INTERVIEW WITH STEWART BRANBORG
MARCH 3, 2003 BY ROGER KAYE
(Also present, Mrs. Branborg)

MR. KAYE: This is an interview with Stewart Branborg conducted March 3, 2003 in Darby, Montana by Roger Kaye. Stewart, thank you so much for doing this with me today. I'd like to ask you to begin with a brief biographical sketch of your background, where you are from, and how you got into this wilderness work.

MR. BRANBORG: I was raised in a family with a mother and dad who had a great appreciation for wildlife and wild country. They took me and my sister on major expeditions into the wilderness of Idaho and western Montana. This partially, or substantially, I would say, because of my Dad's service for forty old years in the U. S. Forest Service here in the Bitter Root. He was Supervisor for twenty years. I was influenced by a fine biologist at the Rocky Mountain Laboratory, William Jelison, who took young people, a group of young men into the woods and on to the ranges of our wonderful game animals. I decided to take up Wildlife Biology. I attended the University of Montana for my undergraduate work. I became involved with field studies, range and timber surveys. I had the opportunity to live on wilderness lookouts for a couple of years. All of this I grew to value more and more through the years. In that process I was invited to be part of a Mountain Goat life history study. I picked up on that in 1947. During the next seven years, I devoted a major part of my time research while attending the University of Idaho, Wildlife Research Unit. It was with the Fish and Game Departments of Idaho and Montana that I worked on Mountain Goat studies. I had become an area game Biologist for the northern part of Idaho and I was offered a job with the National Wildlife Federation in 1954 by Charles Callison, the then Conservation Director. That took me in to four and a half years of legislative work with Callison working in all areas of conservation. Particular areas of concern with wildlife and of course very strong support for the Wilderness bill offered by the Wildlife Federation, lead by Callison. This put me in contact with Howard Zanhiser in about 1955. I became a member of the governing council in 1956, of the Wilderness Society. Then, as a part of the Executive Committee, I worked closely with Zanhiser. I was given great latitude and freedom to pursue the Wilderness bill in support of the Zanhiser campaign. Indeed the Wildlife Federation was one of his stalwart organizations that did much to promoting understanding of the Bill. That took me through some four years with the Federation. In 1960, when the Federation became embroiled in a controversy, Callison and others within my friendship circle departed. I went to the Society and asked for a job. Zanhiser encouraged me to be in touch with the then President Harvey Broom. It was decided that if I could make my magnificent salary of $8000.00 through use of direct mail and other skills that I had captured at the Federation, I could go to work. So, I was enlisted for a position as Director of Special Projects, I think the title was. From that after a couple of years I became Associate Director under Zanhiser and when he succumbed in 1964, in May, I was appointed to succeed him. The rest is history.

MR. KAYE: So you were Director of the Wilderness Society then?

MR. BRANBORG: I became his replacement in May of 1964, on the eve the final signing of the Bill in September. It was my task at that point…we had waged this long campaign from 1956 to 1964. There were seventeen Congressional hearings. There was a strenuous effort of organize grass roots people for the wilderness cause and in support of the Bill. It was my task to make people aware that in this great accomplishment of setting the national policy in a preservation program we had only included some eight million acres in the wilderness system. All the rest had to come through the laborious process of public hearings, local studies, the passage of proposals up through the hierarchy in the agencies and Congress. There would again be a round of hearings to see the inclusion of these areas into the wilderness system. So that took me into implementation and what I feel was my contribution; in organizing grass roots teams in some forty states, in support of wilderness.

MR. KAYE: When you were with the National Wildlife Federation as Conservation Director you were their representative on the refuge issue. What were some of the things that you did with the Wildlife Federation in support of the campaign to establish the Arctic Refuge?

MR. BRANBORG: I of course had fallen under the influence of Howard Zanhiser, Callison at the Federation, and the Muries. Olaus had come to the University of Montana in the 1940s to a northwest section meeting of the Wildlife Society. Here was this sweet, humble epitome of a fine biologist.

The infusions from Olaus and Zanny I think crystallized by thinking about the rich experience I had had in the backcountry. Those months on the lookout, and working on trail and telephone line and wild country, and the great trips that I had had with my family. It gave a framework for something that was deep in my psyche, my life. But here it was brought together that needed our best effort to realize protection of all of the unique things that we had experienced in the wild setting. I was working under Callison on legislation, on educational campaigns. I am sure that part of my job was to make contact with those members of Congress and their staffs to give them background on the Arctic Range, and to support this effort. Of course in effective lobbying, the best job you can do is to say, "Here in Olaus Murie. Here is Mardy Murie." I had the realization of the value of those people, so wherever we could convene good, open minded staff people, members of Congress, House or Senate, we would do that. That was my expertise, not that I had fully accomplished all that I ultimately as a base of my competence as a lobbyist. I know that these people had touched me, and as a representative of the Federation, I could speak with real conviction and eloquence because of my tie to these spirited people.

MR. KAYE: Interesting! Were the people, the legislators and so on that you lobbied touched or influenced my the Muries and their philosophy about wilderness?

MR. BRANBORG: Some were. The John Sailers, the Lee Metcalfs, just to name a couple. In that period, conservation and the environment were not popular causes. You introduced yourself with your card. The best way to get into a Congressional office was have people call from the home state, or district saying, "we're sending in Steward Branborg to discuss this issue with you."

MR. KAYE: Oh really?

MR. BRANBORG: I had a lot of background in doing that. So if I really wanted to get in I would call the local affiliate of the Wildlife Federation; a Sportsmen's group and say, "Would you mind writing and or calling that office and telling them we have this important issue to bring to them?" That would prepare the groundwork. But at that time, when you walked in you didn't necessarily get a warm reception if you didn't have that kind of introduction. But there were those, lets say epitomized by John Sailor, who embraced the concept. He knew it and he felt it. And so he would steep in the presence of Olaus, and Zanny and Mardy. He savored them for what they stood for as people, and their testimonials. He loved what they spoke for. He sensed the values that they represented. Some others later, the Udalls, they were good. Senator Nelson was good. Hubert Humphrey in Minnesota, the first introducer of the Wilderness Bill on the Senate side. These people had the feeling. They had the measure of the quality of these spirited folks who spoke for the wilderness. And they themselves sensed what we valued.

MR. KAYE: What did you do as far as your position with the Wildlife Federation to encourage members to write their Representatives and get involved? Did you have a campaign to involve members?

MR. BRANBORG: There was a very strenuous campaign particularly as we went into the hearings for the Wilderness Bill. It was outreach, mobilizing people. In Idaho, as a matter of fact I was assigned to go with Ted Trueblood with my 35mm slides on the life history of the Mountain Goat. We held meetings at the Rotary and the schools all the way from southern Idaho up to Sand Point and the Canadian line in every community we could reach. It was just proselytizing for the Bill, explaining why it was so very important to gain its passage. But in every instance, when there was a field hearing, we as the Wilderness Society would go into the grass roots communities, bring together those who shared this concern about wilderness. That concern had been nurtured through a series of mailings that Zanhiser had engineered from Congress, to the citizens using the mailing list of the Wildlife Federation and most of the conservation groups. They numbered into the hundreds of thousands as I recall. The Federation was some three hundred thousand. And there was Audubon, the Sierra Club, the National Parks Association and other groups. Everybody on those lists had received these descriptions

of the Bill, its purposes, the rationale for its passage, the speeches that were made by Sailor and Humphrey upon introduction. People had had repeated mailings saying, 'here is the Wilderness Bill. Here is the effort that we're making. Here is why people from all over the country must be in touch with their members of Congress to voice their support.' It was that foundation that gave us the starting point.

MR. KAYE: Was this the same approaching, but probably on a much smaller scale in your advocacy for the Arctic Wildlife Refuge?

MR. BRANBORG: I think with the Arctic Wildlife Refuge of course you focused on the key committees in the House and Senate. You focus on those members who will be friendly. You do that systematic approach. You call and mail to your membership out in that state, and the key leaders. You say, "Here's the Arctic. Here's what it means. Here are the magnificent dimensions of what it represents for wildlife and wildness." Then you have those people apply words of encouragement and pressure to those who are on that Committee. Of course you are watching that vote. You are going in from the Washington level to say, "How's the Congressman doing? What will the Senator do on this?" You are talking to staff. You are talking to the member. You're walking with the member to the House floor or Senate floor. You are catching him wherever you can. But you're nailing down his vote. I am damnably sure that was my job on the Arctic, along with Callison and Zanhiser. The Muries of course were not in the Washington scene except when they came to visit. I think C. R. Goudermooth, the Wildlife Management Institute, Ira Gabrielson, I think they were fully in ownership of this campaign. You probably read in the context of this documentation their testimony. They were working with Zanny, with Callison in coalition.

MR. KAYE: The document that you point out is a hearing record for a Senate testimony that you gave on behalf of the National Wildlife Federation in 1959, recommending the establishment of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In reading through this, one thing that interested me was that it was very eloquently written. You are representing a group that is largely hunters and hunting interests, yet you don't focus on that as being the value of setting this place aside.

MR. BRANBORG: I believe that's because of my own personal feeling and love for the living creature. The appreciation emanates I believe, from my parents. But having come out of Wildlife Management schools you know the heavy emphasis on harvest. Having survived with Annalee on Elk and Deer meet through the winters, and being a hunter, I was increasingly appreciative of the living creature. While I had to represent the interests of the hunting community and recognize appropriateness of hunting in specific places, I didn't feel in my heart that this was the function of the Arctic; to provide hunting opportunities any more than any of us emphasized recreation.

MR. KAYE: What did you see as the primary value of what became the Arctic Range?

MR. BRANBORG: I believe I saw through the eyes of Olaus and Mardy the magnificence of the area, the rich community of wildlife and this spacious, endless panorama. And here was the community of life and this spectacle, this museum. These people were so articulate and so persuasive that that influence came on what I had had as a kid and as a young biologist in the field and it coalesced with all of the things in my background to make me see that in the wild untrammeled setting we had things that far transcended the human experience of taking an animal or indulging in one kind of recreation or another. Putting oneself in that setting as an observer who traveled as quietly and unobtrusively as he could, but to savor it, to measure it, to watch it and above all, to leave it untouched as much as humanly possible.

MR. KAYE: In your testimony to the Senate in 1959, you talked about the importance of an area, "free from man's domineering influence." Tell me what you meant by that in the context of the Arctic Refuge.

MR. BRANBORG: Significant signs of course, of human presence. Really, I get down to any signs of human presence. What I was thinking about then, I can't bring back. But basically, leaving the setting without any signs of having been there, as much as possible. And I think that is incumbent upon us. And I think that's the test that we face now. How do we give support to wilderness with a public that says 'this is the ultimate criterion, we will come, we will savor, we will indulge ourselves, but we will leave it basically untouched'. Well of course it's almost impossible to not leave some sign. But I think that that is what I felt at the time, as much as I can project into that time fifty years ago almost.

MR. KAYE: Your quote, "free of man's domineering influence' is very similar to the Wilderness Act statement of 'wilderness is in contrast where man and his works dominate". It seems like your advocacy for the Arctic Refuge and the Wilderness Act was very much the same.

MR. BRANBORG: Undoubtedly, because I had been one of the early readers of the Wilderness Bill drafts. Zanhiser was leaning on me to look for imperfections as he was looking for people like you in the agencies. There were Dick Griffith, and people in the Forest Service and many different disciplines to whom he presented the draft of the Wilderness Bill and asked that they read it and study it. He wanted them to refine the language and make it as good as they could for the purpose of the wilderness. By this time almost on the eve of the introduction of the Wilderness Bill, right in this period, I had been exposed to those words and those thoughts, most of which had fallen from Zanhiser's good mental process to the tablet where he did his first draft of the Bill. That stuff was being fed into my system.

MR. KAYE: I noticed you used the word 'wildness' as an adjective, as a descriptive of the values of this place in some of your writings. Tell me what you meant by 'wildness', and what some of the parts of it are.

MR. BRANBORG: Of course, coming on the scene as a visitor, watching the land within vision of the magnificent glaciated mountain basin, the meadow, the lichens the mosses, the Labrador Key, that's some of the country that we both know. I think there's in periods of isolation, when you're by yourself, you do feel that there is energy and a presence that is much greater than self. You are just there. You watch and feel this and you listen and you hear. You marvel at what's there. And you absorb what's there to the best of you ability in the absence of the knowledge of all that goes on within the lichen or the Lemming, but you are the furry Marmot, the Caribou. It's enveloping. It comes over you. You sit and absorb the marvel of it.

MR. KAYE: Is this the wildness of the wilderness that you refer to?

MR. BRANBORG: This is the wildness, yes. No patterns of conformity, no impacts of human beings are present. The communities of animal and plants, the glacial and geological forces, they are all there working in their timeless way. Any reflection brings you to the realization that this is the evolutionary process of life and the landforms. You are here as an observer. And you are here as a humble agent who gets to see this without any interference on what is taking place.

MR. KAYE: It's interesting that you mention the word evolution. Olaus Murie used that work very often in his wilderness writings. The idea being, let me ask if I understand Murie correctly from your understanding of him; that a part of the value of this place would the evolutionary process would be free to continue here unhendering by people. Was that a value of this place to you?

MR. BRANBORG: I think very definitely. Here is the stop where things are continuing. The landforms are changing. The animals are changing. The plants are changing, and the climate may change. It is an epitome of evolutionary process if we can keep our hands off of it.

MR. KAYE: Does that contribute to the scientific value of the place? Was that a concern of yours, or a value to this place?

MR. BRANBORG: Yes, I always identified the scientific value, but I recognized that scientific exploration would pose a threat to wilderness if we got carried away with it. The intrusion of science in a way that interfered with or inhibited natural evolutionary process would itself be destructive to the wilderness and the wildness. That was something that came to us as it is here today. We can't tolerate intrusions on the wilderness that are destructive in the name of science.

MR. KAYE: Olaus used the words spiritual value and intangible value quite a bit. Did this place hold some intangible value for you? I think that some of the values we have talked about are intangible, but…

MR. BRANBORG: I believe so. Interestingly, in references to spiritual values from Zanhiser, Murie and the two that I knew the best; Harvey Broom, Sig Olson, Oberholser, and I am not mentioning others that were rich in their philosophical base and their spiritual base. I don't read to remember their references to the deity, to God. But I think in those people and in myself, there's a rich spiritual feeling that comes. And some of the best expressions of that were from Olaus in describing what had happened to him when he walked around the block waiting for a bus. I think it was in Pennsylvania when he was on his way to Washington. He met me for dinner with Mardy. He said that he came to a place were the 'beautiful leaves of fall had come together." He looked into that montage, and he saw that there were transcendent things, beyond us. I remember conversations with Mardy where said that some of these things that flow together in our lives are by some design. There is synchronicity. Things come together and are meant to be. Many times in my life in the Salmon River Canyon and in the high basins of the Bob Marshall or the Selkirk Mountains of northern Idaho, and I had my wilderness experience in these areas on my Mountain Goat research that I was doing. I think you feel a spiritual influence, and I don't think I'd tie that to any specific higher power. But I felt that there was a strong spiritual influence. I don't know that I ever really discussed that with Howard Zanhiser. We both had spiritual experiences in the Cathedrals of Washington. It was our habit, when I drove with him to and from work, to stop by the Cathedral, or the Catholic Shrine and stand in awe within these structures.
Finding ourselves, I guess, in the midst of the flurry to do all of these things for the Wilderness Bill and the membership of the Wilderness Society and holding the operation together. Certainly, there was a heavy feeling of spirituality within these rich characters. Harvey Broom, Howard Zanhiser, Sig Olson, and of course Olaus and Mardy.

MR. KAYE: How about Bob Marshall? You were probably pretty young in his time, but I know you met him as a child and your father knew him didn't he?

MR. BRANBORG: Yeah. When Bob Marshall retired from the Forest Service his brother George had run on to some old notes. Those old notes indicated that there were five people in the Forest Service that Bob recommended for his replacement in the Office of Recreation, as the Chief. One of them was my father.

MR. KAYE: Oh really?

MR. BRANBORG: I don't know whether my dad had been with him on more than the one occasion when I remember Bob coming to our home. He had hiked from the Salway River over the Montana Divide, down into Boulder Creek on the west fork of the Bitter

Root in one day. That was a tremendous exertion of forty or fifty miles. His face was sunburned, and he was at our dining room table when my mother served dinner. I remember him, I suppose, that would have been in the 1930's before his death. I think he passed on in 1939. It would have been in the period of 1935 to 1939.

MR. KAYE: Is that the table in front of us here, in your house?

MR. BRANBORG: That's right. That's this dining room table here.

MR. KAYE: Interesting! Which chair did Bob sit in? Do you know?

MR. BRANBORG: We didn't label it. But I suggest to those who love wilderness that you rotate through the chairs so that you can be sure that you have the right spot. There are only two sides, and I think he was sitting across from me when my mother and father were on both ends. We can bring that back.

MR. KAYE: Well Stewart, you had mentioned you and Zanhiser in D. C. stopping by monuments to find yourself in the larger scheme of things. Do you think that for Zanhiser, yourself and others, this Arctic Refuge proposal was perhaps a symbolic place, or served some function like a monument?

MR. BRANBORG: Yes, I think there was a very definite feeling that preservation of this unique landscape represented in a special way, a sanctuary for nature. And nature is epitomized in its preservation. The word sanctuary almost came down to wilderness. If you preserved wilderness, you have given us another area that was indeed, a sanctuary. That encompassed Olaus' repeated emphasis on evolutionary process. Here were living things, in this setting. Here was the natural process continuing. But you had to have a place where this was recognized, set apart. It's value for it's wild characteristics identified and embraced. The process of giving it status, the Wilderness Law, accomplished that.
Placement in the Wilderness system, and the purity of the Wilderness System is up to us. But if we encompass the concept of sanctuary, we in our protection and respect for that sanctuary will see that the area is protected from our intrusions, and from all that we bring to it as humans beings. Sanctuary is a special theme. And I think it's within the wilderness setting, when we are by ourselves and we look at all that's around us that we get the sense of sanctuary that you allude to in the lovely Cathedral, in the setting of the Washington, D. C. area or wherever. A person, by himself, recognizing the immensity of this evolutionary creation and being humbled by it, coming down to appreciation of what we as human beings are; or perhaps more importantly, what this special place represents if we leave it as it is.

MR. KAYE: You mentioned humility, is that part of the experience, or part of the aura of the place?

MR. BRANBORG: I don't think that there is any question that when you are in this setting and you feel that you are humbled. You are all of these things that have made this scene what it is. You are just there to savor and absorb. But you, as a human will do best by it if you leave it without any disturbance or interference.

MR. KAYE: Earlier, you mentioned Sigrid Olson a couple times. Of course, Olson was one of the people who was also involved in establishing the Arctic Refuge. What do you remember of Sig and his orientation towards wilderness?

MR. BRANBORG: I remember Sig as one of my great, beloved supporters within the wilderness council, the circle. I remember Sig most outstandingly as a supporter of the Wilderness Bill when the people within the council would challenge Zanny and me, but mostly Zanny, for sticking through this long and strenuous fight. And when the going was tough and people would say, 'Let's just promote the concept of wilderness, we don't need this Wilderness Bill as the bulwark around which we preserve lands'. Sig as my intimate friend would be briefed by me on what we needed to overcome the sharp criticisms of Zanhiser in the setting of the council meeting. Sig would come in with his eloquence, his deep voice and say, 'By God, we have to go all the way to gain enactment of this legislation! Without this, we don't have the framework of policy. We don't have a system that will include these unique lands from these different jurisdictions of the government. We have to have this as a foundation for the work that we are doing! Without this, we don't have the base for people to work in giving lands permanent dedication. We will be constantly subjected to the wayward ways of the individual, bureaucratic interpretations of what wild country is. We have to set these standards, these policies. We will be beaten by the attrition that occurs from different land managers and different agencies in different sections of the country doing all kinds of things to manipulate and abuse wild country in a way that it is inimical to wilderness.' So I remember that most of all about Sig Olson. I remember is deep eloquence in speaking to points of principle. But I remember him as my faithful backer in the years when he was President; when I, as a relatively young heard of the Wilderness Society. He was right there to listen to me and to help me make the judgments and to sustain me through thick and thin, and sometimes within the council. As for Zanhiser, there were some tough criticisms. They were criticisms built around finance, Zanny's judgments. Zanny was famous for involving the person with whom he was engaged in the development of all of the alternatives that were before him. Here are the ways we can proceed. Here's what Senator Humphrey said. Here's what Congressman Sayler said. Here's what the chairman of the committee is doing. What do you think? He enveloped you in discussions of strategy. Yet, on occasion, members of our council would go at him in an adversarial way that was extremely disturbing to him and to me his chief ally and supporter. On occasion, he left meetings in state of frustration. They wouldn't treat me as a young person, the way would go after him. That's what I want to get in some of my history of the Wilderness Bill, and I shall. But when you say, "What do you think about

Sig?", I think of those sessions when we were tense and the steaks were high because people were saying that we weren't doing what we needed to have done. It was towards Zanhiser, and to a degree me. But it was focused on Zanny. Sig would come in with his great ovations and he would set them right on there butts!

MR. KAYE: That's great, wow! What is yours sense of Sig Olson's main interest in wilderness? What was the chief value? Was it recreation, wildlife? What did you see that motivated Sig so strongly?

MR. BRANBORG: His feeling for it, and his spiritual appreciation of it. He loved it in it's totality. He loved to be there. He savored it in every sense. But I don't think he thought of it so much as recreation. I think he felt it reached him when he was there. He had that capacity, that great ability to articulate that.

MR. KAYE: You say it reached him. Tell me what you mean by that.

MR. BRANBORG: It took over, as it does I think most of us that are…..[side one ends]

My feeling about Sig was that when he was in the wilderness, the wilderness took over. I think that influence characterized Howard Zanhiser and Harvey Broom. Harvey Broom is an unsung hero of the Wilderness Society. He was one of the founders with Bob Marshall. I think it was an enveloping experience, for the individual experienced certain influences on his or her mind when in a situation where the wilderness was the only prevailing influence. And I do think it was a spiritual thing. I think it went to the heart of the soul of these people, as it does me. I think in terms of some of the mysticism that we see in native peoples who can get to other plains of human experience in a given setting within certain influences; I think when Sig was in the wilderness, the wilderness was the permeating, dominant influence on everything he did. And I think that is true for many of us. If we can be with good companions, but ourselves go out on a high ridge or down on a spruce, or out under the big cactus; I think that's where it reaches us. That's where it gets to us. As I look back, don't I regret not asking Sig, not asking Harvey, not asking Zanny, "Why didn't we discuss this more?" We said that we would save it, it was priceless, but there is no human way of describing what it meant to us. But let's talk about what it does to us when we're out there in isolation. We didn't do it. I didn't do it enough to carry me through this day. But you provoke those thoughts, and I am just as sure, as I am sitting here with you that if Zanny or Sig was there, if Oberholzter or Broom were there, they would say that. Yes, wilderness is a consuming influence. It is that gives me spirit when I am there.

MR. KAYE: You represented, back in the 1950's at your testimony on the Refuge, the National Wildlife Foundation which was largely hunters and hunting interests. Yet apparently what you are saying, connected with them, because I read your testimony,

and that apparently was approved by that organization? Even though this would never be a major hunting ground, people allowed you to work on this and promote these values?

MR. BRANBORG: I think that was because the breadth and depth of Charles Callison, the Conservation Director. That statement was never taken through an executive committee or a board. The organization, probably through resolution, said in so many words, 'we will support the establishment of the Arctic Range'. There was not much direction except for Callison saying, "Work on this!" As Callison said, "You will be given freedom to support Zanhiser in your years here," in 1956 to 1960, after introduction of the Bill, "you will be concentrating on the Wilderness Bill". I had to prepare in the last two years the weekly legislative report. It was a report of the Bills, and action on the Bills, the Clear Air and Clean Water Bills and the spectrum of environmental issues. He gave carte blanche support to Zanhiser and that meant that I traveled with Zanhiser, even in the Echo Park controversy that preceded the introduction of the Wilderness Bill before 1956. And as you know, that was a very decisive victory for environmentalism; keeping the dams out of Dinosaur National Monument. There was nobody with Zanhiser in the Senate Chamber when John Kennedy stood on a crutch and made our appeal to protect the National Park System from the intrusions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the dam builders. That was when I became intimately acquainted with Callison, and recognized how broad and deep he was. That was when I grew very close, intimately connected, with Howard Zanhiser. And with Zanhiser if you were his friend, you became and intimate friend. He puts his arms around you, tapped in to your thinking. He knew what you were worried about and knew what your aspirations were. But he gently, as a father, like my father would say, 'You don't want to that, think about that.' I was raised in that kind of a culture in my family, where when I wanted to be a smoke jumper, my dad said, "No, you don't want to do that. That's romantic and stuff. You'd better get experience on range survey. You need to know range." Or, "You'd better go into the timber survey". I was one of those younger people who was malleable, and Zanhiser knew that. He was a master in the most wonderful, constructive way, of manipulating the human spirit. And here was this field biologist that has this great family background and he just took me and guided me. He suggested and cajoled in a gentle way. I just loved him dearly!

MR. KAYE: Interesting! Is it correct to say then, that your advocacy on behalf of the Wildlife Federation for the Arctic Range, in your testimony that we read here, is largely a function of Zanhiser's philosophy then?

MR. BRANBORG: Zanhiser, and Callison's, my boss. But yeah, I was under the influence of the wilderness guys. I was under the influence of my mother and father, who loved the wild. Nobody in the Federation gave too much of a damn. So Zanhiser was working on me and Callison was working on me. As I said, I was thirty-five years old when I gave this testimony. I didn't know what I was doing. I had this wonderful woman, Annaveigh bringing up these great kids. But, you remember when you were that

age, you were feeling your way. So I was increasingly appreciative of my field experience. I was damn proud of those seven years on the Mountain Goat. And then I hooked on to Olaus. I remember going to the hearings with Olaus on the dams on the Clearwater River. We were the only two conservationists in this big hearing room in the Department of Commerce. Olaus told me that we had to be careful that we didn't get sucked in to a discussion about where we want the dam, as opposed to "we don't want no dams, no how!" Here, we were each other's side- kick to testify. Those people really put the Indian sign, in a most wonderful sense on me, and influenced me. I was right. My background and my love of the wild country, it was a transcending influence. It culminated in Zanhiser's richness. And I think, this is something I wanted to talk to you about; the gentle spirit of these people, in dealing with other people. They took care of you. They would me Roger Kaye, and they would say, 'My God, what a man! Here, within the bureaucracy and all of the experiences that he has to put up with, buffeting and harsh as they are, here is this great guy. How can we link with him? And how can we give him support and encouragement?' There was this loving, caring for people. And it takes us back to where we started before we went on the tape, how we need to indoctrinate our people who are wilderness advocates in reaching out for and nurturing other people. Nurturing, I think, is the key word. They looked at the individual who cared about a wilderness, just a good person, and figured how they could bring the best out of that person. Above all, that epitomized that group. They were sensitive to people. When they saw people doing great things they rejoiced in their accomplishments. When they saw people coming together to save the wilderness, it brought exhilaration to them. And this was a joyousness that just encompassed new friends. And those capabilities were what I tried to capture in the program that we took through the field, where as I said we didn't work always on the issues. Many times we came to give three days of strategy on saving a wilderness or protecting a river. We when from that to sessions where the Friday through Sunday meetings were devoted to 'What's it take to keep your spirit up? What is there in the wilderness that inspired you? How do we form circles of people in Alaska to keep our fires burning brightly? How do we take the defeats and the rebuffs, but keep ourselves together and give ourselves strength and rejuvenation?' Then most importantly, 'How do we identify these people in our communities, who care so deeply about the lose of these values, and this wild country, and the beauty of this land, and the things that are being sacrificed through development?' How do we reach to them and draw them in? Once we have them in, what do we do to find a place for them to fit into this movement? Everybody brings special knowledge, special background and special feelings. How do we get them beyond the despair that afflicts so many people? They care, and they would give their all if we showed them how. And that is our role; to identify them, to bring them in, to find a role for them, to see them accomplish the things that are within their realm of capability and interest. Because of the joy and exhilaration that comes that as they become inspired with this great conviction that because they are here, the world is a better place. Because we're here, and because I was here, this wilderness is where it is. Because Roger Kaye is here,

he was doing this beautiful job. This thing is going to be saved in perpetuity. Without Roger, we couldn't have done it. He did it, so there we go.

MR. KAYE: Well Stewart, another thing I wanted to ask you, and this relates directly to your testimony in 1959, to that Senate Committee; you are talking in terms of the Wildlife Federation and you mention that many people will never get to this Arctic Refuge that was proposed at the time. Then, you make a statement, and I'll quote you here, "I have seen growing awareness of wilderness values on part of the members of our Federation." Could you explain that a little bit? What value did you see for your members who would never go there?

MR. BRANBORG: In many ways, in this period, the conservation/environmental movement was coming into its age. This was the emergence of conservation as a force in our society. Within the state organizations that made up the National Wildlife Federation there was a sharp growth in the breadth of understanding of the individual men and women who lead their state wildlife organizations. And their interests were dimensional in terms of clean air, clean water, way beyond what their enjoyment of wildlife was; hunting, fishing and good habitat. They had that, but they responded to the leadership of the Federation in fighting for clean air and clean water. Then you remember, in 1956 we had made these massive mailings with the Federation's list saying, "Here is the Wilderness Bill. Here is the wilderness resource within these Federal jurisdictions. This wilderness will not be preserved unless we set up a national policy, and a system for bringing these areas into the wilderness system." The individuals, the grass roots leaders, the state leaders, were in a period of tremendous growth. They were aware that the lands that they valued; the public lands, the wild county, the habitat, was imperiled. So it was really very easy for us to reach them in communication, and in mailing alerts. "Your Congressman in on this Committee, would you please let him know that you stood firmly for this legislation?" So there was that ownership, and in the next few years, if you recall, all of the major legislation fell into place. There were Wild and Scenic Rivers, Endangered Species, the public land laws, and in same period there were raids against the National Forests. The Timber Supply Act, the so-called Deward Bill of the 1940's to take large parts and transfer them to state ownership for distribution and sale. Those battles, as with Echo Park Dam, a precedent for invasion of the National Park System by the dam builders, these had sharpened people, and they savored the success of those battles carried on in Congress. Echo Park was a decisive defeat for the Bureau of Reclamation and those in the Colorado Basin; all of those big powerful States allying to put those dams in the unit of the National Park System. It was a massive effort, a media effort, a fundraising effort to wage that battle in Congress and to prevail. That set the base for the Wilderness Bill. So people were ready when these mailings came and all of a sudden everybody knew about the Wilderness Bill, and it was on the top of the priority list. So, that was one group of people I was speaking for. But I valued the mountain folks I had known, the mountain men, and the people who lived in the foothills who had a feeling for the wild setting. And I knew from my experience that Frank Lance on the Salmon River

had never really used the word "wilderness" much. But he savored the spiritual values that made him spend his life on Lance Bar in the midst of the wilderness year round. It made him the stalwart defender of the Big Horn, when the Salmon River Canyon was invaded by the prospectors, and they began to take the sheep because of the savored meat. Frank Lance said, "First you're going to contend with me, if you take any of these Big Horns. If there's anything left over, I'll take you in to the Law!" Those people, and some of the mountain men who worked for the Forest Service were masters at getting through the woods, and the double headed ax. They could handle string of mules, and the cross cut saw. They could climb a tree to hang telephone wire. Those people had a feeling for that value. It hadn't been articulated. It hadn't been specified. They hadn't been reached by a Bob Marshall, or a Guy M. Branborg, but they had it, and it was there. That brings me to the point of the cultural values that you alluded to. It's my conviction that as you know, our people grew up with wilderness as they came across this continent; the pioneers. And I think people living on the homestead must have had that spiritual feeling that some of the artists capture when they show the housewife out in the fields and meadows. You know, some of that great artwork in the prairie settings, or in the mountains. I think that wilderness invaded the human spirit and made the presence of those animals and plants a part of what people miss so much now, when ninety percent of us are confined to the urban setting. Where do we go? We go to the beach, the mountains, the prairie, the desert, the river, the lake; we go out. And that's it. If we get people to say, "what is it that you are after?", the ultimate is wildness. And where do you find that but in wilderness? This is in our culture. This is deep in us because we've got to have the outdoors! We may tear it up with ski resorts and development just because of nobody ever saying, "What is it that you are really after?" We may say "the big bull" or " the big ram", and get that in there. For some people that may be part of the wilderness but for most people today, seventy or eighty percent, for those people the sight of a living creature in a natural setting is the ultimate of human experience.

MR. KAYE: One last thing Stewart; I noticed in your living room, you've got a number of books by Seton in a prominent place. They are children's books. Why are they here?

MR. BRANBORG: Well, I think because…. [skip in tape] …with a feeling and the encompassing of what's there. People will say, "Of course, we've got to have an Arctic Range' and all of the rest of the wilderness. And we're going to go for two hundred million acres", which should be our ultimate.

MR. KAYE: That's interesting because in your testimony here on the Arctic Range in 1959, you talk about " the experiences and conditions that have contributed so much to the inner strength of our people and the nation". So this is our cultural heritage you are saying.

MR. BRANBORG: Yes.

MR. KAYE: That's beautiful. Obviously, it must have been effective like you say, because you refer to it so strongly here in your testimony. It must have resonated with hunters who maybe discovered that that was why they hunted in the first place. Is that true?

MR. BRANBORG: Yes, the good sportsman that cares about those animals, yes. But I don't know what the circumstances were that day, or days before when I wrote that testimony. I can't recapture that. My mind is like a sieve on many of those important details.

MR. KAYE: But it's very much in line with, your testimony is just following what you're telling me here today.

MR. BRANBORG: I hope it is.

MR. KAYE: It is. And some of the other documents that I have found in the archives, some of your correspondence, …. [tape stopped]

Well, Stewart, that's all the questions that I have. I want to ask if there is anything else you'd like to add or say about wilderness, the Arctic Refuge, or your hope for the future.

MR. BRANBORG: I want to thank you for the privilege of participating in this vital work you're doing. …Commendation, one thing stands out in my experience today in working to protect the beauty of the Bitter Root Valley, but most notably from the thirty-two years in Washington, D. C. We will succeed in direct proportion to our ability to use the gentle, persuasive approaches that we find in Zanhiser, and Olaus, to bring the best out of people. The American people basically care about their land, and about each other. Most have receded in frustration from active involvement in the social and political issues of our day. They have given up. I think that within the wilderness movement, we have to reach out, let them see the glory of the Arctic Range and the Salway Bitter Root and the Pelican Islands and Okeefenokee, but once they say, "Yes, this is worthwhile, this is worth committing my time and energies in life to." We must show them how they can be participants, nurturing them and finding a nitch for them. And we can do that by taking the very skills that we find epitomized in these individuals going out to the working circles of these dedicated men and women and talking about and developing the systems which are old and tried and true for showing people what they can do as they realize their own power in influencing the course of the empire. And of course, this great fulfillment that comes to individuals as they proceed to bring change for the better, so that they can look back on a lifetime and say, "Because I was here, the world in a better place". The joy and fulfillment that comes out of that, and in showing the people how to work and relate closely together; to be each other's best friend, and to trust each other, and hammer out the differences that inevitably occur between us, as any team works

together. We must rejuvenate and re-inspire, and develop the resilience to take the inevitable rebuffs and setbacks, and built that into us through a planned, intentional system of indoctrinating people in the great art of using democracy for all that it can deliver to us. We've got it. We know how great our people are. We know how great some of our wilderness and other leaders are. We need to show those leadership circles how to share and bring other people into the circle of activism that will save the wilderness and bring it to us in perpetuity.

MR. KAYE: Well, thank you. As Stewart and I are just concluding here, his wife Annaveigh Branborg came up and said, "Well there's some things that you should know about Sig Olson and Olaus and Zanhiser." So please go ahead add to this.

MRS. BRANBORG: I would say that Zanny was somebody that you just immediately loved. He was a fine person. You just felt good in his presence. You didn't have to know him real well to love him. But we knew him and his family well. There was a quality about him that you couldn't help but just love. The same is true of Sig. Sig was just a wonderful person that you just immediately loved also. I can't give you any big examples other than just being with him. You were glad to be there, and glad to have him with you. It was wonderful. We knew his wife, and she was a wonderful person too. Olaus was a little different sort of person in that he was, to me, sitting with him was like sitting next to Christ. He had a spiritual quality about time that was different than most people. He would sit and look at things and talk about things. You just felt that this was a real fine spirit, that just a man.

MR. KAYE: Well, thank you!

MR. BRANBORG: I am adding to Annaveigh's comment, because she captured something that is so real in my experience. Sig had a great, loving, generous quality in reaching out to you, and in reaching out to the stranger. That was shared by Zanny who would just in his soft and gentle way, become part of you in any discussion. He would do the same with the lovely people who waited on us at the Cosmos Club, or who stood on a street corner with, waiting for a light to change. This projection of real awareness of the individual; 'where are you today?' and 'here's what I've been doing today'. That was very much a part of these people. The same was true of Harvey Broom. There was an innate sweetness, a generosity, a caring that just radiated out of these individuals. It would make a friend out of most anybody you encountered. But the aura of Olaus in his humble, sweet way addressing a group of two hundred, and being totally Olaus; no paper to read, no outline of points he should cover; getting up with complete informality and saying, "This is what I feel in the wilderness, and this is what I feel in the energy of the people in this group". The one word we haven't mentioned today is 'energy', but there is a real conviction that if you are in the wilderness setting, you draw a great energy from all of those things that are a part of that wilderness. Olaus in his simplicity and his humility and his soft-spoken, informal voice just brought you right to him. You thought, "Well

here is a great spirit! Here is a great human being that epitomizes so much that is fine and worthy in our world!”