’ve had such a long job just trying to stop certain things that perhaps the creative part of it has been slowed down, just having to prevent. That’s the pie.

GB: Well, here. [unintelligible] The first two chapters of that...Now here’s what these...I found this out, that’s why I became...Let’s assume this is Mavis or let’s assume this is the [unintelligible] that we’re concerned about this forestry problem. Okay, now here you have...This is the community, this is Ravalli County, this is the very area. Here you’ve got some banks out here. There’s no communication between this group and the bank. Okay, and here you’ve got...Remember this place you go by? I don’t know what it cost—30, 40,000 dollars—to develop a horse arena. Now there’s no communication between that ad hoc group nor this one. There’s no communication between that group and the banker, other than to pay interest.

MM: See, you have organized chaos in that sense. Well, that’s the capitalist system.

GB: Okay, and then here you’ve got your snow mobilers. Okay, there’s no communication between this way, this way, or this way, or any other way. You’ve got churches, you’ve got lodges, you’ve got business interests. There’s no communication this way, this way, and this way. This is just on a local level. You put another circle out there, a bigger circle. Here you’ve got the Metcalfs. Here you’ve got the Congress, and the Congress are influenced by special interest. Here you’ve got poor Lee Metcalf. I shouldn’t say this. [unintelligible] on the tape. But he hasn’t the influence to get his other colleagues to use reason and logic, what’s happening to the forest resources in Ravalli County because this court were elected by the very people that finance, that are opposing regulation. I could go on. This thing makes a very interesting thing to me. There is communication between this group and me, because Lee asked me, on behalf of this group, to provide him some information on the [unintelligible]. He said if I could provide him the information he would follow up with the chief, [unintelligible]. But he’s also got to follow up with his colleagues in the Congress and, by God, he hasn’t time to. Why are you going to do it, see? And until we recognize as a people, I think until the people in the universities recognize this kind of a structure, we’re just going to be jumping up and down.

MM: I was watching Bill Moyers last week and he did an interview with a man named Sir Jeffrey Vickers, who is an Englishman who was the man responsible for the nationalization of the coal industry and for that he was knighted by the Queen under the Labor government, I believe. He’s a man of very...A very gentle man. He’s about your age. A well educated man. He said some very interesting things. One was that he felt that capitalist systems were very unable to make the adjustments that are going to be demanded of them, of all systems, in the next 25, 35, 50 years, caused by a population-resource collision. He feels that you have to have more governmental control, the hope being to get good people in high positions making decisions and less of this anarchy, or whatever it is, of the social system that exists underneath the governmental system with each little man wanting to do his own thing.

GB: Absolutely. I think that’s got to come about, but I don’t see...Take this, look at this thing in another way. Now here we’ve got the Duponts, the Rockefellers, and so on and so forth, in this
structure. Here you've got the ladder. Here you've got working people. What they're doing, in my opinion, is these people work and about half their time is spent earning their living and taking home their living and the rest of their time or two thirds of the time is spent earning a profit for these people. Now these people won't spend their money for the social things or the cultural things that we want. All they want to do is hoard more, so they go over to Vietnam and want to control resources and stuff in Vietnam and they wind up with the fiasco that we got into in Vietnam. Now that structure has got to change like your man, what is his name?

MM: Oh, Sir Jeffrey Vickers.

GB: Yeah. And that’s got to change, and that’s what he’s talking about. When these things go into social advantage instead of increasing the wealth of the capitalists that control this company and control these people that are elected to Congress, and when these people that are elected to Congress can appoint people to regulate the capitalist system...But I think the capitalist system is through as we know it. I don’t think you can regulate them.

MM: The regulators always...Even the E.P.A., a brand new organization. How long did it take to be totally controlled by those that were supposed to be regulating? Maybe six months and suddenly you watched capitulation going on. I think all the regulatory agencies are more in the hands of industry than they are in the hands of the people. And here they’re set up to defend the people against the industries.

GB: There again, out of the grassroots is coming some [unintelligible]. Because of grassroot pressure, here’s the E.P.A. in Denver supporting the very things—a study that we want made of two timber sales in the Bitterroot Valley—and they’re going out all guns.

MM: Is this sort of the same thing that happened in the Flathead kind of thing?

GB: Yeah, same kind of thing, but for a different purpose. That was a water resource, quality and quantity resource study. And out of that, Dale’s writing in the Missoulian. You know, the contribution the press, the media, can make. We picked this up and used the Flathead thing...

MM: I remember your letter.

GB: ...as a tool. Then we organized this adult group and the E.P.A. couldn’t be paying more attention to it. What want is...All we’re trying to do is apply science to the management of the resources and the way to apply science is to get the forestry school involved and the E.P.A. and the Forest Service, just taking a look at what they’ve done to [unintelligible]. I think if we do that, we’re going to solve these problems.

MM: You don’t think that the mills can ultimately come in and say, “We have to have X, Y, and Z.”
GB: Yeah, they’re saying that but...

MM: Of course not now, because they’re all closed down, but...

GB: Yeah, they’re still saying it, but these 11 people that signed that letter are, through circulating of certain material, basic and fundamental material, that they acquired a knowledge of the problem. They have joined in doing the same thing that I’ve been doing all the time in the valley and they reached the bankers and they reached the businessmen up and down the street. The E.P.A. sees this and they sent a man over from the E.P.A. to meet with these 11 people to see what their individual concerns were. Mavis, I’m so proud of the way every individual could explain his concern. There was very little repetition in their explanation because they saw facts of various things that this man hadn’t...Strict democracy in action.

MM: And it’s going faster than you thought it would, isn’t it? If the E.P.A. comes through.

GB: Oh yeah, if the E.P.A. comes through and Lomback (?) comes through and makes the study of the two sales, with the Forest Service.

MM: The Forest Service is...I don’t know, I’m on the Natural Resources Council of the Chamber and we get together. Mainly we’re agency people and environmentalists. The businessmen very seldom show up, even though there are supposedly 40 of us on that council. Don Aldrich. We sit up and think of one good program after another.

GB: Talking to yourself.

MM: But also to the agency people, because they show up, and I think that’s sort of worth while because a lot of those people are leaning in our direction and they need to be bolstered up.

GB: I would just like to have you come back and spend a half a day. Here’s the material that we’re circulating. When we half started with an ad hoc committee, we realized that there were people there that didn’t have any understanding—some good understanding, thorough understanding, others that didn’t. The agreement was, are you willing to re-require background, and that’s what we did. I’ve set up a meeting with John Harris and...

MM: Bea Apple?

GB: ...Arnie Bullwink (?) to come up here and talk about this because it’s the very thing that I think we have to be doing: at the community level to have people acquire knowledge of problems. And I don’t care if it’s forestry, [unintelligible] may be, but we can go through this and these people are interested enough to do it. You’d be surprised. You can read it and analyze it yourself when you read the letter. I’ll give you a copy. I think I have...
MM: So do you think that the leadership of the environmentalists over—I don’t know how many years—maybe 30 years and longer, really, I’m sure, is beginning to pay off, or do these things go cyclic, up and down?

GB: I think it’s paying off and I think the concern over...I don’t think we should even refer to them as environmental movements. I think we should refer to them as social movements, because of recognizing certain problems that confront everyone. The people down in this group here, they have problems too, but it isn’t the same kind of problems. Our problems are...

MM: Do you think that if, you know, and Halbreuner (?) says in *The Human Prospect*, that book of his, that...Again, it’s something like Sir Jeffery Vickers, but he says it much stronger. He says that there’s going to be a terrible wrenching...

[End of Interview]