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ABSTRACT

The Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project: Oral Historiography, Process and Practice, is a combination of analytical and practical application and overview of the field of oral history. The analytical overview identifies the two major themes in oral history, academic and community, by analyzing the scholarship, including criticisms and progress of the field. It examines the different methodological approaches to oral history as well as the multidisciplinary use of the field. It also examines the process that the author went through when researching, conducting and interpreting her own oral histories for the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project.

Lastly, this thesis project includes the complete oral history collection compiled by the author. Interviews included in this collection are Cecil Andrus, Russell Heughins, Rick Johnson, Kenneth Robison and Kevin Sligar. Complete abstracts and indexes included for each oral history and full transcripts for the Cecil Andrus and Kevin Sligar interviews.
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CHAPTER ONE – ORAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Oral history, as defined by the Oral History Association (OHA) is “a field of study and a method of gathering, preserving and interpreting the voices and memories of people, communities, and participants in past events. Oral history is both the oldest type of historical inquiry, predating the written word, and one of the most modern.”¹ Oral history therefore is a resource and a tool, a historical instrument that can be interpreted by numerous fields of study and practiced through the application of numerous methodological approaches. Oral history can be further broken down into two distinct practices, academic oral history and community oral history. Academic and community oral history emerged on the historical scene in the early 1970’s as two distinctly separate methodological approaches. In order to influence the ambiguous field of oral history, academic and community oral methodology created individualized standards, or guidelines, one could follow when conducting and interpreting oral history interviews.

The standards or guidelines proposed by academic and community oral history were reinforced by numerous publications of field notebooks, or how-to-manuals, that outlined the methodological approaches of numerous historical subfields. The new social history of the 1970’s, second wave feminism, and memory studies most dominantly clung to academic oral history standards, while community oral history found a solid following.

by public historians and local historical societies, as well as by the historical sub-fields of genealogy and environmental history. Each historical sub-field published field notebooks specific to its historical emphasis and methodology. By doing this, oral history became a multidisciplinary field of study, open to novice and expert practitioners, who advanced and united both academic and community oral history standards.

Before examining the interworking of academic and community oral history, it is important to examine the ancient origins of oral history, its more recent American roots and the historical climate of the late 1960’s and early 1970’s that facilitated the split of oral history into two specific methodological approaches and interpretations of oral history. The examination of the founding of oral history is important, not only as a starting point, but because the vast majority of oral history field notebooks and practitioners such as historian Mabel Lang begin their analysis by tracing oral history back to the fifth century B.C. with Herodotus. Lang identifies Herodotus as not only the “father of oral history,” but “the Father of History.” In her article “Herodotus: Oral History with a Difference,” Lang discusses the impact that Herodotus has had on both oral and conventional history. Lang argues oral history and conventional history were one in the same; to call it oral history was redundant “since his inquiries seem to have been almost exclusively oral.”2 Oral historian Donald Ritchie states in his book Doing Oral History that “all history was at first oral,” and agrees with Lang that Herodotus was the first practitioner of oral history to apply it to what has become known as conventional history.3

---

While Lang and Ritchie agree on the ancient origins of oral history, numerous sources explore the connection between the uses of oral history in conventional, or written, history. Historians Anthony Seldon and Joanna Pappworth suggest that oral sources cannot stand alone as historical truths, rather, they must be considered “a type or sort of evidence,” insisting oral history is only a means of contributing to conventional history. Mabel Lang points out that even Herodotus was “very quick to see the danger of assuming that oral history can tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.”

In their book, From Memory to History: Using Oral Sources in Local Historical Research, Barbara Allen and William Montell state that “oral sources afford a kind of information about the past different from that contained in written record. Part of that difference lies in the fact that a good deal of what people remember about the past simply never gets recorded.” From 1920 to 1940, oral history existed in the form of autobiographies and memoirs that related to, most posthumously, the vast amount of information that went unheard, as Allen and Montell pointed out. When historians began to use these documents as evidence in larger historical context, oral historians were encouraged to collect stories and memories from people who were still alive, not so much

---

5 Seldon and Pappworth, 6.
6 Lang, 95.
for the sake of preserving them for posterity, but rather to add as data to archives and libraries for the sake of historical research.\(^8\)

During the time period 1920-1940, oral history was seen as evidentiary, that is, used collaboratively with conventional history. It was not recognized as its own field and was only narrowly embraced and practiced by few scholars. Allen and Montell further developed the idea of oral history as evidence by suggesting, “even when a subject is well documented in print, oral sources can be useful in filling in gaps in the record.”\(^9\) Oral Historian Michael Frisch, in his book A Shared Authority: Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History, makes the argument that “oral testimonies are not histories; they are evidence of the whole, the whole being larger historical facts.”\(^10\) As oral history progressed, both in the academic and community spheres, scholars specifically designed oral histories to elicit information that would supplement what was already available, on the merits of adding to conventional history, not changing history. This idea is articulated in the appearance and integration of oral history in America during three different periods: pre-World War II, post-World War II and the paramount year, 1967.

During the Great Depression President Roosevelt, through the long arm of the Works Progress Administration (WPA), hired “unemployed writers to chronicle the lives of ordinary citizens, especially valuable were the WPA’s interviews with former slaves.”\(^11\) In the 1960s, when these slave narratives resurfaced, and “when historians finally accepted these records – comprising more than 10,000 pages, they helped to alter

---

\(^9\) Allen, 4.
\(^11\) Ritchie, 21.
fundamentally the historical interpretation of American slavery.”¹² This project was a unique example of the practical use of oral histories, but their importance was not recognized until three decades later, when a new wave of oral historians would interpret them differently, thus inspiring more accurate depictions of post-Civil War race relations and Reconstruction in America.

The experience of World War II transformed much of American historical methodologies. The people that were affected by the conflict in turn influenced the study and practice of oral history in the United States and abroad.¹³ In America, oral historian Allan Nevins laid the foundation for the first formalized oral history movement and focused on society’s elite citizens, political leaders and military figures. In her article “Who Are the Elite, and What is a Non-Elitist,” Alice Hoffman examines the definition of elite, and its relationship to the practice and process of oral history. According to Hoffman’s definition, elite is “1) the choice part or the chosen and 2) a minority group that exerts decisive power.”¹⁴ Therefore, elite oral history is best described as recorded memories from a small, power-holding group. The first oral history interviews conducted by Allan Nevins focused on “judges, cabinet members, senators, publishers, business executives, and civic leaders.”¹⁵ Nevins’ interviews focused primarily on the financial impact the war had on the wealthy as well as on military strategy and national politics.

¹² Ritchie, 21.
¹³ Donald Ritchie suggests that European oral history projects from the start were the “domain of social historians who sought to record the everyday lives and experiences of working class people” and the common soldier, in the War’s aftermath. Ritchie, 23.
¹⁵ Ritchie, 23.
Nevins was an elite oral historian, thus the first oral history movement was that of elite oral history.\textsuperscript{16}

By 1967, oral history was recognized as a “type or sort of evidence,” despite its inconsistent use by conventional historical scholars.\textsuperscript{17} There were however, those scholars who invested a great deal of scholarship in the field and united to form the Oral History Association (OHA). The OHA was established in 1966, and sought “to bring together all persons interested in oral history as a way of collecting and interpreting human memories to foster knowledge and human dignity. Local historians, librarians and archivists, students, journalists, teachers, and academic scholars from many fields have found that the OHA provides both professional guidance and a collegial environment for sharing research.”\textsuperscript{18} The OHA worked hard to improve the scholarly opinions of oral history. They did so by creating a set of guidelines that combined several methods and practices of oral history into one. While not every oral historian agreed with these guidelines, they did agree that having a set standard would help to unite the field and promote the practice. In retrospect, it also created a staging point for academic and community oral history. The way in which historians and practitioners interpreted the OHA guidelines led to the division between academic and community oral history.

In the field of oral history there are two different sets or definitions of methodology, the first referring to the physical, tangible means of conducting and collecting oral histories, the second dealing with the professional training, objectives and

\textsuperscript{16} Allan Nevins opened the Columbia Oral Research Office at Columbia University, New York, in 1948. Nevins’ oral history program marked the first oral history movement in America. Despite the elite subjects included in Nevins’ oral histories, the Columbia University Oral History Research Office (as it is referred to now), has become a center for biographical memoirs as well as an oral history repository, archive and research center. “Columbia University Oral History Research Office,” http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/indiv/oral/about.html (Accessed February 19, 2009).

\textsuperscript{17} Seldon and Pappworth, 4.

motivations of the oral historian or oral practitioner.\textsuperscript{19} The definition in the first sense deals with the sequencing of interviews, funding, confidentiality, internal review boards, locality, and set up of the interview process and will be referred to as method. The second definition refers to the specific ideologies and objectives of the historian/practitioner: what evidence or stories they seek, how they analyze the collected data, and how they use that data to advance or illustrate academic and historical agendas. The definition in the second sense will be referred to as methodology. Oral historians examine collected histories and conduct their own oral interviews through certain ideological lenses - such as Marxist and feminist - that shape the scholars’ methodology. Community oral history identifies more with method, whereas academic oral history identifies more closely with methodology.

Field notebooks became the way in which oral history practitioners would propagate a unique methodology, specifically highlighting their field or fields of interests. Field notebooks were also a means of justifying certain motivations for conducting and interpreting oral history interviews. Historian John Fox compares and contrasts five basic oral history field notebooks and concludes that whether in the form of a book or journal article, all are intended to instruct, conduct, interpret and present data.\textsuperscript{20} Emerging as both an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary introduction to oral history are numerous guides for the practice and methodological interpretation of oral history.

\textsuperscript{19} For the purpose of this paper, the social science professionals who draw upon or conduct oral interviews will be referred to as oral practitioners, whereas the title oral historian will be used when discussing specific, often self identified, historians who conduct oral interviews and analyze them for the sole purpose of collecting or adding to existing collections.

This is seen through the application of field notebooks in community and academic based oral history use.

Academic oral history started out as a way to classify and professionalize the field, creating consistent sources out of oral interviews. Oral historians set out to standardize oral history methodology. An increased amount of “how to” literature stemmed from academic oral history as instruction manuals and field guides packed the halls of academia in attempts to justify the methodology of oral history. According to Joanna Bornat, academic oral historians aimed their research and scholarship more towards “the commercially published book and journal article,” intended to be read and used by other professional, academic oral historians.21 These field notebooks were often reflective of oral history projects specific to that scholar’s field and would focus on one of three methodologies. The first of these three methodologies was indentifying areas of history that were incomplete and as John Fox stated, focused on “how they could give voices to ordinary people.”22 The second focused on question methodology, how to construct, ask, and follow-up and interpret questions and answers. The third was based on validating oral history through certain methodologies associated with memory studies. The first methodology was representative of oral historians of the new social history movement; the second was best exemplified by the second wave feminists of the 1970s; and the third found resonance in fields such as psychology, sociology and history, though each would use a different methodology to validate not only oral history, but also the veracity of human memory.

22 Fox, 121.
The first to capitalize on the publication and use of field notebooks were the oral historians of the new social history, or counterculture. The founders of the Oral History Association were members of the new social history movement and embraced the academic oral history method that focused on the people who occupied the base of the “social pyramid,” the lower and middle classes. Oral historian and past president of the American Oral History Association Charles Crawford suggested that “while larger numbers of people in the lower and middle classes make complete studies at these levels impossible, effective research may still be conducted” and that “no other method except oral history” would work “for they [the common man] are not represented in the published record as national leaders are.” Therefore, the modern movement articulated the subjects oral historians would study, and academic oral history demonstrated through field notebooks what methodologies would be used and how these projects would eventually begin to play a larger role in reconstructing social ideology, elevating the history and importance of the working class. As a historical and methodological trend, working class histories from 1967 forward dominated the framework, function and analysis of American oral history.

The modern American oral history movement integrated Marxist and socialist ideologies into one methodological approach promoting working-class and “from the bottom” histories. Oral historians studying social, cultural, economic and ethnic groups embraced Marxist and socialist ideologies, promoting history from below to narrate the

---

24 Crawford, 3.
25 Knowing that oral history is not exclusive to America, the field and certain methodologies of oral history have developed differently than oral history in Europe. Countries like France and England have made significant contributions to oral history. These countries have had consistent track records for viewing history ‘from the bottom’ and have concerned themselves with oral histories of ordinary people, that are witnesses to, or receivers of, policy made by others. Seldon, 6.
unheard, untold and neglected histories of labor movements and unionization, civil rights and feminism and cultural and ethnic diversity, by means of oral history.

Marxist ideology in America was not a spontaneous generation. Cultivated by oral historians, Marxist methodology had been building and the political, economic and historical atmosphere of the 1960s fostered the right mindset for the inclusion of anti-capitalism, anti-elite, pro-common man ideology. Historian Jose Carlos Sebe Bom Meihy stated in his doctoral dissertation, “The Radicalization of Oral History,” that the existence of the counterculture and the influence it had over society in the late 1960s “encouraged the acceptance of interviews [oral histories] as a source and starting point for analysis” and the inclusion of new historical perspectives.26 Matthew Magda’s oral history collection and publication Monessen: Industrial Boomtown and Steel Community, and Carl Oblinger’s work Cornwall: The People and Culture of an Industrial Camelot, are examples of oral history projects that examined the economic and power structures of these communities. Oral historians like Magda and Oblinger carried out oral history projects that focused on social divisions and class struggles, as well as those that examined the economic and power structures in American society. Scholar R.J. Rummel’s analysis on Marxist thought and oral history supports Meihy’s argument, in that these projects utilized the most basic foundations of Marxist ideology, developing a methodology that “determines historical outcomes” as seen from the bottom up.27

Marxist ideologies point out the difference between the “bourgeoisie” and the “proletariat.” The “bourgeoisie” did not recognize the “proletariat” as anything more than

bought (cheap) labor. Applying Marxist principles, American society of the 1960s was made up of numerous “proletariat” groups including women and ethnically and culturally disenfranchised members of the American democratic, capitalist society. “Because they were considered ‘vanquished,’ excluded from social recognition, they were confined to a historical corner.” Meihy argues that the counterculture inspired oral historians to seek out the “proletariat” groups and through this concentric relationship the counterculture became historical collaborators, “cultural agents capable of encouraging the process of social inclusion” and recognition.

The new oral history projects conducted during this period captured, as oral historian Donald A. Ritchie mentions, “everyday experiences of families and communities, whether in inner cities or satellite suburbs. When historians came to realize that women and racial and ethnic minorities were missing from the pages of most history texts, oral historians recorded their voices to construct a more diverse and accurate portrait of the past.” The academics and scholars of the counterculture like Donald Ritchie used oral history as a stepping-stone and encouraged historians to dig deeper into the archives of written history for documents that would prove the existence of these disenfranchised people and validate their experiences through oral history. Historian Paul Thompson in his book The Voice of the Past: Oral History stated, “all history depends ultimately upon its social purpose.” The counterculture embraced and used this idea as a means of promoting certain political, social and economic agendas, thus adding

28 Rummel, 87.
29 Ibid.
30 Meihy, 10.
31 Ritchie, 4.
32 Ritchie conducted several of his own oral history projects including one on soldiers’ experiences during the Cold War, and acted as editor for the “Oral History Evaluation Guidelines,” a publication of the Oral History Association.
33 Thompson, 1.
legitimacy to some of the most radical and influential movements such as Civil Rights and feminism. The inclusion during the 1960s of the WPA interviews with former slaves demonstrated that history could and should be rewritten to more accurately portray the events and peoples of the past.

Feminists, “like social historians, were initially attracted to oral history as way of recovering the voices of suppressed groups.”\(^3^4\) Second wave feminists wanted women’s voices and stories to be heard, not merely referenced as the subjects of oral histories. Feminist oral historians Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai reinforced the need for a feminist oral history methodology in their field notebook Women’s Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History stating, “as the thirst for information about women’s lives began to be assuaged, it became apparent that attention had to be given to the very medium and process through which this information was being made available.”\(^3^5\) Feminist academic oral historians ushered forth a new movement in oral history and, in doing so, created a new method that guaranteed feminist perspectives a permanent methodological place in the field of oral history.

In the early 1970s, feminist historians sought out oral history as a field of academia that would allow them to explore women’s experiences and realities. Kathryn Anderson explains in her article “Beginning Where We Are: Feminist Methodology in Oral History,” that “women’s experiences and realities have been systematically different from men’s in crucial ways and therefore need to be studied to fill large gaps in


knowledge.” Feminists like Kathryn Anderson, Sherna Gluck and Daphne Patai argue that it was not enough to simply tape a woman’s words, ask appropriate questions, and laugh at the right moment or display sighs of empathy. Anderson states that “women have much more to say than we have realized. As oral historians, we need to develop techniques that will encourage women to say the unsaid.” Feminists wanted to use this new method to create a context for women’s voices, to record, analyze and interpret women’s construction of self-identity and gender and in doing so “reconstruct human history.”

Women had been the topics and subjects of numerous oral history projects as featured in early Mormon (The Church of Latter Day Saints) genealogical studies and community history projects on pioneering and life on the Great Plains and in the West. Many of these women’s oral history projects focused on women’s activities both at home and in the work force, brushing the surface of what feminist oral historians would consider viable research. Feminist oral historians were, for the most part, baffled by these studies and found them of no real use when it came to extracting facts or gathering new perspectives about women’s lives and activities as Gluck, Patai and Anderson refer to in their work; they wanted to know not just what women did, but how they felt about doing it.

This new academic oral history method would not only analyze, but also professionalize the field of feminist oral history using field notebooks, and help to reverse

---

36 Anderson, 106.
37 Gluck and Patai, 9.
38 Anderson, 104.
39 Gluck, 39.
40 Gluck and Patai, 13, and Anderson, 103.
the unsatisfactory way in which women were being portrayed historically. Feminist oral
history discourse asserts that:

Women’s oral history requires much more than a new set of questions to
explore women’s unique experiences and unique perspectives; we need to
redefine our methods for probing more deeply by listening to the levels on
which the narrator responds to the original questions. To do so we need to
listen critically to our interviewers, to our responses as well as our
questions. We need to hear what women implied, suggested and started to
say but did not. We need to interpret their pauses and, when it happens,
their unwillingness, or inability to respond. We need to consider carefully
whether our interviewers create a context in which women feel
comfortable exploring the subjective feelings that give meaning to actions,
things and events, whether they allow women to explore “unwomanly”
feelings and behaviors, and whether they encourage women to explain
what they mean in their own terms. The language women use to explore
topics will be all the richer when they have ample opportunity to explain
and clarify what they mean.41

The new method set forth by feminists during the modern American oral history
movement focused on: listening more closely to what women were saying; interpreting
what was not said as much as what was said; crafting questions that would “encourage
women to say the unsaid;”42 and creating an environment that “emphasized commonality,
empathy and sisterhood,” as opposed to “traditional practices rooted in assumptions of
the researcher’s separateness, neutrality and distance from the subjects of research.”43

Several feminist oral historians quickly implemented the new methodology and
conducted and published oral history projects that epitomized the tenets of feminist oral
history discourse. While some literature’s focus was on explaining the methodology such
as Joyce Kornbluh and M. Brady Mikusko’s field notebook Working Womenroots: An
Oral History Primer, other publications offer examples of the types of projects conducted

41 Gluck and Patai, 17.
42 Anderson, 104.
43 Gluck and Patai, 39.
using the feminist methodology, such as Laurel Galana and Gina Covina’s book *The New Lesbians: Interviews with Lesbians Across the U.S. and Canada*, Alice and Staughton Lynd dedicate a chapter in their book *Rank and File. Personal Histories by Working Class Organizers* to women’s role in industrial work, and others such as Ruth Sidel’s *Urban Survival: The World of Working Class Women*, and Nancy Siefer’s work *Nobody Speaks for Me: Self-Portraits of American Working Class-Women*, offer comprehensive coverage of working class women, surveying the gender field from 1972 to 1978.

From New Social History to Feminist, oral history methodologies are continually evolving. The academic field often uncovers previously cloaked connections between the social and political, the powerful and the meek. In the 1980s a new oral history trend focused on the connection between history and memory. Academic oral history was the force behind oral history and memory studies and once again used field notebooks as a way to open up a new methodology further promoting the field of oral history and its multidisciplinary uses.

Historian John Bodnar in 1985 embarked on an oral history project interviewing the citizens and workers at the Studebaker Car Company in South Bend, Indiana. In Bodnar’s article “Power and Memory in Oral History: Workers and Managers at Studebaker,” he analyzed the results of the oral histories he conducted. In doing so he was surprised to find out that the narratives revealed not only the “traditional history of labor and management” at the Studebaker Car Company, but also examined the social construction of memory through a working class analysis of the oral history.\(^44\) The interviews conducted between 1984 and 1985 were not “originally planned to explore the

social shapings of memory,” rather they were “designed to probe the nature of labor-management relationships in a rather straight forward manner.” Bodnar’s ideological lens shaped his analysis of the interviews and led to his interpretation on the social motivations that shape memory. The interviews were in theory conducted to illustrate the institutionalized relationships and power structure within the Studebaker Company, but they turned out to be more complex and far more socially charged than originally expected.

The interviews were arranged into three major themes “all corresponding roughly to the structure of power in a given period.” The plots represented the memories and consistent themes found within the oral histories collected from the past employees of the Studebaker Company and citizens of South Bend, Indiana. “The themes with which they linked those details often represented the interests of powerful institutions as much as they did the interpretations of ordinary people.” Bodnar’s study not only captured the history of the working class, but also identified the construction of memory based on social institutions and motivations.

Bodnar’s work did not contribute any new findings to the field of oral history. Working class histories had been collected primarily from small, industrial communities all across the United States. His work did, however, engage debate between historians and other social scientists concerning the scholarship and research of the very ambiguous field of memory studies. Because of Bodnar’s Studebaker histories, the field of memory studies flourished and has become a primary focus when practicing and interpreting oral

---

45 Bodnar, 1204.
46 Bodnar, 1203.
47 Bodnar, 1202.
history. In Bodnar’s wake, oral historians and practitioners from around the world reached similar conclusions about the social construction of memory.  

Oral history requires the examination of memory. Psychologists and historians alike ventured into the field of memory studies starting with the wife and husband team of Alice and Howard Hoffman in the late 1970’s and then again with John Bodnar and David Thelen in the 1980’s, examining the most contemporary of oral histories. The focus of their examinations was the veracity of the human memory. As memory studies continue to challenge the theoretical framework of the field of oral history, practitioners have embraced the critique and as a result, a new subfield and methodological approach emerged that examines both the construction of oral history and its relationships to memory studies.

For the first time scholars began to look at the study of oral history and the study of memory as one in the same. Historian Jose Meihey concludes that memory is the essential content and overall objective of oral history. Meihey claims that three sectors, “feminists, Jews and workers” have led the way in working with interviews, uniting both oral history and memory. “Studies dealing with problems concerning centuries of male dominance, Jews in concentration camps and their modern Diaspora, and exploitation and struggles at work have in practice brought together the two main factors: one, the stories of individuals retrieved by recording memory narratives and two, the motivation to
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49 Alice Hoffman is an oral historian; her husband Howard, a psychologist, is often the subject of her oral history research. Their collaborative publication *Archives of Memory: A Soldier Recalls WW II* is based on oral history interviews Alice conducted with Howard, the historical interpretation of the data by Alice and psychological interpretation of the interviews by Howard.
organize political movements capable of reflecting the demand for identity in each category.”

David Thelen, in “Memory and American History,” challenged others’ beliefs about memory by saying: “a dramatic reconception of memory” took place “arising from the confluence of two different lines of inquiry.” The lines of inquiry came from psychological memory studies, apart from oral history. The first was Frederick C. Bartlett’s theory on remembering: “remembering appears to be far more decisively an affair of construction rather than one of mere reproduction.” The second line of inquiry stems from Jean Piaget in 1973: “If we change the way we think about the world we automatically update memories to reflect our new understanding.” John Bodnar’s analysis of the Studebaker interviews incorporated both lines of inquiry in that “memory was a cognitive devise by which historical actors sought to interpret the reality they had lived...they could not do so alone, without reference to a social context.”

Reliability, as oral historian Alice Hoffman defines it in Archives of Memory: A Soldier Recalls WWII, is the consistency of individual memories. Validity is the predominance of the same memory among a group of people. Oral historians are all too often thought of as only interviewers. Hoffman’s article argues that oral historians are not only skilled interviewers, but also a unique breed of historian that are still developing research and interview methods. Hoffman’s article not only validates the field of oral history, but also validates the personal memories that tend to find themselves under the
scrutiny and criticism of other scholars and professional fields. Hoffman’s research and methodology makes the connection between reliability and validity of memories to that of historical interpretation and practice. The corroboration of historical data, analysis, and interview repetition furthers the research of memory and oral history and validates the reliability and stability of personal memories.

Memory studies is the most contemporary approach to oral history and has received criticism from not only historians but also those in the field of psychology. Yet the critique of this methodology is no different from what had been expressed in the early years of academic oral history. Oral Historians Barbara Allen and William Montell explore the criticisms of academic oral history in their book *From Memory to History: Using Oral Sources in Local Historical Research*. They state that:

> Arguments for and against the use of oral sources for historical information fall into four basic categories, extending from the totally negative outlook to the totally positive: (1) All orally communicated history is false, and should be avoided; (2) orally communicated history, although neatly embellished, does not always make havoc of historical fact; (3) orally communicated history mirrors formal history and may be profitably employed to shed light on social, cultural and popular aspects of the past; and (4) orally communicated history is rooted in historical fact.56

Most critiques fall within the second and third categories identified by Allen and Montell. However, some critics like Barbara Tuchman insist, “oral history gathers trash and trivia with all the discrimination of a vacuum cleaner.”57 The continuation of fieldwork in oral history and the publication of scholarly journals such as *The Oral History Review*, provide oral historians with the opportunity to justify their methodology in presenting their data in the form of field notebooks.

---
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Criticism of community oral history is not all together different, but unlike academic oral history, where numerous scholars and fields contribute to its critique, community oral history receives the bulk of its criticisms from the field of academic oral history. This tension between the two stems back to the initial interpretation of the guidelines published by the Oral History Association in 1967. Whereas academic oral history was more focused on the development of questions, interpretation and presentation of oral sources, community oral history was focused more on the creation of oral history projects and its subsequent availability to both novice and professional practitioners of the field and to the public. As opposed to professional oral historians who carry out oral history projects, libraries and historical societies became increasingly active in conducting and studying oral histories. Increased participation in oral history as both practitioner and patron resulted in a surge of collected data (interviews, tape recordings, transcripts) not scholarly in method or practice, but nonetheless valuable to the locals invested in researching their own history and defining their community. Allen and Montell argue, “while the time and energy devoted to these projects is commendable, the published results are often uneven, and the quality of the publications stemming from them is correspondingly marred by omissions, inconsistencies and factual errors.”

Historian Joanna Bornat, in her article “Two Oral Histories: Valuing our Differences,” referred to the surge in community oral history as a “popular movement” inspiring more people, critics and proponents alike, to take interests in new and existing projects and to take community oral history out of the community and into the much larger spectrum of society. Local historical societies began publishing their own oral
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history field notebooks that focused on the development of a community oral history project. Allen and Montell state that a “major stumbling block” for people wishing to do community oral history projects is that “they are unsure of what oral information is historically important. In addition to being unsure about the questions of the accuracy of orally communicated history, gatherers of such history may often be at a loss as to how to interpret these materials.”

Oral historian David Henige’s work “Where Seldom is Heard: Method in Oral History,” focused on the “the importance of method, and the need to be concerned constantly and explicitly with methodological issues” in academic and community oral history. Henige states, “explicit attention to method is designed to serve three purposes. In the first place, it can help to amass as much useful information as possible in the most efficient manner. Once this is done, method can provide the means to array that information as effectively as possible. Finally, giving thought and expression to method throughout the enterprise can help to overcome doubts as to the reliability of both fact and interpretation of oral history.”

Academic oral historians such as David Henige, Barbara Allen and William Montell petition the field of community oral history in that “whatever their goals, they are providing historical sources, and no historian’s work can be better than his or her sources. All such collectors then, have the obligation and hopefully the desire to be concerned with methodological issues.” Henige asserts that the “proliferation of work” in community oral history was the result of “technological
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rather than methodological or philosophical advances, so that a great deal was done simply because it could be done, rather than should have been done.”

Criticisms aside, community oral history excelled and, according to Joanna Bornat was grounded in cultural, social and political discourse, not much different from academic oral history, substituting professionals for local patrons as interviewers. Bornat also stated that community oral history was “propelled by a commitment to change, both in terms of changing the historical record and to produce change in and for those engaged in interviewing and being interviewed.” Stemming from the same new social history environment, it is no wonder that this too was the focus of community oral history.

Classifying oral history as a whole as “from the bottom,” “made it possible to raise issues concerning alienation and social participation” within community oral history. Not only did it redefine the purpose and need of oral history as relevant and reliable sources of history, it exposed the need for working class histories. In the early 1970s some of the first community oral history literature emerged that illustrated the social impact of looking at history ‘from the bottom.’ Studs Turkel was one of the first oral practitioners to publish a book exclusively using community based oral histories. His first book, Hard Times (1970), chronicled the interviews that Turkel conducted as a Works Progress Administration interviewer in the 1930s. Turkel’s second book, Working (1972) was an instant best seller. In this book, Turkel interviewed working class citizens about “what they do all day long and how they feel about what they do.”
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Turkel’s style was edgy, provocative and honest. He did not censor the transcripts; the peoples’ voices and stories were raw, untouched and unedited. This was a new type of history, fresh, contemporary and popular. Turkel’s transcription of the oral interview, and his presentation of data, proved that community oral history could be marketed to the masses. That is the benefit of oral history – for years people were tuning out the working class, but Turkel’s work turned up the volume – people started listening to the stories of the working class and to one another.

Turkel introduced oral history to the people, for the people, and not just aimed at the professional field of academic oral history. People were being heard, people like Tom Patrick, a police officer and later firefighter in Harlem, New York. Turkel’s interview with Tom Patrick was much more powerful than a letter or other primary document that could have been used in publication. Turkel, using oral history, captured the raw emotion of the Patrick interview in its transcription:

Last month there was a second alarm. I was off duty. I ran over there. I’m a bystander. I see these firemen on the roof, with the smoke pouring out around them, and the flames, and they go in. It fascinated me. Jesus Christ, that’s what I do! I was fascinated by the people’s faces. You could see the pride that they were seein’. The fuckin’ world’s so fucked up, the country’s fucked up. But the firemen, you actually see them produce. You see them put out a fire. You see them come out with babies in their hands. You see them give mouth-to-mouth when a guy’s dying. You can’t get around that shit. That’s real.68

In 1976, Alex Hailey published Roots.69 Hailey’s book was made into a PBS miniseries and was an immediate success. Hailey’s accounts of the life and everyday trials of Kunta Kinte, a.k.a. Toby, started and encouraged genealogical movements across

68 Turkel, 598. Often times, excerpts from oral history interviews are italicized indicating that what is being stated are someone’s words, in the form of an answer or statement, and not the author’s thoughts or notes.
69 Ritchie, 23.
the United States: again, Americans were introduced to the value of common peoples’ experiences. Even though Hailey’s work was criticized and largely fictitious, the impact was very real and further promoted the historical revision of slavery based upon the slave narratives collected by the WPA interviewers. Communities and religious groups jumped on the genealogical bandwagon, creating the need for more local oral history projects. Genealogical inquiries account for a large amount of patronage at local libraries and historical societies. Most people look to these public sources as a starting point for their own family research project and for the use of oral history equipment. Examples of genealogical oral history field notebooks are Linda Barnickel’s *Oral History for the Family Historian: A Basic Guide* and William Fletcher’s *Recording Your Family History*. These sources offer step-by-step instructions for researching and interviewing family members and creating genealogical timelines depicting not only family lineage, but participation in historical events.

Community oral history approaches appeal to new oral history practitioners as well as emerging sub-fields of conventional history. The basic community oral history method can be adopted and modified to suit the needs of a variety of academic fields. Not all oral history has to be about changing history. Oral historian Paul Thompson states in his book *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, “oral history can be a means for transforming both the content and the purpose of history. It can be used to change the focus of history itself, and open up new areas of inquiry; it can break down barriers between teachers and students, between generations, between education institutions and the world outside.”
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educational institutions and academia, encourages new methods to be used thus adding to the progression and professionalization of oral history, both academic and community based.

Environmental history is one of the sub-fields that is finding use for oral sources and, as Thompson stated, opening up new areas of inquiry and changing the focus of conventional history. Environmental oral history can be used as evidence, demonstrating that the environment, like memory, is a construction of societal, ecological and cultural motivations and ideologies. The three main strands of environmental history view the environment through the same motivational and ideological lenses as oral history does: political (institutional), material (ecological) and intellectual (cultural). The American Society for Environmental History (ASEH) is taking oral history and applying it directly to the field of environmental history. The ASEH has been conducting oral histories with founding members of the society, including J. Donald Hughes, Thomas Dunlap and Donald Worster. The project started in 2007 and has continued with interviews in 2009 with Carolyn Merchant and Marty Reuss. Most of these interviews have been conducted at the ASEH’s annual conferences.

The content of the interviews runs from the early development of the field in the 1970’s, through teaching the first courses in environmental history, to the progress and scholarship extending into modern times. The ASEH has made these interviews available online and they continue to update their oral history website with the most current transcripts, abstracts and indexes for the interviews. The use of oral history by the ASEH has inspired many university environmental history programs as well as historical societies to begin conducting oral histories with the direct focus on the tenets of
environmental history. Historical societies and oral history centers have begun combing through existing community oral history projects and interviews, extracting narratives that could be used by environmental historians conducting local research, and provide sources nationally using digital archives.

Whether conducted on an academic or community based standard, all oral history is viable evidence used to corroborate, open up new thoughts about, and revise conventional historical records. This was the aim of the modern American oral history movement and that of the various subfields of oral history. Historians of the counterculture, feminism, and those of public history united not only their fields of study by writing handbooks and field guides to practicing oral history, but also unified and strengthened oral history as a whole. The two fields, while still separate, have similar motivations as well as the desire to create consistent narratives of historical use and incorporation into conventional history. These areas of oral history specifically set standards unique to their methodology that would give way to new history, re-inform the old history and create a foundation for local and community based projects.

---


73 Projects like “The Smokejumping and Firefighting Oral History Project,” “The Hells Canyon Oral History Project” and “The Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project,” are all examples of environmental oral histories conducted by or in conjunction with the Idaho Oral History Center, Idaho State Historical Society. See also the Northwest Digital Archives, http://nwda.wsulibs.wsu.edu/, for electronic resources and oral history finding aids for these projects.
CHAPTER TWO – PROCESS

The Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project was created through a combination of academic and community based oral history standards: I followed the process of conducting a community-based project and presented the data following an academic oral history approach. The need for the project was based on the academic research I conducted about conservation in Idaho and the project provides a means for furthering not only my own research, but also the scholarly research of others, by means of a public, community based oral history collection. In this paper, I will explore the process that I went through when conducting my project and will include various examples of the methods I used for researching the topic, choosing the narrators, working with the equipment, conducting the interviews, processing the collected data, and finally, the presentation of my collection.

There are several ways to start an oral history project and the outcome of the project depends heavily upon how comfortable and how well researched the interviewer is prior to launching into the actual face-to-face interviews. However, before one can get to that point several preexisting factors must be taken into consideration. First, an agency or sponsor who has the proper equipment and processing software must be on board with the project. Just as one prepares and defends a thesis prospectus, the same justification and defense is needed to ensure that the proposed project will not be a waste of time and
resources for the sponsoring agency.¹ Second, one must develop a plan of action for the project, including researching more broadly the chosen topic, finding people to interview and developing questions to ask during the interview. Each one of these stages has three to five sub-steps, each one necessary for ensuring the preparation of the interviewer and the success of the overall interview.

I started out this project with a broad goal; I wanted to research conservation efforts in Idaho and in doing so create sources that would be of use to patrons and scholars alike for further research. I wanted my project to reflect what oral historian David King Dunaway described in Field Recording Oral History, “a record of events for greater study and distribution,” a process that “involves anticipating the needs of future researchers and interviewing beyond the scope of any individual research project.”² In order to ensure this objective, my project had to be specific enough to be able to find informative narrators, as well as narrators who would provide multiple discussion topics. When I went to the Idaho Oral History Center (IOHC), a branch of the Idaho State Historical Society (ISHS), I met with oral historian Kathy Hodges. Through my meetings with Kathy, she was able to help guide me in developing a project mission, purpose and plan of action. She provided me with the Historical Society’s local publication, A Field

¹ There are several sources dedicated to the construction of an oral history project. The best ones that I found were The Oral History Association’s Guidelines and Principles of the Oral History Association, Donald Ritchie’s book Doing Oral History, and Valerie Raleigh Yow’s book Recording Oral History: A Guide For the Humanities and Social Sciences. Some local historical society publications devote a great deal to the beginning process of an oral history project. Those I found most useful were Stacy Ericson’s A Field Notebook for Oral History and Sanford J. Rikoon and Judith Austin’s book Interpreting Local History and Culture, both published by the Idaho State Historical Library.

Notebook for Oral History by Stacy Ericson, and thus began the process of what would become the “Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project.”

I spent over one hundred and fifty hours over the course of three months familiarizing myself with oral history; what it is, how it is used, and what an oral history interview looked and sounded like. I also familiarized myself with the IOHC’s collections and processes, which included taking an interview from tape and making it something that would go into the Public Archives and Research Library (PARL) as a researchable source, both audio and transcript. During this time, I also focused on refining my own project goals. I researched the term conservation and what it meant in historical context to Idaho. I explored other sources that discussed either briefly or at length conservation and environmentalism in Idaho. I had to conduct enough research in order to find out if a project like what I was pursuing had already been done. To my relief, a project like mine, focusing on oral histories from individuals who were involved with conservation efforts in Idaho, had not been undertaken. All of this research provided a stepping-stone on which I could define my oral history project.

The purpose of my oral history project was to explore the grassroots conservation efforts in Idaho beginning in the early 1970’s. I examined the organizations and individuals that played significant roles in further promoting conservation agendas throughout several decades of political, economic, legislative and public battles over Idaho’s environment. Prior to setting up interviews, my research led me to two
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organizations that had lengthy history that involved several areas of conservation. The Idaho Wildlife Federation and the Idaho Conservation League, each local citizen conservation organizations, both focused on the conservation of Idaho’s natural resources and promoting public awareness and education about conservation issues. Both were also based around community support, including membership and financial stewardship.

A key factor that led me to these organizations was a keynote lecture given by Dr. Karl Brooks, environmental historian from the University of Kansas. After his lecture on the current environmental status of Idaho, I was able to speak with him about my oral history project. During the course of our conversation, he assured me that my project was a much-needed source for environmental historians and Idaho State history. He provided me with some names of individuals who were involved with conservation in Idaho, and more importantly, those who were involved with either the Idaho Wildlife Federation or the Idaho Conservation League. In finding sources that were specifically linked to these two organizations, I began the second stage of oral history, which is setting up interviews, developing questions and working with the equipment. These steps are known as the pre-interview stage.

In the field of oral history, there are certain terms used to describe the individuals involved in an interview. The person conducting the interview is the interviewer; the person being interviewed is the interviewee or narrator. I will refer to the second term, narrator, when discussing the individuals I interviewed. There are several factors to consider when choosing a narrator. According to Stacy Ericson in A Field Notebook for Oral History, (Idaho State Historical Society, 2001), 2.
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Oral History. “it is important to choose a person who has valuable information no matter his or her age. Not just any older person will make a good source. Choose someone who doesn’t mind talking and choose someone who is reliable.” I was very fortunate with the narrators I was able to contact. However, my experience with contacting individuals yielded one interview for every five people I contacted. Some people would not return my phone calls or respond to my letters. Yet, the individuals with whom I successfully made contact, were one hundred percent interested, involved, dedicated and reliable sources for my project. While the number is relatively small, the diversity of perspective was great, resulting in a great sampling of individuals ranging from volunteers, executive directors and even national leaders on conservation issues in Idaho.

My first contact was with Kenneth Robison, whom I met at Dr. Brooks’ lecture. During an informal discussion, Mr. Robison revealed his interest in conservation, which stemmed back to the 1970’s when he worked for the Idaho Statesman covering stories on the Boulder White Clouds Controversy, his participation in the Environment for Lunch Bunch, and his subsequent years as a member of the Idaho Legislature. Based on our conversation, I knew Mr. Robison would be an excellent first interview. I contacted him a week later, asked if he would be interested in recording an oral history interview with me, and followed up with a letter reminding him of our conversation. He promptly e-mailed me, agreeing to sit down for an interview.
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It was during our first meeting, or pre-interview, that I told Mr. Robison about my project, alluding to my interest in conservation in Idaho, opening up the lines of communication for him to tell me what his interests were and what areas he considered of particular importance to him concerning conservation. Based on his interests and background I had enough information to begin constructing questions that I would then take to the actual interview and ask. The pre-interview is a tool used to establish communication and a basic understanding about what areas of the potential narrator’s past one is interested in and helps both the interviewer and narrator come to a consensus of information to discuss, rather than approaching topics from “dramatically different positions.”

During the pre-interview I presented the potential narrator with a personal data sheet, a form put together by the Idaho Oral History Center, specifically designed for the narrator to fill out personal information that would aid in the question writing process.

The pre-interview is a “necessary precondition of research for oral historians.” It is after the pre-interview that the practitioner takes the research that has been done, combine it with what she or he has learned from the prospective narrator and formulate questions that will be asked during the interview to maximize the historical potential as well as reinforce the validity and reliability of his or her sources. Oral historian David King Dunaway states, “we research to know, not to judge. The historical interviewer does not apply standards of his/her own time or of his/her subculture to historical testimony; s/he is in the business of eliciting witnessed facts and constructing a historical frame of
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reference that is neutral, as much as possible, for the facts.”13 Dunaway mentions several key points that are crucial to remember when formulating questions that are objective and open-ended enough for the narrator to expand on.

Constructing questions is the heart of oral history methodology. For local or community projects, construction of basic questions suffices. Charles Morrissey, oral history practitioner, explains the process: “Phrase questions in open-ended language, avoid jargon, pursue in detail, ask for examples, defer sensitive questions until rapport is solid, let the interviewee set the pace of the interview and speak whatever explanations are foremost in the volunteered version of what occurred.”14 Simple, one sentence, open-ended questions are a good place to start for any interviewer. The initial questions I asked to set the tone for the interview were:

- Describe where you lived, what were some of your early memories?
- What kinds of outdoor activities did you participate in as a child?
- What was your first experience with conservationism or environmentalism?
- What led you to take interest in conservation?
- Was there any particular person, event, etc. that played a key role or influenced your involvement with conservation and the environment?15

Questions are a way to elicit more information. According to oral historian Paul Thompson, “in principle, the clearer you are about what is worth asking and how best to ask it, the more you can draw from any kind of informant.”16 To expand on the open-ended questions, oral historian Charles Morrissey introduced the “Two-sentence format
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as an interviewing technique in oral history field work.”

Morrissey first introduced this style in 1967 during the First National Colloquium on Oral History. The two-sentence format “provides the interviewer with a reoccurring opportunity to explain, in the first sentence, why a particular question deserves an informative answer,” and the second sentence “repeats closely the wordage in the first sentence, in an effort to leave no doubt in the interviewee’s mind about the question being posed. Similarly, the second question always asks one question and only one question.”

Examples of the two-sentence format questions I asked are:

- You are currently conducting oral histories of your own for a book about Idaho history that you are writing. Why do you feel that oral histories are important when writing the history of Idaho?

- Idaho Power claims credit for stopping the Hells Canyon High Dam, and the Hells Dam controversy DID redefine the relationship between federal and state governing powers. Do you think Idaho Power has done the public a good service, or have they exploited public fears to maintain their control over water?

The two-sentence format creates a more casual, conversational atmosphere that “provides the interviewer with an opportunity to involve the interviewee in the co-creation of the document.”

It is important to remember that the narrator has ownership of the interview just as the interviewer does and wants to share as much information as possible.

Morrissey states that the overall success of oral history interviews is determined by two basic qualities, rapport and collaboration and that “the two sentence format
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vitalizes each of these fundamentals.” The first sentence of the two-question format builds rapport based on the information and context of that which is being stated. The second sentence containing the question results in a collaborative historical document based on the research of the interviewer and the details or subsequent facts related by the narrator. This technique and the relationship between the interviewer and narrator is an especially important one for academic oral historians, those focused on the scholarship and the presentation of the data or history collected; academic oral historians want their analysis of the work to highlight the importance of the narrators’ stories. As in community oral history, the two-sentence format allows the “interviewer to explain how scholars with different academic interests can benefit from the document being co-created.”

I was able to use this type of format to give a broader, multidisciplinary approach to my interviews by incorporating political, environmental, and legislative and media angles into my questions. Because Idaho’s conservation history is steeped in political and legislative decisions and sometimes battles, political, geological and economic questions were essential to my interviews. Each of these questions therefore, created a means for multidisciplinary use of each interview.

- *It was your concern for your daughters' education that got you into politics. Did you also feel that Idaho's schoolchildren were at a disadvantage in comparison to the rest of the nation?*

- *As someone who has worked on environmental campaigns, including the spotted owl controversy, you have been part of many decisions that have pushed conservation into the realm of politics. Can you describe*
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Crucial to the interviews are the audio recordings. High quality audio recordings of the interview provide oral historians, scholars and researchers “with the literal and accurate rendering of historical testimony.” The equipment used for oral history interviews has dramatically changed and evolved throughout the years. Tapes and tape recorders are outdated and are being replaced by more modern digital equipment. Yet, even though digital equipment is preferred, most oral history centers and historical societies still have a combination of the old and new. Getting to know the equipment is essential in preparing for an oral history interview. One oral historian suggests knowing the equipment and confidence in the set up is the “equivalent of the physician’s bedside manner.” I was introduced to the recording equipment by Kathy Hodges and she and I did a mock interview so that I would have a complete understanding of how the recorder worked, how to set it up in a timely and efficient manner, how to adjust the sound and how to transfer the audio file once the interview was complete. I set the recorder up four times and put it away four times, each time explaining to Kathy the process and method behind each action. By repeating the process, I was able to set up and take apart my equipment before and after each interview knowing that I had done it correctly and captured the interview with timeliness and clarity. Not fumbling around with the audio equipment is an automatic indication of professionalism and confidence when conducting an interview.
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The pre-interview stage, constructing thoughtful and concise questions and familiarity of equipment all lead to the actual face-to-face interview. Once the pre-interview stage is complete, the interviewer enters into what is known by oral historians and practitioners as field recording. Field recording consists of the interview, questioning and listening. The process begins even before the equipment can be turned on however. According to the “1976 federal copyright law, all people whose voices are recorded on tape have instant copyright on that tape from the moment it is made. Permission must be given for any use of the tape, and this is the purpose of the legal release.”

Once the legal release is signed, the interview may begin. “Field recording is obviously a great deal more complicated than setting up one’s equipment and turning it on.” No matter how prepared the interviewer is, there are times that the narrator will throw a curveball or say something completely unexpected but that should be pursued further. Oral historians and community oral history practitioners can prepare for these circumstances by listening. “It is altogether too easy to proceed through a schedule of questions without listening for the chance statements that yield unsuspected knowledge.” By listening to the narrator during the interview, clarification can be made on the spot, and detail is gained about a particular event or memory adding to the richness of the interview as a source. Listening also alerts the interviewer when the interview has gone off track or when a new question needs to be asked. The interviewer must also learn to listen for silence; silence is often an indicator that the narrator has concluded that thought and is ready to move on.

28 Ericson, 46. For a copy of the legal release, see Appendix C.
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ask or change the topic before the narrator is finished talking. By interrupting, the interviewer is suggesting that what is currently being said by the narrator is of no importance, causing the narrator to retreat verbally and visually from the interview and creating tension and dead air. Thus, refining one’s skills as a listener will make for a much more cohesive interview and ensure a “right relationship between interviewers and interviewees, a pattern in which oral historians gain the trust of their respondents while maintaining their position as detached critics.”

It was my own assumption, prior to learning the oral history process that the interview was the final product. Likewise, other scholars have noted, “some people may think that the oral history ends when the interviewer turns off the tape, gets the release forms signed, and leaves the interview location. The reality is that the interviewer has only finished part of the oral history.” The last stage for the interview is the post-interview and includes “making a copy of the original tape, labeling both original and the copy with essential information, indexing the recording, and writing a thank you note to the narrator.” Also included in this stage is writing an abstract of the interview and transcribing the audio file. If a transcription of the audio file is not available, the interview is still considered finished if there is an abstract and index for the interview, and it can be put out on the shelves for patron use. This is the process according to the Idaho Oral History Center and Public Archives and Research Library and may differ slightly elsewhere.
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34 Ericson, 48. The post-interview stage I have described is according to the Idaho Oral History Center and the steps that I was trained in to complete my interviews. The post-interview process can vary from agency to agency.
Making a copy of each interview consists of transferring the audio file from the ScanDisc (SD) chip in the recorder to, in my case, the “O” drive on the IOHC server. After transferring the file, I converted the file from an MP3 to a .WAV file. The .WAV file is a compressed file that has a higher quality of sound in a smaller file. I then burned a copy of the .WAV file onto an archival CD and labeled it accordingly.

The next step is to begin working on the finding aid. A finding aid is a term used primarily in the library and museum fields, describing a series of written formalities detailing the contents of a single interview. Based on the IOHC guidelines, I prepared each finding aid in this order: abstract, index (including names and places) and transcript. There are certain elements each part of the finding aid should include. The abstract is a “one-paragraph summary containing basic information about the interview. It will become a part of the catalog entry, enabling researchers quickly to find interviews related to their topics of interest.” After I finished writing the abstract, the next step was creating an index. An index breaks the interview into one-minute segments, noting changes in topics and subjects discussed as well as significant names and places. If the audio file is not intended to be transcribed the index tends to be more detailed. “Not all interviews will be indexed the same way. Some narrators will give a long detailed explanation of one subject which can be briefly summarized, while others in the same amount of time will mention names, dates, places and activities, all of which should be listed.”

The final step in preparing a finding aid is the transcription of the audio file. A general rule of thumb for transcribing is for every one minute of audio, it takes four

35 “Abstract” definition and format prepared by Ellen Haffner, Idaho Oral History Center, Idaho State Historic Society. For an example of an abstract, see OH 2575, “Abstract.”
36 Ericson, 51. For an example of an index, see OH 2575, “Index.”
minutes to transcribe. This stage goes significantly faster if one has perfect typing skills and speed, but in my case, the general rule was accurate. “The purpose of the transcript is to give those using the oral history a written account, so they can follow along as they listen to the recording and better maneuver through large amounts of material. It also allows access to the oral history for the hearing impaired, and a transcript is a form of backup in case the recording is lost or damaged.” \(^{37}\) A transcript is also a completely independent searchable product. If one does not want to listen to the audio file, a transcript acts as a literal substitute. There are numerous sources available on transcription methods and styles. The Idaho Oral History Center staff instructs interviewers working on transcription to use discretion when transcribing. For the purpose of my oral history project, it was not necessary to include every ‘um,’ ‘oh,’ and ‘uhh.’ However, if I intended my project to be analyzed by, or if I myself was, a linguist, including each utterance “as well as all other vocalizations, hesitations, and repetitions” would be necessary. \(^{38}\) Grammatically speaking, there are several corrections that can and are made while transcribing an interview. ‘Yeah’ is transcribed as ‘yes,’ ‘nah’ is transcribed as ‘no,’ but much more than that and one runs the risk of too much word manipulation. The interviews I conducted were with well spoken, articulate individuals, leaving very little for me to change in the transcription.

For some interviews, the finalization of the transcript signals the finished product. The legal release, personal data form, index, transcript (if available) and abstract are then three hole punched, housed in a folder and put on the shelves of the library. This was not

\(^{37}\) “Transcript” definition and format prepared by Ellen Haffner, Idaho Oral History Center, Idaho State Historic Society. For an example of a transcript, see OH 2575, “Transcript.”

the end of my project, however. I chose to have my completed project published on the Northwest Digital Archives. The Northwest Digital Archives (NWDA) “provides enhanced access to archival and manuscript collections in Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Alaska, and Washington through a union database of Encoded Archival Description (EAD) finding aids.”\textsuperscript{39} The NWDA is set up as a network with institutions and agencies in the Northwest and each participating institution or agency has to follow certain criteria when selecting and publishing projects to the digital archives. The purpose of the NWDA is to maximize exposure of projects from participating agencies and link researchers to a wide variety of collections, manuscripts and projects that they might otherwise not have been able to research given their location. “Significant subject commonalities include the major economic forces in the region, agriculture, forest products, fisheries, and natural resources; urban and rural social and progressive movements; local state, regional, and national politics; outdoor recreation; Native American language and culture; and the place of religious communities in the region.”\textsuperscript{40}

The first step in publishing a project to the NWDA is writing an encoded archival description or EAD. The EAD is a specific, extended finding aid that is universally recognized and searchable on the NWDA site. There are several components to the EAD not included in the typical finding aid one might run across at a library. The first step was to write a summary of what is being submitted. The second step was to write a historical note about the importance of the project in context of Idaho history; the historical note also serves to highlight certain subjects mentioned in the interview and also any overlapping themes brought up by more than one of the interviews. The next step was

\textsuperscript{40} Northwest Digital Archives.
writing a content description. The content description contains the specifics about the project, how many interviews, audio files and transcripts, as well as where the interviews are housed and why and for whom the project was conducted.

Also included in the EAD is any related material that deals with the project or that the interviewer referenced in his or her research such as manuscript collections or specific papers and archives. Such sources must be included in the EAD to aid researchers. The next step to writing the EAD was describing each interview in detail, which is a step already completed in the post-interview process when writing an abstract. The abstract is then equivalent to the detailed description needed for each interview for the EAD. Finally, subject terms must be assigned to the EAD that are specific to what topics are covered in the project. Subject terms are approved by the Library of Congress and can be searched on their electronic database. Once all of this material has been accumulated and written, it is then ready to be published to the NWDA. Each participating agency has an individual trained in uploading the EAD to the NWDA server. The Public Archives and Research Library’s administrator Linda Morton-Keithley is trained in all aspects of EAD technical writing and uploading processes. I worked closely with Linda as well as with the Idaho Oral History Center’s assistant Ellen Haffner while writing my EAD. Because of the technical writing skills that it takes to master the EAD process, these two individuals were key players in the successful upload of my project to the NWDA. The Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project can now be accessed by anyone using the Northwest Digital Archives search engine, and is also searchable from the Google search engine.⁴¹

⁴¹ To see the exact NWDA publication of the “Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project” and website address, see Appendix G - Northwest Digital Archives Finding Aid.
When constructing this project, it was my objective to make these interviews available to as many people and as many academic fields as possible. Going through the entire oral history process was the only way to truly fulfill that objective. Not only have I created primary sources, but in doing so helped add to the rich history of Idaho and provide future researchers in such areas of conservation and environmental history a reference and starting point. There is much to be learned from these interviews and the people and voices behind them. It is my hope that each narrator’s story, through the creation of this oral history project, is seen as a viable piece of information crucial to the larger narrative of Idaho history. I am honored to have been part of this history.
APPENDIX B

Andrus, Cecil – OH 2575
ABSTRACT

Andrus, Cecil – OH 2575

DB # 0164

In his interview with Carissa Black and Kelly Orgill in December of 2008, Cecil Andrus, who was the 26th and 28th Governor of Idaho and United States Secretary of the Interior, talked about his experiences in Idaho and national government as well as conservation in Idaho’s wilderness areas. Andrus narrated his experiences from 1960-1995 and included topics such as: Idaho identity; state and local politics; the Department of the Interior; Idaho wilderness areas; environmentalism and conservation; and cooperative politics. Andrus mentioned the role of the citizen conservation organizations in state and national government, and the role of education and its impact on Andrus’ entry into politics. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
Andrus discussed his political career. He listed the jobs he had prior to becoming a state legislator, including service in the military, fighting in the Korean War, and working as a lumberjack in Orofino, Idaho.

Andrus explained his motivations for entering politics. He recalled a city council meeting at which he challenged the seated senator, Senator Leonard Cardiff, to improve the public schools and kindergartens in Orofino and the surrounding small towns.

Andrus described how he went about changing the standards of public education as a state senator. As governor he mandated kindergarten services. Andrus recalled some of the opposition the kindergarten legislation faced. Some referred to the establishment of mandatory kindergarten as a communistic plot.

Andrus stated that Idahoans were not “stupid, dumb, backwards people,” referring to the legislators in office at the time of the interview. He saw most Idahoans as educated and not backwards thinkers.

Andrus described the “sparcity factor” involved in asking for more educational funding in rural parts of Idaho. He also talked about his first term as a state senator. During his first term as senator he discovered that politics were not black and white. He learned to compromise and collaborate.

Andrus discussed his stance on environmental issues. He was the first successful gubernatorial candidate to run on an environmental ticket in the United States. He referenced his involvement in successful environmental legislative acts including the passage of the Alaskan Land Bill. He contributed his successes to being in the right place at the right time.
Andrus described the Alaskan Land Bill in detail and how the passage of this bill provided the opportunity to “get things right” in terms of preserving natural resources. He briefly described the development of the West along with the destruction and later protection of the West.

Andrus stated that Idaho had more mileage of protected land than any other state in the nation with the exception of Alaska.

Andrus described in detail the process of saving the salmon in Idaho along the Washington/Oregon border. He talked about the steps needed to preserve the natural migration process of both the juvenile and adult salmon. He mentioned that there was no way to get rid of the dams that prevented and killed off the salmon before they were able to reach their spawning ground, yet there were ways to collaborate with the preservationists and the power companies that would ensure the success rate for salmon migration in those areas.

Andrus discussed the role of Idaho Power in the Hells Canyon High Dam controversy. Andrus stated that Idaho Power didn't play a role in stopping the dams, the public stopped the dam. Idaho Power, albeit a different company back then, was acting purely out of greed.

Andrus talked about public lands and resources in the United States and how the majority of these two with the exception of some fossil fuels and hydropower are west of the Mississippi. Andrus reflected on the idea of stewardship of the land and how those that control over half the vote in politics live east of the Mississippi river and had to become aware of the issues that those west of the river were facing, including the environment and preservation of natural resources. However, Andrus mentioned that some of the strongest supporters of environmental policy were residents of the east coast because they had seen the devastation of what people can do.

Andrus talked about Rick Johnson and the Idaho Conservation League and how organizations like the Idaho Conservation league have brought about change.

Andrus recalled a story about Ernie Day, Ted Trueblood and Bruce Bowler, and himself in conjunction with the passage of the 1980 Wilderness Act and the Wilderness Of No Return area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Minute</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41:00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Andrus talked about the cyclical pattern of the Sagebrush Rebellion and the roll that Ted Trueblood played in surfacing the Sagebrush Rebellion. He also mentioned that all public land at the time had multiple use, thus any decision made about the use of the land, must be made with future multiple use in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>In retrospect, Andrus described the issue with the salmon as an open sore in his career, in that there doesn’t seem to be an end in sight. Andrus also mentioned that there are several conservation organizations that are not as well balanced as the Idaho Conservation League, at the time of the interview. He said these groups would grab an issue and take a position that is not attainable just to have something to “scream and holler about.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Andrus talked about the changing connotation of the term “Environmentalist.” He mentioned that he would describe himself as a “common sense conservationist.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Andrus listed several accomplishments that have taken place over the course of his tenure in politics including: Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, BLM Organic Act, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Andrus talked about the problems that Barack Obama will face when entering into the office of President. Andrus stated that Obama will not be very popular after a while because of the actions that he will have to take to fix the problems the country faces. Andrus also spoke to the issue of race and Obama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Andrus described the role of the Secretary of the Interior and stated that whoever holds that position is responsible, with exception of the Secretary of Defense, for the sustaining of the future of the United States due to the management of all lands in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54:30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Andrus described the generation of alternative forms of energy in the West and problems between getting the energy from the source to the destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55:33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>END OF TRACK ONE END OF INTERVIEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAMES AND PLACES INDEX

Bowler, Bruce
Cardiff, Leonard
Chenoweth, Helen
Day, Ernie
Guth, Norman
Little, Brad
Minnick, Walter
Obama, Barack
Orofino, Idaho
Trueblood, Theodore
CA: I was elected to the state senate in November of 1960. I served four terms as state legislator, was elected governor in November of 1970. I served at, well it was a little over six years, and I resigned and became a member of President Carter’s cabinet. And then in 1981—and that period of time was from 1977 to 1981. I returned to Boise went in—well basically [I] lied to my wife. I told her, I said, “I’m all through with this politics business. I’ll go back into the private sector and make all that money I promised you when I married you many years ago. And I’m, it was an unintentional false hood, but never the less six, seven years later, I ran for governor again 1986, was elected, was re-elected in 1990, served until 1995, and retired. Voluntarily I might add. There was no term limits at that point in time in Idaho, you could do whatever.

That spans almost 50 years of political activity, some of it part time but much of it full time. And I still remain active in the political arena as you point out, with working for the election of President-Elect Obama. Walt Minnick, I was chairman of his campaign, and he was successfully elected to the first congressional district. And that just about gives you the political background of how I got started. People assume that I am an attorney because I usually have got on a coat and a tie, and I’ve got a title and all that stuff. And I say, “Heavens no! I’m a lumberjack
and a political accident.” And if you’ve read the book, you know exactly what I’ve done.

KO: That’s, well there is a picture of you in the book with an ax standing there.

CA: Yeah, yeah I grew up in what they call slabs, slivers, and knot holes in lumberjacking and in the woods during the Depression. Keep in mind, I grew up in the 1930s long before either one of you were even thought of, so I go way back. OK, take off.

CB: Alright, I would just like to know, in your book you mentioned that you got into politics because of the education of your daughters. Can you go into a little bit of detail on what influenced that?

CA: Certainly, I served, unlike our current President of the United States, I voluntarily served in the military. I didn’t run to the Alabama National Guard and hide. And I served in the Korean War. I was very fortunate in I did not earn a purple heart. Some of my friends did, and some of my friends are still in Korea, buried there. So, I understand what war is all about, and I voluntarily went. I served. I came back from that and was, basically— Uncle Sam discharges you; I was unemployed. He gave me three hundred bucks, and by then I had a wife and an infant child. And I had a job offer in Orofino, Idaho, back into the lumberjacking aspects of how I grew up. I accepted that job and became involved in the small lumbering community in Orofino, Idaho. Orofino, the Spanish definition, ‘fine gold’ because gold was first discovered in Idaho on Orofino Creek, in gosh 1860 or 1850.
So anyways I settled up there, went right back into the timber industry aspect of making a living. My wife and I became involved in the local community PTA. We had our oldest daughter was commencing elementary school. I was chairman of the, or chairman commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post in Orofino. And we, just like two young married couples, we became involved in the local activities. And when Tana started school, we became concerned, as other parents in the area did, about the level of excellence of education for school children in our community. And the point that I tried to make as chairman or commander of the VFW Post, became involved in, how do we improve education. In fact we even, that was prior to kindergartens in Idaho, we created our own kindergarten funded by the VFW Post and things of that nature. Well, my point was that my child in Orofino’s small basically rural educational system should be entitled to an education equivalent to or better than at least the larger areas like Lewiston, Boise, Caldwell, Pocatello, Idaho Falls, where ever. But we were not because when you have so many more different classrooms, it takes a lot more money per ADA to bring about an education. You don’t have the options. You don’t have, you can’t hire the higher level of excellence of teaching staff. And so that was the point.

So through my involvement in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and our concern, we had a public meeting at the local school house one evening, and we invited the incumbent state senator, a man by the name of Leonard Cardiff. Keep in mind, I am 28 years old at that time, and when you’re 28 years old your mouth works faster than your brain. And so we put together this meeting and invited Senator
Cardiff to come. I thought he was ancient. He was 66 years old, and I thought, “Man! What over the hill.” Anyway, we had the meeting and expressed our concern. And he made the ridiculous statement that, “Well the education was good enough for me. Its good enough for them,” kind of approach. I am paraphrasing what he said. And for some reason, I jumped up and said, “Well, Senator, it’s obvious that it was not good enough for you.”

And well the crowd laughed; he got mad. And it was a discourteous thing to say, but I did it. Well the next thing I knew, some people gathered around and said, “Well you should run against him for the state legislature.” I won’t bore you with all of the details, but I did. You’ve read the book; you know the story. And here 50 years later, here we are.

CB: That’s right. Do you have a follow-up?

CA: But anyway it was the concern for public education that got me involved. Otherwise I would still be a lumberjack in Orofino.

KO: I did kind of wonder when I read that in your book, that Cardiff had said, well it was good enough for him. Do you think that’s a typical Idahoan attitude because you see that frequently in people?

CA: Not now.

KO: Not anymore?

CA: No, no, no, no, no, I do not believe that now.

KO: But it was one time?

CA: It was at one point in time that they thought an eighth grade education in small rural communities was a good enough start in life. You could read, you could
write, you have simple mathematics to balance your check book, and things like that was good enough. Because most of the young people, the young women/girls, however you want to define, you know most of them went to normal school or got married right out of high school. The young men went to work in the woods and did other things, you know, and that was an accepted way of life. That was fifty years ago, and now, no, that is not the attitude in Idaho at all. While I was governor, we created kindergartens. But to show you how slow it was, it took five attempts to get it through the Idaho Legislature. And we were one of the last two states in American to bring in kindergartens. And the only way I finally got it done was to put it before the legislature and said, “It shall be voluntary. Only those children whose parents desire go to kindergarten.” Well every parent that had a five year old child wanted to go to kindergarten. So boom, away they went, you know. So anyways that’s the history of kindergartens, and how they got started.

KO: You mention, too, in your book that people actually thought it was a communistic plot.

CA: Yes, that’s true. There were members of the legislature, some of them still have—of our current legislature still have the same attitude and the same level of mentality. And that is that it was a communist plot to remove the children from the influence of the home and the parents and brain wash them. Ridiculous right wing crazy ideologues and we still have some in the Idaho Legislature.

KO: We do, are we seeing less of those now?

CA: Yes.
KO: Do you think Idaho is changing and will phase out?

CA: Oh yeah, we’re not stupid, dumb, backwards people. We still have a few people, but every state does, that are right of Attila the Hun. But they’re not accomplished. If we had the time, I could describe to you the evolution of the cattle industry and how the basically young men and some young women ended up, instead of just herding the cows, going to the University of Idaho and studying agricultural economics. And they’re every bit as well educated and politically astute as anybody. I am trying to think of, Brad Little, who is a state senator in the legislature, is, he is about the fourth generation of a livestock operator family in the cattle and sheep, well livestock industry, extremely well educated, knowledgeable, intelligent, articulate and probably will end up being a Republican candidate for governor one of these days. So, but if you look back at his grandfather, then you know it was a different situation. Hey all I got to do is to know how to take care of the cows and the sheep and hope that the market is adequate to make a living for my family. Brad, well, its kind of an evolution. Excuse me, that’s a long answer.

CB: How did your experience as a lumberjack and also your years in the state senate, state legislature, influence your campaign with the White Clouds?

CA: Well, I came to the state legislature, as I pointed out earlier, with a narrow vision of what I wanted to accomplish. I beat, I won the election. And then they said, “Well you got to go to the state capitol and serve in the legislature.” And I said, “I really don’t have time. I just wanted to prove a point.” Well, so anyway, I think I had, oh, I probably had a sport coat and a couple pairs of slacks and maybe a tie
or two. And it--anyway I came the legislature with the idea in mind, “I will do what I can to improve the funding for elementary schools in rural areas.” And we were successful that first year and including in a distribution formula what we call then a sparsity factor. In other words, if you had fewer children in a classroom unit, you still had the cost of funding that unit and paying for that teacher, but it took more classrooms throughout a rural area than if you had them all coming to school in downtown Lewiston, for example.

Well that sparsity factor brought about more funding in rural parts of Idaho. So I was pleased with that. But I also learned that things were not all black and white and that there were areas of grey. People who had diverse opinions many times had very legitimate concerns and opinions. And that’s why I learned that, as you teach in Politics 101, politics is the art of compromise. So you gotta recognize other people’s feelings and concerns. And many of them have very, you know, accurate, logical, well-founded concerns, so you take them into consideration. So, how did that, what did I learn? I learned, number one, that I was reasonably successful in the legislative area, and I enjoyed it.

I became more of a student. I did not graduate from college. I served one year and part of other credits part, but I was more an engineering type student, mathematics. I took freshman English because it was required, but after I became involved in the political arena, I probably studied more government, history and taxation than I ever had in school. And it became a necessary part, so it was a learning experience. And ten years later, I was the first Democrat to be elected governor in twenty four years.
CB: What’d you say, I was reading in one of your interviews, you referred to yourself as the first donkey in twenty-five years to become the—

CA: To walk on the gold carpet.

CB: That’s right. So would you say that the art of compromise is one of the keys to success for political activity?

CA: That and compromise is interchangeable with the word collaboration. You’ve got to be willing, you can’t just blindly say, “My way is the only way.” You’ve got to sit down and bring the people to the table and devise an acceptable solution to any given problem.

KO: Well that must have been especially challenging in Idaho, trying to balance the needs of jobs and the desires of environmentalists.

CA: Well I consider myself, I, in those days, I considered myself an environmentalists. I was a lumberjack, but I hunt and I fish. I did then; I do now. It was a way of life for me. But, you don’t—now, I’ve had a lot of battles, and I was probably the first gubernatorial candidate in 1970 to run on a somewhat environmental ticket anywhere in America and be elected. And Colorado followed two years later with, I can’t grasp his name right now, but anyway he ran on more of an environmental ticket and was elected. But yeah, there were controversies but you begin. I’ve learned that—I used to fight a lot when I was a kid, and as a young man that was a way of life, kind of. And as I got a little older I learned that black eyes, split lips, and broken teeth were probably not the best way to resolve an issue. And I learned to sit down with people and work it out, and you don’t hear very well with your mouth open. And
you have to teach yourself to sit, unlike I’m doing now, you have to sit and listen to the other person. And all of a sudden a light comes on, and you think, “Hmm, that’s not a bad idea,” or “Hey, they’ve got a point,” or “Hey how can we fix that.” So yes, I have probably been personally involved in creating more wilderness, more national parks, more wild and scenic rivers, more study areas than any other person, but I just happened to be on the right horizon of time to be able to influence a passage.

The Alaska Land Bill, it was 103 million acres in one fell swoop, but we had the opportunity in Alaska. We, society, had the opportunity to do it right the first time because it hadn’t been torn up. You know just very quickly, say two hundred and fifty years ago we started from the East Coast to build a strong world and America. We started migrating westerly, and the only currency we had to entice the people to move west and develop was land and resources. So we were giving away, you know, the grass lands and the timber lands and the water purity and one thing and another, just to get people to get people to migrate. So all of a sudden a couple hundred years later, we end up on [phone rings]. Yes.

Unknown person: Rod Santos.

CA: Who? Rod Santos, oh yeah, former Fish and Game Director, well, I don’t have time. Anyway we arrive at the Pacific Coast. And we look back over our shoulders and see what, well, we gave away so much that we had—you know every time you fouled the air, spoiled the rivers or anything, you just moved over another horizon, and there was unlimited natural resources lying there awaiting development. And so we just kept doing it. So then we turn around and started
fifty years ago saying, “Whoops, what have we done?” So we started protecting
the remnants of the things. You know some rivers have not been fouled some
forests lands that needed protection and recreation areas and so forth. And that’s
what it amounted to, the remnants that we were saving.
Well then Alaska, we had the opportunity to do it right the first time, and we did
it. And we did a pretty good job of it. And here we created the Hells Canyon
National Recreation Area, the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, the River of
No Return Wilderness Area, and the list goes on and on. And we have more
mileage of wild and scenic river designation than any other state in the nation
with the exception of Alaska.
CB: Just kind of tagging on the Hells Canyon, Kelly and I had come up with a
question, Idaho Power claims credit for stopping the Hells Canyon High Dam.
CA: Ok, excuse me just a minute Ms. Black. [Addressing his assistant who came into
the office] Now did you say Rod Santos? I’m so old now I’ve become a historical
reference. And all these people call me, “How do I get to Obama?” or “How we
gonna save the salmon?” or “How we gonna do this?” or “We gotta do that.”
KO: I was wondering myself, can we save the salmon?
CA: Yeah, but not by coming back to what you said before—
CB: Do you want to ask him? This was kind of your question.
KO: I was going to say—
CA: Not by drawing a line in the sand and saying don’t step across it.
KO: We have to work together.
CA: We gotta work together. And we don’t have time this morning, but I could walk you through saving the salmon, as we know them in Idaho, is a water quality and a water velocity issue. Because it used to be that a smolt a juvenile salmon, seven inches long, eleven months old, would be flushed to the Pacific Ocean in the spring with the run off of the snow and everything. And it would take nine to ten days, and two to three years later they came back as adults. And sixteen million of them came in the mouth of the Columbia, eight million went up into Canada, and the Columbia. And eight million went into the Clear Water and the Snake and everything else.

Ok, now with the dams there, and that water moving them, flushing them, most people think of little fish would swim out to the ocean. They point their nose up stream, and the water flushes, pushes them out. And like I said, that water is traveling at a velocity of about twelve feet per second. When you put the dams in so the little fish come steaming down out of upper Idaho, all of a sudden they hit Lewiston, and it’s slack water. And so they go from a movement of twelve feet per second to one foot per second or less. And the biological change from fresh water to salt water is already taking place in their body. You get predators have an opportunity to capture a lot of them. Some of them just plain die because of the body change. Then they have to go through all the turbines and the stuff.

Now see, there is a way, without breaching. People ask me, “Well, are you for breaching the dams?” And my response is not being, not side stepping the question is, “I know from personal experience you are not going to breach those dams.” Politically it is impossible because it would take an act of Congress and a
lot of money. And there are people who benefit from the generation of electrical energy like California. We divert energy from those dams to California. They shut down their hydrocarbon and fossil fuel generation and use the hydro electricity. It helps clean up their air, and it’s cheaper. Washington and Oregon benefit from it. Well we’ve got four members of the congressional delegation, two senators and two house members. And how are you going to out vote a hundred members of Congress from California and another forty or fifty from Idaho [Washington?] or Oregon. It’s simply not going to happen. So therefore if you’re practical and a realist, then you say, “Well then what else can we do?”

Well you can increase that velocity during the migration time of the year in the spring when you get the run off, dump a lot of that water over the dam, flush those fish out like you used to, for that six week period. See, biologically, scientifically, we know exactly when that migration takes place, almost to the day. So you can flush at that time. You get through flushing, stop, fill the reservoirs. So the barges haven’t gone to Lewiston for six weeks, big deal. They can use the railroads or the trucks for six weeks, or they can project into the future and do their shipping at different times. Because we have the ability to bring the adults back upstream, but we didn’t take care of the juveniles going down stream. And if you want a big fish coming up river at some point in time, depending on the species of the fish from two to three to maximum four but not—earlier you’ve gotta have to have a little one going down stream so that they grow up in the ocean and come back up as adults.
So can you, the answer to your question, can you save them? Yeah, but it’s gonna take some people to quit shaking their fist and throwing stones at one another. Would it be better for the salmon if the dams weren’t there? Absolutely, but they’re there. And all I’m saying to these wild eyed activists on both sides is, “For God sakes recognize that they are there and say how do we work around it?”

KO: Did you want to follow up on Idaho Power?

CB: Yeah, I was just going to say, Idaho Power claims the credit for stopping the Hells Canyon Dams. And in doing so, it kind of redefined the relationship between federal and state governing powers. Do you think that Idaho Power has done the public a good service or have they exploited the fears to maintain their control of water?

CA: No, well, Idaho Power is trying to, at, now this is years ago keep in mind. And they’re a different company today than they were back in those days. They had no hand to stop that; the public stopped Hells Canyon Dam. Idaho Power activity was simply greed. They didn’t want a public generation facility. They wanted to control the electrical energy that would come from any type of facility like that. But, yeah, they’ve, no, I, in answering your question is, “Did they do it?” No, that’s a figment of their imagination, and their public affairs department trying to take a bow for something that the public did. But that was typical of Idaho Power in those days. But keep in mind, they’re a different company today.

CB: Right, absolutely. How do, with that, how do you view the Idahoans and their struggles with conservation and environmentalism in comparison to mainstream America? Now the West, you mentioned, is clearly unique in the fact that we have
what the east coast doesn’t have anymore. And we can use that to preserve and conserve those resources. But in comparison and maybe drawing on your experience as Secretary of the Interior, how do you see that as compared to mainstream America, maybe over the forty years that— has it been forty years since the White Clouds issue, I guess?

CA: Forty years, yes, yes, it’s been thirty eight, thirty nine years now. Well focusing my mind on the question, now how do I see the change from then until now?

CB: Yes, in comparison with maybe some issues that—

CA: Oh, with the Eastern United States?

CB: Yes.

CA: Well most of the public land and public resources, with the exception of the fossil fuels and a little bit of hydro in some areas, is west of the Mississippi River. Now, the public land, whether it be BLM, Forest Service, Indian Reservations, they’re all basically west of the Mississippi River. So, the vast wealth in resources that we have not extracted today still lie here, and the renewable resources are available. So it behooves us to improve our stewardship, which we have done. And that has brought more strength, but we, the constitutional provision, one man one vote, has an impact here because there are more votes east of the Mississippi River than there are west of the Mississippi River. And if you dump California out of as a separate entity, then it becomes even more out of balance. And so, the eastern United States can’t control in the voting booth as to the direction we take. However, some, many of them in the last thirty, forty years, have seen the wisdom in, “Hey you can’t destroy it all.” And some of our, some of our strongest
supporters for our better environmental protection come from the eastern part of the United States because they have seen the devastation that has taken place by too many people.

And we have a tendency, we humans, we love things to death. Got a beautiful lake right there that you mentioned a while ago, if you build a road up to it and you had a large city close by, pretty soon there would be beer cans in it and everything else you know because too many people. That’s like our national park system. You can only handle so many people trampling upon mother earth without destroying mother earth. So there has to be some limiting factors.

CB: You mention that Ernie Day took that photo. With figures such as Ernie Day, who were very influential in the grassroots conservation, citizen conservation organizations in Idaho, how do you see the role of these citizen organizations adding to say the power of legislature through lobbying. Or I spoke with the director of the Idaho Conservation League, Rick Johnson, and he was very satisfied with the turn in kind of the politics, especially with the Minnick election. Do you see that these conservation organizations are going to play an even larger role with state politics in the next four to eight years hopefully?

CA: Yes, I think Rick has seen it. Keep in mind, I knew Rick Johnson years ago when he didn’t have the grey in his beard.

CB: Yes. Long hair. [laughs]

CA: He was a bomb thrower. He had long hair pony tailed, bomb throwing type of individual. The maturity that comes with age and getting your head beat in a few time has worked wonders with Rick. He is an outstanding student of
environmental history. He has probably without question the best organization in the state of Idaho and probably the Rocky Mountain west. The Idaho Conservation League, as far as desiring and bringing about protection, he is not blind and one sided. He doesn’t draw a line in the dirt. He used to, and then he’d stand there and throw bombs.

But, years ago, you mentioned some of my friends, Ernie Day, Bruce Bowler, Ted Trueblood, were all very dear friends of mine. They’re all gone now. It used to be individuals that did the heavy lifting and brought it down. Now organizations like the Idaho Conservation League have come into where it’s the organization instead of individuals that bring about change. If you’ve talked to Rick Johnson, you’ve talked to one of the best in the business. But without Ernie, well again, one quick story involving the three men I mentioned: The River of No Return Wilderness, well the Wilderness Bill was passed in 1964. I was a state senator. But it was passed and the Congress of the United States, Frank Church carried the bill in the senate. In there it said that you shall study certain areas for designation as wilderness and protect them. But it also said in that bill that previous, I’ve lost the term, existing areas that had been selected—there’s a name for them, but I don’t have it in my head. I have it; I just can’t regurgitate it. Anyway those special areas had to be looked at first.

So, a few years go passed by, and they write regulations. They do things, and then all of a sudden, I become Governor of the state of Idaho. That was a heart wrenching situation for many people to have, like I said, the donkey walking on their gold carpet over there. But, it fell into my lap to bring about the designation
of that area as to what I thought wilderness should be in that part of Idaho. We did a study, and we found—and that protected area, the previously protected area, was 1.4 million acres. All right around the edges of that, there’s a lot big yellow pine trees and timber. And the timber industry and Boise Cascade in particular was thirsting to get in and cut it down, de-nude the area. They were big in those years about clear cutting and one thing and another. I found that the hydrological divides had not been adequately protected. Therefore we had to expand that 1.4 million acres to about one almost, well it was 1.89 almost 1.9 million acres. And because of the hoopla that was going on by the devout timber beasts was you know adequate to where I thought, “I’ll look like a wild-eyed, screaming, tree-hugging, posey-sniffer out there in crazy land if I’m not careful, and then I won’t get it done.”

So I went to Ernie Day, Bruce Bowler and Ted Trueblood. And I said, “Okay, you bandits, I need help. I want you three guys to create a study group, public group of some kind,” like now would be a 501c3. And they named it. They said ok, and they called themselves the River of No Return something group. And I said, “Now I want you to come up with a number that’s someplace around 2.3 to 2.5 million acres that you want protected. And then when you make that public, then I’ll step up and say, ‘Oh, that’s too large. It should be 1.89.’” da da da da da da, and then I’ll look more moderate. And it worked like gang busters, except when we signed in the final bill to national level, those three guys fell in love with their proposal. And that was the amount that was passed. Now the River of No Return Wilderness Area is now 2.3 million acres, just what—but at the time, it helped me
say to the people there was more land that had to be protected, and it has to be a minimum of 1.89 million acres.

And then when it got to the Congressional level, why with the help of some of these east coast people you referred to earlier who had floated the Middle Fork of the Salmon and some other areas, we were able to add some of those sensitive, fragile areas to it. And it came up to 2.3 million acres. And it was signed into law—you see that picture right behind you there, that is President Jimmy Carter on your right, my left. And I’m speaking, and that was the signing of that bill in December of—

KO: 1980?

CA: Of 1980 and I had taken Ernie. Ernie Day was still alive, Ted had gone, Bruce was ill and couldn’t travel. I took Ernie Day and—see, age catches up on me; I can’t spit the names out so quickly as I used to—well an outfitter and a guide from the Middle Fork of the Salmon River, Norman Guth G-U-T-H. Norman Guth and Ernie Day, I invited them back to Washington D.C. for the signing ceremony because they had been deeply involved in it. And they came back, and they were present at the signing ceremony.

And I, they brought back a smoked steelhead. And they said we want to take a smoked steelhead and give it to the president. Well the secret service doesn’t let any food go into the White House with out, you know, their clearance and everything else. But since I was a member of the cabinet, I had free access to come and go. So I said, “I’ll tell you what we’ll do.” I took a nice leather brief case I had, and we put smoked steel head in that. And I carried it in, and the secret
service didn’t say anything. I walked right through. We went into—I made arrangements. We went in the West Wing to visit with the President and introduce these two guys to him. And I opened up my brief case and gave him the smoked salmon. He tasted it, and I don’t know if you’re familiar with smoke steelhead, but there’s a lot of oil. Well it had seeped out into my brief case. Well it ruined about a hundred dollar brief case. [Laughs] But anyway, the President took it, he enjoyed it there and took some up to Roselyn.

CB: So it was a success?

CA: Yeah, so that was the story of the River of No Return Wilderness Area, which is now the Frank Church Wilderness of No Return Wilderness Area, that’s how that was created. And I was the architect. As Secretary of the Interior, I had helped create the area when I was governor, and then all of a sudden I find my self sitting in another chair. And it’s my responsibility to get it passed into Congress. So we got it. Ok, go ahead.

KO: Do we have anymore?

CB: We have the Ted Trueblood.

KO: Looking at Ted Trueblood’s Save our Public Lands campaign, when he was fighting like the Sagebrush Rebellion, what do you think had more impact with that? ‘Cause I know that he did a lot of mailings to the public trying to tell them the truth about the Sagebrush Rebellion.

CA: Well the truth is the sagebrush rebellion is not anything new; it’s cyclical. It first came into being in the 1800s, same thing, you know, in the hills. “Don’t step on me,” and they’d show the rattle snakes and da da da da da. And it usually surfaces
in certain election times, and it’s a misnomer. Ted was a writer for *Outdoor Life* and *Field and Stream*, and he wrote a lot of articles pointing out that it was a political—what do I want to say. I’ll get the right word. It was a political maneuver usually in opposition to some environmental concerned or Democratic candidate. And Helen Chenoweth was the most recent person to surface it a few years back. And I forget, but she was opposed to any kind of the wilderness wanted roads throughout every area and everything. And she was taking the position that you should not have protection. And we the cowboys and Indians that live out here ought to do as we damn well please. The thing, and a lot of people who lease public land like AUM, Animal Unit Month designation by some of the ranchers, years ago. Although it was public land, they considered it was their land because they were paying a minimal price to graze their cattle on it. And an AUM is a mother cow with a calf on her side; that’s the definition. And you gotta be careful in a given year, how many Animal Unit Months you dump on any piece of ground because it varies from year to year. [Transcriber’s Note: According to the Idaho Rangeland Resource Commission, an AUM is the amount of forage needed to sustain one cow and her calf, one horse, or five sheep or goats for a month.]

And what a lot of people don’t understand, they keep saying that the federal government owns that land. And I say wait just a minute; we own that land, you, me, you and the other people. The federal government manages it, by an act of Congress, with regulation. Now if you don’t like it, then change the regulations, but don’t say it’s owned by the federal government. It is not! So that’s about
another key thing in the environmental that the opponents always say that well, we should have, all the public land should be multiple use. Now the use of that term, what does it imply to you? It implies that we all use it for whatever we want it for. Well have you ever seen people having a picnic in an open pit mine? Have you ever seen, you know, it depends on what the use is. So if you’re gonna, if you’re gonna clear cut an area, you’re not really going to have any elk or deer in that area for a few years at least, ‘til something grows back. So if your gonna use this area for an open pit mine, then you gotta have this area for fishing and hunting or this area for river rafting or kayaking or whatever use. So multiple use is a concept that is in migration around the areas of what you want to use it for. But for them to imply that we will use it all for any purpose is a bunch of bull.

How we doing, are we about done?

CB: Almost. If you could just in retrospect over the last forty years or so pinpoint an issue that you have seen change dramatically since you’ve worked on it, are there any areas that you seen, or let see, let me rephrase that—

CA: Come to fruition? Now, that we didn’t win back then?

CB: Yes, and maybe the opposite, if you have any references to anything that—

CA: Well probably the salmon migration and numbers is probably the biggest one that continues to be an ulcerated sore on the public mind. It, now by the same token some of my—now we talked about Rick Johnson and the Idaho Conservation League a while ago. Not all environmental groups are as well balanced as they are. The Sierra Club, for example, has a tendency to be more concerned about generating membership and money and lobbying and you know absolutely blind
to the need and the culture aspects. You know, “Get all the cows off of the public land.” Well that destroys an industry, a culture, and it’s not good for the land. Now it’s bad for the land to put too many animals on there ‘cause it beats it to the dust. But you can’t let it grow wild. Pretty soon it turns to thistles, so you got to have some grazing down to what they call a stubble height. And then you gotta move the cows. And the Brad Littles of the world understand that. But, we still have some, Earth First, for example, you know they’re a bunch of ridiculous idiots, that they will grasp an issue and take the way out, unattainable position just to have something to scream and holler about. So their entire, they’re not all good organizations in my opinion.

And I said earlier, I considered myself an environmentalist back when I started. The connotation has changed by definition in other people’s mind. I now say, “I am a common sense conservationist.” Now what does that mean? I don’t know. But in my mind it means I’m the same guy that used to be an environmentalist, but they changed. I didn’t change, and so I had to change my definition. But back to your question about what has been undone. There’s been tremendous change in my area. You know we’ve done a lot of things with the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Wild and Scenic River Act, the Endangered Species Act, the BLM Organic Act. I could just, in we humans—I’m an old man, by definition, somebody else’s not mine. But, we humans are here for a very short period of time. Now you might think at your young age that, “I’ll be here forever,” type thing. I have seen the evolution of the environmental community in the last fifty years make tremendous changes. I clicked off a whole bunch of them, and I didn’t
even name half of them. So, we’ve attained, almost attained maturity probably, but there’s, there will always be—like now the energy problem. How you gonna handle that? How you gonna face that? What type of energy you gonna do? What do you do about the ozone level, global warming, glacial destruction?

We’ve, you young people have got some problems you’ve got to solve now. I’m done. We have done our share, but it is not enough. I mean, that’s just like Obama stepping into the White House, he has probably the most devastating situation that can face a president-elect, all created by the idiots in the White House, George Bush, Dick Cheney, and some of those people that took a 64 billion dollar surplus eight years ago and changed it into a 3 trillion dollar deficit that, Hell, I’ll be dead and gone. But you ladies and your children are going to have to pay the bill.

And, Obama’s got, you know, the bail outs, the deficit, the war in Iraq is still going on. It should never have been started in the first place, and that poor guy has got to wrap his arms around all those things. And I can tell you in advance, he will not be very popular after a while because some of the things he is going to have to do in order to change that. And already the ridiculous aspects saying, “Well he is not an American, therefore he can not be president. That’s the right wing ideologue, war-monger type mentality of the radio talk show people and those right wingers that are continually harassing the public through letters to the editor. You know, so his father was black, big deal. He was born in America. Our constitution and our laws provide that if two illegal aliens come across the border and their child is born on American soil, the child is an American citizen. Well, Jesus Christ, he was born in Hawaii, which is a state, a white mother and black
father. I think slavery is past, I would hope. And you know it’s refreshing for me to sit and watch a television program where the president-elect is eloquent in his diction and sentence structure and can put two or three sentences together and make sense as compared to a buffoon from Texas who can’t even speak the English language. You know it’s embarrassing.

CB: With that, I mean Obama—

CA: Now that’s a very partisan statement, but I make that statement publicly. It’s ridiculous.

CB: Sure, obviously President-elect Obama’s got much bigger fish to fry with his, this disaster that he is coming into office with, but do you think his choice for—I don’t know, has he made his choice for the [Secretary of the] Interior?


CB: They’ll obviously be focusing on aspects of the environment. I mean do you think that whomever that person will be, well, do you know who that person is? [Laughs] I won’t ask you that.

KO: Can you do it again? We could have you be secretary again?

CA: There is a short list that I am familiar with, but they’re basically westerners who have knowledge of the culture and resources. And they care about what this man cares about.

CB: So they’ll definitely take that—

CA: Interior is probably, with the exception of defense, more important to the sustaining of the future of our America than anybody else because you’ve got so many of—see one- third of all of the lower forty-eight United States is in public
ownership. There’s about 2.1 billion acres in the lower forty-eight. Seven hundred and sixty million acres of that, one-third, is in public ownership. Most of all of that, not all, but most all is west of the Mississippi River. Now you could throw in the Alaska acreages, and that changes it somewhat. But, interior manages most of that in one form or another, with the exception of the US Forest Service. That’s in the Department of Agriculture. It shouldn’t be, but it is. And that’s a political reason many years ago. Yeah, I think that, without divulging any confidences, I can say that the short list that I know as of today is basically of western influence. You know if you talk to a person in Brooklyn or New York or South Carolina or Maine, see they have no comprehension of the vastness, number one, of the western United States, and the cultural differences between their lifestyle and ours. And the broad expanse of land out here that they talk about, I’ll drive over. Well they’re talking about going from L.A. to Boise. Well that’s a two day trip if you drive twelve hours. See they, so—and the lifestyles that we enjoy.

CB: Yeah.

CA: So that interior post is an important one. And you look at alternate energy, wind, geothermal, photovoltaic, sun conversion, thermal temperature conversion, most all of that will take place in the Western United States. But something they haven’t talked about or even thought about yet, you generate all of those alternative forms out here, but you want to light the light bulbs in Chicago. So you’ve got to have a transmission line from the western United States to Chicago that will carry the load. Then you come into right of way problems, you come into how do we—you can’t pick it up like a snow ball and throw it to Chicago. You
gotta have a wire that electricity will run through, and that’s gonna be every bit as
difficult as the development of those alternative forms.

CB:  Sure. Excellent.

CA:  Ladies I’m just about out of time, how we doing?

CB:  Kelly do you have anything? I think that’s a great note to end on.

CA:  I’ve bored you long enough.

CB:  Not even.

KO:  It’s been very interesting.

END OF TRACK ONE
END OF INTERVIEW

Transcribed by Carissa Black, January 17, 2009; audited and corrections entered by Ellen Haffner, January 24, 2009.
Questions for Governor Cecil Andrus:

General Questions

- Can you remember or describe any specific experiences you had as a child that involved or were influenced by the surrounding environment, i.e. camping, hunting, and fishing?
  - What kinds of outdoor activities did your participate in as a child?
- Did you take advantage of the outdoors; how did you view the land you used for recreation?
- What was your first experience with conservationism/environmentalism?
  - What led you to take interest in conservation?
  - Was there any particular person, event, etc. that played a key role or influenced your involvement with conservation and the environment?
- Were you affiliated with any conservation organization?
  - What was your level of participation in the group?
  - What were your impressions of the group that you were affiliated with?
- How did conservation change on a political front as new conservation groups emerged on the scene?
- What are your impressions of contemporary conservation efforts as compared to your affiliation/involvement?
  - What did you believe to be the most important issues surrounding conservation during your involvement?
  - What issues stood out and stand out to you today concerning local and statewide conservation?
- What were some of the most prominent conservation groups around Idaho?
  - What was their level of participation and interaction with the public?
  - How did the citizens of Idaho respond to these conservation groups?
- Do you see a difference between what is referred to as the “hook & bullet” conservationists and those working in the field today, via conservation organizations, state agencies and volunteers?
- Can you recall any other stories or experiences concerning conservation and certain events, people, or media?
Specific Questions

- What do you think is the key to political success in Idaho, especially when it comes to controversial issues such as the environment and conservation?
- Ted Trueblood’s “Save Our Public Lands” Campaign opposed the Sagebrush Rebellion – how did Mr. Trueblood change public opinion, perhaps through his mailings and outdoor writing, or by influencing local politicians?
- Do you see a distinct difference between Idahoans and other Americans? Karl Brooks says Idahoans are more independent what do you think and why?
- How do you view Idahoans and their struggles with conservation as well as local and federal government in comparison to mainstream America - your position gives you a unique (and deeply informed) position on the question - just who are Idahoans, when you compare them to the rest of the nation?
- Can you comment on the Andrus Center for Public Policy and its mission? What are your aspirations for the foundation?
- Idaho Power claims credit for stopping the Hells Canyon High Dam, and the Hells Dam controversy DID redefine the relationship between federal and state governing powers; do you think Idaho Power has done the public a good service, or have they exploited public fears to maintain their control over water?
- It was your concern for your daughters’ education that got you into politics - did you also feel that Idaho’s schoolchildren were at a disadvantage in comparison to the rest of the nation?
December 6, 2010

Governor Cecil Andrus
350 N. 9th Suite 550
Boise Idaho 83702

Dear Governor Andrus:

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with our intern, Carissa Black and for the wonderful stories and experiences that you shared during your interview. She told me it was a pleasure to interview you. I know future generations will enjoy the recording as much as she did.

Currently we do not show that you have requested a copy of the tape or transcript of your interview. If you decide that you would like copies of these items, you can contact us by mail or by telephone at (208) 334-3863, and we will send those out to you at no charge as soon as they are ready.

Thanks again for allowing your interview to be included as part of the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hodges
Oral Historian
Idaho State Historical Society
Public Archives and Research Library
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Heughins, Russell – OH 2576
In his interview with Carissa Black in September of 2008, Russell Heughins, who was a retired Air Force MSgt, and volunteer, member, past president and executive director for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho and the Idaho Wildlife Federation. Heughins narrated his experiences from 1975-2008 and included topics such as: his childhood in Massachusetts; travels with the U.S. Air Force; his educational track; environmentalism; and conservation. Heughins also discussed his career with the Idaho Wildlife Federation, the goals and objectives of the citizen conservation group and the changes he has seen with conservation and the IWF over time. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
Heughins talked about where he was born, his brothers and sisters, and life in South Ashburnham, Massachusetts, as a child. Heughins described the physical environment of Massachusetts as compared to Idaho. Heughins walked to school. He discussed how long it would take him to get there and the friends he would walk with.

Heughins described the distinct characteristics of the landscape where he grew up and the difference in the size of the mountains, the terrain and weather in Massachusetts as compared to Idaho. Idaho was much more grand in every aspect of landscape.

Heughins recalled a story about sledding from one end of town to another in one ride. Heughins talked about his family’s yearly picnics to the state park as well as his fishing excursions before and after school. He recalled his mother and how she “ruled the roost” when it came to watching out for the children.

Heughins described spending his evenings as a child listening to radio shows. He mentioned what type of activities he was involved in during the summer and how he and his friends would make up games to play.

Heughins talked about the population of South Ashburnham, Massachusetts, and how it had grown. He compared its growth to that of Meridian, Idaho.

Heughins discussed the age difference between him and other students at the high school in Albany, Oregon. He was always at the older end of the age spectrum when it came to school.

Heughins described the similarities and differences between Albany, Oregon and South Ashburnham, Massachusetts. The winters were
harsher on the east coast, but the rain was much worse in the Willamette Valley, Oregon.

16:00

Heughins talked about his decision to go into the U.S. Air Force. He chose to do so because he didn’t want to go into agriculture.

17:16

Heughins discussed his mom’s side of the family and how they were always into agriculture. He recalled a story about his Aunt Annie and her molasses cookies. He talked about his great Aunt Annie as one of the first animal advocates he knew. She would not let people hunt or fish on their property.

19:20

Heughins described his early days in the U.S. Air Force, including the bases where he was stationed, the areas he trained in, his deployment to Okinawa, Japan, and his stint in Vietnam.

25:43

Heughins talked about being stationed at the Mountain Home Air Force Base, his initial perception of the area and his subsequent move to Meridian, Idaho. He described how Idaho was the best kept secret for hunting and fishing among his Air Force buddies.

28:20

Heughins talked about how when he first moved to Meridian, Boise was still a small city, and how his family liked the area. He described how he was introduced to chucker hunting.

29:56

Heughins discussed his education after he retired from the military, using the GI Bill. Heughins attended Boise State University, where he received his degree in history, secondary education. From there he moved to Moscow, Idaho, and received his masters of history in public history. He wrote his thesis on the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and public policy.

38:00

Heughins talked about the fishing trips he went on with his grandfather who would visit from Boston, Massachusetts.

39:17

Heughins talked about his affiliation with the North American Versatile Hunting Dog Association (NAVHDA) and the conservation work that group did around the Boise Foothills area. He explained that his work with NAVHDA wetted his appetite for conservation work.

39:49

Heughins discussed his first encounter as a volunteer with the Idaho Wildlife Federation (IWF). He talked about IWF’s regional conservation affiliations and groups. He explained how such organizations and regional conservation affiliates have changed over the years.
Heughins described Idaho conservation in the 1970’s into the 1980’s, a time period that he thought was the ‘hey-day’ of Idaho conservation.

Heughins discussed his role with the IWF including the areas of conservation he looked at. He mainly focused on public lands since he knew quite a bit about public policy from the thesis he wrote as a master’s student at the University of Idaho.

Heughins mentioned the work done by William R. Meiners. Heughins was very fond of Meiners and worked with him during the late seventies and early eighties on several acts of conservation that the IWF supported, such as the Birds of Prey National Recreation Area.

Heughins talked about the Public Lands Review Commission and the case Rogers Morton vs. the National Resource Defense Council. This case resulted in the Federal Land Planning and Management Act.

Heughins explained that he claimed William Meiners as his mentor when it came to conservations and public policy issues. Heughins described other roles that Meiners played in the public realm of conservation. Heughins also mentioned the partnership between Meiners and Bruce Bowler.

Heughins talked about his first impressions of the IWF and mentioned some of the active members that were still around at the time of the interview.

END OF TRACK ONE

Heughins talked about the different positions he held in the Idaho Wildlife Federation, including president of the organization, member on the board of directors and participant on several committees. He also mentioned his role as executive director.

Heughins discussed his participation in creating the affiliate organization, Idaho Bird Hunters. He talked about reviewing BLM policies and guidelines.

Heughins listed several accomplishments of the IWF since his involvement. These included regulation of Idaho’s poaching laws, as well as calling attention to animal diseases.
Heughins talked about the Dry Creek Wildlife Restoration project initiated by the Idaho Bird Hunters.

Heughins talked about a program called ‘FIRE,’ Field Inquiry Research Experience. The new initiative was part of Heughins’ recruitment program to try and get younger individuals involved in wildlife conservation.

Heughins recalled the changes within the IWF he has witnessed during the course of his involvement with the organization. Such topics of change included: The evolution from rod and gun clubs to species-specific clubs, change in the gender and age of members, membership diversity, and recruitment and educational programs.

Heughins expanded on the topic of cooperation between the IWF and the species-specific organizations. He also discussed the relationship between the Idaho Wild Federation and the Nation Wildlife Federation.

Heughins elaborated on the IWF’s recruitment policies. He explained their efforts towards reaching out to universities and the general public, promoting membership through education and internships.

Heughins talked about motivations for his continued membership and work with the IWF. He discussed his social and moral responsibility in preserving wildlife and the general environment. Heughins also talked about the IWF’s continued efforts in cooperation with the Idaho Conservation League.

END OF TRACK TWO
END OF INTERVIEW
NAMES AND PLACES INDEX

Albany, Oregon
Amarillo, Texas
Andres Air Force Base, Washington DC
Boise State University (Boise, Idaho)
Bowler, Bruce
Bowler, Burt
Bowler, Carolyn
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
Christianson, Fred
DeVoto, Bernard
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
Federal Land Planning and Management Act (FLPMA)
Fitchburg, Massachusetts
Gardner, Massachusetts
Hill Air Force Base, Vermont
Idaho Bird Hunters
Idaho Conservation League
Louv, Richard – The Nature Deficit in Children (Book mentioned by Heughins)
McCord Air Force Base, Washington
Meiners, William R. “Bill”
Meridian, Idaho
Morton, Rogers
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho
National Environmental Protection Agency
National Resource Defense Council (NRDC)
Neilson, Moorley
Public Land Review Commission
South Ashburnham, Massachusetts
The National Wildlife Federation
The University of Idaho (Moscow, Idaho)
Treasure Valley Chapter of North American Versatile Hunting Dog Association (NAVDA)
Washington State University (Pullman, Washington)
Wichita, Kansas
Willamette Valley, Oregon
Questions for Russ Heughins:

- Where were you born / where did you grow up?
- Describe where you lived, what were some of your early memories?
- Can you tell me a little bit about your grandparents? Who they were, what they did, what influences did they have on you?
- Can you remember or describe any specific experiences you had as a child that involved or were influenced by the surrounding environment, i.e. camping, hunting, and fishing?
  - What kinds of outdoor activities did your participate in as a child?
- Did you take advantage of the outdoors; how did you view the land you used for recreation?
- How has Boise changed since you have lived here? From when you were a child until now.
- Can you tell me a little bit about your educational experiences
  - What areas did you study?
  - You mentioned a historiography that you did on Lewis and Clark, can you tell me a little bit about it? What influenced you to write about Lewis and Clark?
  - How has your education influenced your participation with the IWF?
- What was your first experience with so-called conservationism/environmentalism?
  - What led you to take interest in conservation? Start from the beginning.
  - Was there any particular person, event, etc. that played a key role or influenced your involvement with conservation and the environment?
- What was the first conservation organization that you were affiliated with?
  - What was your level of participation in the group?
  - What were your impressions of the group that you were affiliated with?
- What was your role or position when you first began?
- What are some of the different jobs you do for the IWF?
  - What were your first impressions of the group?
Who were some of the other people that you met through that group?
Are there any anecdotes or stories that stick in your mind about the IWF?
What did you think about the other conservation organizations at the time?

- What set the IWF apart from other conservation groups such as the Idaho Conservation League?
- How has the IWF tried to stay current with conservation issues and membership?
- What types of initiatives does the IWF take to ensure that it is fulfilling its mission?
- What did you believe to be the most important issues surrounding conservation during your involvement?
  - What issues stood out and stand out to you today concerning local and state wide conservation?
- Can you recall any other stories or experiences concerning conservation and certain events, people, or media?
September 15, 2008

Mr. Russ Heughins  
921 S. Orchard, Suite H  
P.O. Box 6426  
Boise Idaho 83707

Dear Mr. Heughins:

I want to thank you for meeting with our intern, Carissa Black, and for the wonderful stories and experiences that you shared during your interview. She told me it was a pleasure to interview you. I know future generations will enjoy the recording as much as she did.

Currently we do not show that you have requested a copy of the tape or transcript for your interview. If you decide that you would like copies of these items, you can contact us by mail or by telephone at (208) 334-3863, and we will send those out to you at no charge as soon as they are ready.

Thanks again for allowing your interview to be included in our contribution to the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hodges  
Oral Historian  
Idaho State Historical Society  
Public Archives and Research Library
APPENDIX D

Johnson, Rick – OH 2577
In his interview with Carissa Black in November of 2008, Rick Johnson, who was the executive director of the Idaho Conservation Organization from 1994 through the time of the interview, recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho, in particular his work with the Idaho Conservation League and the Sierra Club. Johnson narrated his experiences from 1979-2008 and included topics such as: the Idaho Conservation League; the Sierra Club; state and local politics; environmentalism; and his tenure as executive director. Johnson also talked about his grassroots work in the conservation efforts in Idaho starting in Ketchum in 1979; the founding of the Idaho Conservation League; his work in Seattle with the Sierra Club; key moments and issues of the Idaho Conservation League, and its relationship with federal and state politics. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
START OF RECORDING
TRACK ONE

00:01 0 Introduction.

00:23 0 Johnson described the geography of the Hudson Valley and Hyde Park in New York where he grew up. His introduction to environmental work was working with the Hudson River Sloop Clearwater, a boat that sailed up and down the Hudson River offering musical entertainment.

01:40 0 Johnson earned degrees in history and political science. He wrote his master’s thesis on the Hudson River Sloop Clearwater. He came to the Wood River Valley, Idaho, in 1979. He became involved with the Sierra Club and the Idaho Conservation League while living in Sun Valley, Idaho.

02:50 0 Johnson explained how the Idaho Conservation League (ICL) was built around public lands and had a strong influence in the Wood River Valley. Johnson mentioned the wilderness campaigns in the early 1980’s that got him involved with the Idaho Conservation League.

03:20 0 Johnson described his activities in the Wood River Valley, Idaho, including hiking and back country skiing in the Pioneer Mountains, Sawtooths, and White Clouds. Johnson talked briefly about the history of the White Clouds, conservation, and Frank Church.

06.49 0 Johnson talked about the changes he witnessed in Ketchum and Sun Valley and their transition from small community-based towns to resort destinations.
Johnson discussed the 1984 legislative session and Senator Jim McClure. He explained why the Idaho Conservation League was against the bill that Senator McClure put before Congress and how that bonded the members of the ICL with wilderness and public lands campaigns.

Johnson talked about meeting with several other concerned citizens of the Wood River Valley to discuss local conservation issues. Johnson recalled realizing during this time that he wanted to work in the field of conservation.

Johnson discussed his trips back to Washington, D.C. He cut off his pony tail in order to testify before Congress on behalf of wilderness conservation.

Johnson remembered having an epiphany about the kind of work he wanted to do while in the Sierra Club headquarters in Washington, D.C. Shortly after that he got a position with the Idaho Conservation League. He worked with the ICL from his home in Ketchum until he took a job with the Sierra Club and moved to Seattle, WA.

Johnson talked about his work as a lobbyist on the “Save the Spotted Owl” campaign, which he co-directed. Johnson discussed how this campaign played a key role in the 1992 Clinton/Gore Election as well as in Newt Gingrich’s Contract with America.

Johnson recalled the day he was offered the job as Executive Director of the Idaho Conservation League. Johnson talked about the circumstances surrounding his decision to take the position.

Johnson discussed some of the issues the ICL was involved with at the time he came in as Executive Director including protection of wilderness, public lands issues, and influence as lobbyists in the Idaho State Legislature. Johnson talked about how lobbying worked and the positions taken by the ICL with legislation lobbying.

Johnson described the initial founding of the ICL and the purpose of the organization. He explained the ICL’s role in state and local politics as well as membership contributions, community conservation, and participation.
Johnson shared how the Idaho Conservation League came about. There were several key figures from around the state who met for dinner to talk about conservation. They all agreed there needed to be a voice for conservation in the Idaho Legislature. Johnson also discussed the role of the board of directors as well as the staff of the ICL.

Johnson talked about the house purchased for the permanent office of the ICL in downtown Boise. Being able to purchase a permanent residence established the ICL as a credible organization that needed to be taken seriously.

Johnson explained the Idaho Conservation League Endowment Fund that provided financial assistance to the ICL and its projects. It started as a challenge from Walt Minnick, who would match a certain percentage of funds raised for the endowment. Johnson mentioned that the endowment was a growing up moment for the ICL. He also described the financial donation process.

Johnson recalled a time when the former mayor of Boise, Brent Coles, came to the ICL open house and propositioned the ICL to work on an Open Space Measure. The ICL helped pass, through non-partisan politics, the Boise Foothills Open Space Measure.

Johnson talked about how, because of the location of the ICL building, he could watch the legislators walk to work.

Johnson stated that they had a home-grown staff of fifteen people who all worked together to keep the ICL in the know with politics. They also helped run the business side of the ICL including oversight of fundraising efforts. The program side of the ICL was broken into two parts, the public lands advocacy and community conservation. Johnson described the purpose and projects of these two programs, including the Boulder White Clouds, energy conservation and community development.

Johnson talked about the ICL’s collaborative work with other environmental and conservation groups. Because of the ICL’s broad focus, they often worked alongside several groups with an invested interest in any number of projects, from financial concerns to conservation concerns. Johnson mentioned that in order for the ICL to achieve a set goal, they had to play a bi-partisanship role in the decision making process.

END OF TRACK ONE
TRACK TWO
Johnson described some of what he considered to be the crucial moments in the Idaho Conservation League history from the founding in 1973 through the time of the interview.

Johnson recalled an incident involving the ICL and Boise Cascade. He talked about Boise Cascade Corporation employees picketing and protesting outside the Idaho Conservation League headquarters in downtown Boise, ID. The incident quickly escalated, and the police were called to break up the protest.

Johnson talked about what he would be doing if he was not the executive director of the Idaho Conservation League. He mentioned working somewhere else with emphasis on public policy and politics.

Johnson discussed where he saw the direction of the Idaho Conservation League going for the future. He mentioned future plans for the Idaho Conservation League were decided through a collective effort and were not just based on his ideas.

END OF TRACK TWO

END OF INTERVIEW
NAMES AND PLACES INDEX

Arthur, Bill
Christiansen, Doug
Church, Frank
Clinton, William
Coles, Brent
Craig, Larry
Foley, Tom
Gingrich, Newt
Gore, Albert
McClure, Jim
Minnick, Walt
Northwest Forrest Plan
Pomeroy, Charlie
Pomeroy, Tom
Simpson, Mike
Sims, Steve
Stuart, Glen
The Rolling Stones
Questions for Rick Johnson:

- What was your experience with your environment growing up?
- What kinds of outdoor activities did your participate in as a child?
- Did you take advantage of the outdoors; did you give any consideration or notice the land you would use as recreation?
- What led you to take interest in conservation?
- What did you hear/witness/recall that leads you towards local conservation issues?
- Why did you join the conservation efforts? What were your motivations, influences, causation?
- What were your impressions of the conservation efforts taking place at the time?
- What were your impressions of the conservation group that you were affiliated with?
- What was your level of participation in the group?
- What do you recall was the purpose, method, membership of the organization?
- How did this organization adapt to changing times?
- Has the organization’s mission changed much over time, has it gotten more narrow or broadened out?
- What are your responsibilities as Executive Director of the ICL?
- What are some of the issues you have faced, whether good or bad, as Executive Director?
- What are your impressions of contemporary conservation efforts as compared to your affiliation/involvement?
As someone who has worked on environmental campaigns, including the spotted owl controversy, you have been part of many decisions that has pushed conservation into the realm of politics. Can you describe how you worked with politicians and environmental groups to overcome or achieve certain goals?

What did you believe to be the most important issues surrounding conservation during your involvement?

What issues stood out and stand out to you today concerning local and statewide conservation?

What are some of your experiences involving events, people, media, and opposition with conservation in Idaho?
December 1, 2008

Mr. Rick Johnson
PO Box 844
Boise Idaho 83701

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with Carissa and for the wonderful stories and experiences that you shared during your interview. She told me it was a pleasure to interview you. I know future generations will enjoy the recording as much as she did.

Thanks again for allowing your interview to be included as part of the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hodges
Oral Historian
Idaho State Historical Society
Public Archives and Research Library
APPENDIX E

Robbison, Kenneth – OH 2578
In his interview with Carissa Black in August of 2008, Kenneth Robinson, who was a journalist and editor for the Idaho Statesman, an independent magazine producer and author, recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho. Robison narrated his experiences from 1957-1988 and included topics such as: the Idaho Statesman; media; state and local politics; environmentalism; and conservation. Robison also talked about his own research on conservation in Idaho, the founding of the Idaho Conservation League and other various citizen conservation groups. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
Robison described his early life growing up on a farm in Jordan Valley. Robison listed the animals his family owned. He also discussed the issue of grazing rights in the Jordan Valley area and what the grazing rights meant to families who used public land. He mentioned the Taylor Grazing Act of 1936.

Robison talked about his experiences with the land and wildlife. He recalled a story of trapping a muskrat on his family ranch. Robison talked about businessmen who would come out to their ranch and pay his father for the right to hunt and shoot on their ranch lands.

Robison recalled his schooling as a young child and how his parents would move into the town of Jordan Valley in the winter so Robison could attend school.

Robison discussed his secondary schooling experience in Caldwell and his aspirations of becoming an engineer. He then described why he did not pursue engineering and ended up as a journalist instead. He mentioned starting in journalism by writing about sports in high school. He later wrote for the student paper at Idaho State University in Pocatello, where he received his degree in journalism.

Robison described his employment with the Idaho Statesman in 1959, and also with the Associated Press in 1962. He talked about his assignments for the Associated Press and his coverage of the State House and the Idaho Legislature. During his time on this assignment, he developed an interest in politics and public policy.

Robison talked about his return to the Idaho Statesman, and his assignment as the Editorial Page editor after a year back at the
paper. As the editor, his duties included writing the majority of the editorials and editing the page. During this time, he developed an interest in environmental issues. In 1968, Robison was sent to a week-long conference on the environment. Brock Evans showed him a slide concerning Hells Canyon. From that time on, the editorials in the *Statesman* reflected his growing interest.

10:15 0  Robison explained how the *Statesman* managing editor, Dick Ronick, and another editor, Walter Johnson, had a great interest in conservation. He mentioned the editorial board process and how the new managing editor and owners turned the *Statesman* from ardent republican and anti-conservation to pro-conservation.

12:30 0  Robison talked about how Ernie Day, Stan Burns, and Franklin Jones came to *The Statesman* Editorial Board in 1969 to discuss the Controversial issue of the White Clouds Mountains and the proposed mine that was to be built in the mountain range.

13:34 0  Robison discussed hiking into the White Clouds Mountains. He wrote a series of editorials in which *The Statesman* declared openly their opposition to mining in that area.

14:42 0  Robison explained how the White Clouds issue brought conservation into the public eye. He further described the White Clouds issues, the politics and legislation, and the numerous players, including Governor Don Samuelson and Frank Church.

18:39 0  Robison mentioned the gubernatorial election of 1970 and the victory of Cecil Andrus. He found it important to note how Andrus won on a conservation ticket.

20:18 0  Robison talked about the controversy around the proposed dams in Hells Canyon. *The Statesman* got involved in the debate in opposition to construction of the high dam. He also mentioned the issues surrounding the Idaho primitive area.

21:38 0  Robison discussed how conservation organizations worked together to propose the establishment of The River of No Return Wilderness Area, 2.3 million acres of wilderness in East-Central Idaho. He further described the intended purpose of the proposal and how *The Statesman* supported this public issue.

23:28 0  Robison described the larger, more contemporary conservation organizations and how their recent conservation victories brought about broader public support. He talked about how these conservation victories would not have happened without the
support and leadership of citizen conservation organizations. This led him to explain the foundations of the Idaho Wildlife Federation (IWF) and its motivations and early victories.

27:10 0 Robison expanded his discussion on the Idaho Wildlife Federation and its relationship with the Hell’s Canyon Controversy.

29:18 0 Robison recalled opposition to *The Statesman’s* open pro-conservation agenda from citizens in the form of letters from the public. He illustrated with recollections of opposition to the White Clouds issue.

31:38 0 Robison remembered a threatening letter from three large corporations calling for the firing of the editorial page editor, which was Robison. Robison further expanded on the issue of opposition from big Idaho corporations, including Idaho Power.

33:33 0 Robison described his magazine endeavor, titled *Idaho Citizen* in 1977. He discussed his run for public office and his successful terms as a state legislator. He pursued the conservation issues as a state legislator.

35:10 0 Robison talked about lunch meetings attended by several prominent citizen conservationists. As a result of these meetings, the Idaho Conservation League was formed in 1973.

37:35 0 Robison discussed the role of the Idaho Conservation League (ICL), its purpose and mission, as well as the executive make-up and first director, Marcia Pursley. He compared the structure of the Idaho Wildlife Federation to the Idaho Conservation League.

39:00 0 Robison talked about the River of No Return Wilderness Council, a separate organization dedicated to the protection of that wilderness. Robison recalled a series of citizen conservation groups started and active during the 1970s. These groups included: The River of No Return Wilderness Council; Hells Canyon Preservation Council; The Greater Sawtooth Preservation Council; Trout Unlimited; League of Women Voters; and Idaho Environmental Council.

42:07 0 Robison recalled the first order of business of the Idaho Conservation League was The River of No Return Wilderness. He mentioned Ted Trueblood’s work and support of The River of No Return Wilderness.
Robison described the Idaho Conservation League’s take on land use planning and lobbying efforts with the Idaho Legislature. Robison mentioned how early success of the ICL alarmed the Industry Coalition, whose influence tended to dominate legislature. In response, those involved in the coalition reorganized, forming the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry.

Robison explained that he was not a member of the ICL, though he helped to organize it. He remained at the *Idaho Statesman* writing about conservation.

Robison described the publication he produced, *The Idaho Citizen*. This magazine dealt with conservation issues. Robison was the editor, producer, and financier of the magazine.

Robison talked about the Sagebrush Rebellion and its impact on conservation through the establishment of the Save Our Public Lands organization. He mentioned another reason for the Save Our Public Lands organization was to help Frank Church in the 1980 campaign.

END OF TRACK ONE

TRACK TWO

Robison noted that he had no formal interaction with the Idaho Wildlife Federation. Robison talked at length about the IWF and its history. He also discussed the National Wildlife Federation.

Robison recalled Bruce Bowler involvement with the IWF and other conservation organizations.

Robison described the organization of the IWF from its early years to 1973.

Robison talked about the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) and its leadership in the 1970’s through the mid 1990’s or lack thereof. He also shared his impressions of the relationship between the IDFG director and the office of governor, though no particular governor was mentioned. Robison described the role of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game in conservation.

Robison recalled how the ICL interacted with other conservation organizations including the IWF, League of Women Voters, and Trout Unlimited.

Robison described the organizational make-up of the ICL and how
they would choose issues to advocate.

Robison discussed his role as a conservationist and the evolution of grassroots citizen conservation groups. He talked about how small, issue/area specific groups would form, and they would then work with larger conservation organizations.

Robison talked about the Committee for Idaho’s High Desert and the proposed legislation that focused on the Owyhee desert area.

Robison discussed the evolution of conservation organizations, noting the significant increase in local and state-wide conservation groups since he first started writing about conservation. He also talked about the weakening role of the Idaho Wildlife Federation since the seventies, mainly due to the limited staff.

Robison described the members of the IWF as people who were mainly interested in hunting and fishing, as opposed to members of the ICL and the Idaho Environmental Council being those who enjoyed the environment for what it was and who liked to walk through it.

Robison recalled a meeting held during the Frank Church Wilderness of No Return controversy in which citizens could talk about conserving the wilderness and why it was or was not important.

Robison talked about certain areas of the state becoming popular destinations for family vacations and outdoor recreation. He also explained the myths of the wilderness debate.

Robison felt not as much attention was given to conservation at the time of interview as it was in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, mainly because three, huge, conservation battles took place during that time period. However the *Idaho Statesman* still promoted conservation in the Hell’s Canyon area.

Robison recalled the major victories as well as defeats for the conservation movement in Idaho, in particular the dam and salmon controversies.

Robison talked about research he conducted for a book on conservation and what motivated him to write a book.

Robison talked about his experience with the *Idaho Statesman* and recalled what a great experience it was for him. It introduced him to the conservation issues in Idaho.
32:48  0  END OF TRACK TWO
      END OF INTERVIEW
NAMES AND PLACES INDEX

American Smelting and Refining Company
Andrus, Cecil
Associated Press
Boise, Idaho
Brown, Jim
Caldwell High School (Caldwell, Idaho)
Caldwell, Idaho
Church, Frank
Day, Ernie
Denver, Colorado
Dorsey, Eugene
Evans, Brock
Federated Publishers
Hansen, Orville
Hells Canyon, Idaho
Humbert, Jim
Idaho Forest Service
Idaho Primitive Area
Idaho State University (Pocatello, Idaho)
*Idaho Statesman*
Idaho Wildlife Federation
Johnson, Walter
Jones, Franklin
Jordan Valley, Oregon
Jordan, Len
McClure, Jim
Nampa, Idaho
Orofino, Idaho
River of No Return Wilderness
Ronick, Dick
Salmon River, Idaho
Samuelson, Donald
Sawtooth National Recreation Area
Sierra Club
Snake River, Idaho
Stanburns, Burt
Taylor Grazing Act of 1936
University of Oregon (Eugene, Oregon)
White Clouds Mountains
Wilderness Society
Questions for Ken Robison:

- Where were you born / where did you grow up?
- Describe where you lived, what were some of your early memories?
- Can you remember or describe any specific experiences you had as a child that involved or were influenced by the surrounding environment, i.e. camping, hunting, and fishing?
  - What kinds of outdoor activities did your participate in as a child?
- Did you take advantage of the outdoors; how did you view the land you used for recreation?
- What was your first experience with conservationism or environmentalism?
  - What led you to take interest in conservation? Start from the beginning.
  - Was there any particular person, event, etc. that played a key role or influenced your involvement with conservation and the environment?
- What was the first conservation organization that you were affiliated with?
  - What was your level of participation in the group?
  - What were your impressions of the group that you were affiliated with?
- Did you work at all with the Idaho Wildlife Federation?
  - What were your first impressions of the group?
  - What was your role or position when you first began and what were some of the different jobs you did for the IWF?
  - Who were some of the other people that you met through that group?
  - Are there any anecdotes or stories that stick in your mind about the IWF?
  - What did you think about the other conservation organizations at the time?
- What led you to the Idaho Conservation League?
  - What was your role in the development of the Idaho Conservation League?
- What set the ICL apart from other conservation groups such as the Idaho Wildlife Federation?
  - What were the similarities/differences between the IWF and the ICL at the start or establishment of the Idaho Conservation League?
- What do you see as the main differences between the ICL and IWF today?
What do you recall was the purpose, method, and membership of the two organizations?

How did conservation change as new conservation groups emerged on the scene?

What are your impressions of contemporary conservation efforts as compared to your affiliation/involvement?
  - What did you believe to be the most important issues surrounding conservation during your involvement?
  - What issues stood out and stand out to you today concerning local and statewide conservation?

What were some of the most prominent conservation groups around Idaho?
  - What was their level of participation and interaction with the public?
  - How did the citizens of Idaho respond to these conservation groups?

Do you see a difference between what is referred to as the “hook & bullet” conservationists and those working in the field today, via conservation organizations, state agencies and volunteers?

Can you recall any other stories or experiences concerning conservation and certain events, people, or media?

Can you tell me about the Scripps-Howard Foundation award for natural resource writing, as mentioned in the Tim Palmer book, The Snake River: Window to the West?

Optional questions, if comfortable with sharing this information.

What motivated you to research conservation efforts in Idaho?
  - What is the background for your research?
  - How are you going to use your own experiences as part of your research?
  - What are you trying to prove or disprove with your research?
  - When you got the idea, how did you know where to start?
  - What information are you looking for when conducting your own oral histories?
  - How do you plan to use these oral histories?
September 15, 2008

Mr. Ken Robison
1119 N. 12th Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

Dear Mr. Robison:

I want to thank you for meeting with our intern, Carissa Black, and for the wonderful stories and experiences that you shared during your interview. She told me it was a pleasure to interview you. I know future generations will enjoy the recording as much as she did.

Currently we do not show that you have requested a copy of the tape or transcript for your interview. If you decide that you would like copies of these items, you can contact us by mail or by telephone at (208) 334-3863, and we will send those out to you at no charge as soon as they are ready.

Thanks again for allowing your interview to be included in our contribution to the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hodges
Oral Historian
Idaho State Historical Society
Public Archives and Research Library
APPENDIX F

Sligar, Kevin – OH 2579
In his interview with Carissa Black in September of 2008, Kevin Sligar, who was a retired United States Coast Guard Officer, member and who was active on the Board of Director for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, recalled his experiences growing up in Boise, Idaho, his childhood and interaction with nature, conservation in Idaho and the Idaho Wildlife Federation. Sligar narrated his experiences from 1964-2008 and included topics such as: his childhood in Boise’s north end; hunting and fishing with his grandfather; travels with the U.S. Coast Guard; his educational track; travels to Ireland and Germany; environmentalism; and conservation. Sligar also discussed his interaction and role as one of the Board of Directors for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, the future mission, goals and objectives for the IWF, including membership recruitment and funding for the non-profit organization. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
Sligar talked about his early childhood and growing up in Boise, Idaho. He grew up in Boise’s North End and was raised by his grandparents. He recalled the landscape of the historic North End, the farms and the open canals around in the mid–to-late 1960’s.

Sligar told a story about getting in trouble with both his grandparents and his elementary school for always being late due to his wandering and exploring the canals on his way to school.

Sligar talked about the house he shared with his wife in the North End at the time of the interview. They shared a love of the neighborhood and the opportunities this location provided in terms of outdoor recreation.

Sligar described how a herd of Mule Deer used to forage close to their house. They were forced to go other places due to construction on several roads in their neighborhood. He also mentioned a story out of a newspaper about a mountain lion spotted by a paper girl in the North End.

Sligar talked about his grandparents, Dorothy and Stuart Emery, their lineage and settlement in Idaho. He talked about what good, hard-working people they were and their residence off of 21st street in the North End.

Sligar mentioned his grandfather inspiring him as an outdoor enthusiast. He talked about going fishing and hunting with his grandfather. He received the family hunting rifle, a 30/30 lever action rifle. Sligar described the country where they would hunt in the Owyhee area.

Sligar discussed summer outings with his grandparents traveling to various parts of the state to fish and partake in other outdoor adventures.

Sligar described his educational ascension to college through Lowell Elementary School, North Jr. High School, Boise High School and
Boise State University. Sligar talked about his choices to go elsewhere after high school, but he preferred to stay in Idaho.

10.35 4 Sligar talked about opportunities he had to venture out of state, but no matter where he went, he always ended up back in Boise. He also talked about some of the places he traveled to, including Ireland, Germany, and Alaska.

11:40 4 Sligar described his experiences in the Coast Guard as a fireman in Kodiak, Alaska. He discussed the Alaska wilderness and the Kodiak Bears, although he had never seen one first hand. He talked about the bears in their natural environment and a book that described the savagery of the Kodiak bears.

14.15 5 Sligar explained his decision to join the Coast Guard, his indecision about his future and his desire to get more experience and responsibility under his belt. Sligar, at the time of the interview, had not been back to Alaska since his service in the Coast Guard. He mentioned wanting to return one day to see what it is like. Sligar described what he wanted to do after he finished his service with the U.S. Coast Guard, such as travel and see more places.

16:49 5 Sligar talked about his travels to Ireland and his work with a training college for adults with special needs. He described his job duties and later his travels that brought him back to Ireland as an employee for the same training college in 1993. He ended up working as the head master of the college for roughly one year.

19:30 6 Sligar talked about his visit to the Ring of Kerry where he saw deer. Sligar also mentioned that later, while living in Germany, he saw what he thought were red deer and described them as very demure creatures.

21:00 6 Sligar talked about his stay in Germany and the deer and wildlife he saw. He would have stayed, but he just didn’t like the atmosphere. He longed to get back to Idaho’s environment.

22:20 6 Sligar talked about applying to grad school in order to take advantage of his GI Bill before it ran out. He enrolled in a Master’s of Education program at Boise State University. Sligar mentioned how his experiences with the school in Ireland and working with the Idaho Commission for the Blind influenced his decision to study education.

24:00 6 Sligar described his job with the Student Work Employment Program through the Idaho Commission for the Blind, and also his work with the AMAS program at Boise State University.
Sligar described his experience with teaching in the Boise Public school system. He talked about his one-year contract teaching world history and reading at East Jr. High School. Sligar also mentioned his fascination with Lewis and Clark and talked about his research on the expedition of Lewis and Clark and the historiography that he wrote during graduate school about his research.

Sligar discussed why he chose to become involved with the Idaho Wildlife Federation and what drew him to that specific citizen conservation group, including the IWF’s principles, concepts and its mission statement.

Sligar talked about his principles as they applied to his own sense of social responsibility and stewardship to the earth. Sligar also mentioned his outlook of population and resource management when it comes to the western industrial countries.

Sligar reflected on the lack of abundance of natural wildlife in the Boise valley as well as the decline of upland birds and mule deer. He attributed this decline to the rise in population in Idaho.

Sligar mentioned that the decline in native species also was a direct response to the Bush/Cheney administration and their opening the wildlife refuge areas to exploration and drilling for more natural resources including natural gas and oil.

Sligar defined the difference between the definition of sportsman and conservationist. He mentioned the definition of a sportsman is broader than just hunters and fishers and should include people who care about the environment and want to protect and preserve the natural resources available to them.

Sligar described the IWF as the first conservation group in the state and the catalyst for the formation of the Department of Fish and Game as well as other citizen conservation groups. Sligar also discussed the importance of the IWF’s mission and how education is both the past and present focus of the IWF. Sligar talked about what the IWF was doing to recruit younger members into the IWF. Moreover, how they were trying to raise money for their non-profit organization.

Sligar talked about the cohesiveness of the IWF’s Board of Directors and the shared vision of the newer “young bloods” of the organizations. Sligar mentioned the passing of the torch from the older members to the newer members.

Sligar mentioned the two new members that he recruited into the IWF and the qualifications they came with.
48:00  13  Sligar discussed his position with the IWF, that he considers it like a part time job in terms of time commitment. He mentioned that Russ Heughins did a great job on keeping the board members updated on the issues that concern the IWF.

50:00  13  Sligar described the way the IWF is funded and how they use their funds to promote their mission of educating the public on the issues surrounding the greater Boise and Idaho area.

51:40  13  Sligar talked about the difference between the activities and agenda of the Board of Directors and that of the fieldwork and projects the IWF sponsors within the community.

53:00  14  Sligar projected his role for the future with the IWF in terms of increasing their funds by increasing the amount of fundraisers the IWF does, recruiting young students into the IWF and providing scholarships and paid internships to students to get them more active in the IWF.

55:04  14  END OF TRACK ONE
END OF INTERVIEW
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CB: This is Carissa Black; I am sitting here with Kevin Sligar.

KS: Yes.

CB: With the Idaho Wildlife Federation, he is on the board of directors. It is September 30, 2008. We’re at the Idaho Wildlife Federation headquarters in Boise, Idaho. Today Kevin and I will be talking about his experiences growing up in Idaho, some observations he has about the changes in the environment and also his work with the Idaho Wildlife Federation. So, if you could just start out telling me a little bit about growing up in Idaho.

KS: Okay, well, you know I was born in Boise in 1960, and back then Boise was quite a bit smaller than it is now. I grew up primarily in the North End, my grandparents raised me there, and at that time, probably the mid sixties, late sixties, there was maybe, I want to say sixty thousand people in Boise. If that, and so the North End was quite rural still, a lot of pastures around there. I know my grandparents lived on 21st Street and you know, off of Hill Road and Harrison Boulevard, and, it seemed liked there was, I remember growing up there, there was pastures around them, a barn at the end of the street, so it was always fun as a kid, to live in that kind of environment where you had horses around you, open canals, open irrigation back then. Most of the canals have now been filled in, but then there were open irrigation ditches that ran throughout the North End, coming
off of the various laterals and so it was great as a child. I remember walking to school, and times being late because I would try to catch frogs, or I would be playing in these things, and lose track of time, and always having to send home notes saying, you know, “Kevin tends to wander on his way to school, and shows up late. The reason being he tells us that, you know, he is playing in these irrigation ditches.” So I was always being, oh, scolded or reminded to not lose track of time and make my way to school. Yeah.

CB: I noticed that you and your wife still live in the North End, so was that kind of, you live more towards the west North End, on 32nd, was it?

KS: Right, yeah, yeah, Northwest Boise.

CB: Was that due to primarily that you liked the atmosphere of where that, you know what that area and neighborhood provided when you were growing up, or just a good market?

KS: Yeah, well actually, you know that is the primary reason. We both grew up in the North End, she grew up over on 39th street. And kind of had a similar experience, being very rural, you know, a lot more pastures around there. And of course all that’s been in filled over the years with various housing developments and so a lot of that’s gone now. It’s very hard to find the open space that you once had. But no, we lucked out, found an old farm house in the North End with a third of an acre, and at the time, it was quite run down. So, and apparently the lot had been split prior to this so, that being the case developers couldn’t come in and re-split it for the row houses or whatever, so we lucked out. It sat on the market for quite a
while but we lucked out with the price and quite happy, we are right at the base of the foothills.

CB: That is a great find.

KS: Yeah, well you know we both love that area of town, and of course being at the base of the foothills it affords us the chance to get up and do a little hiking and that is interesting because there used to be a small herd of mule deer up there, several years ago, probably within the past I’d say three years, but since they’ve done more development back there around the Quail Hollow Golf Course and Cartwright Road, they built a number of homes up those ridges back there, and I think it has cut off that corridor. So I have not seen them in several years now, and interesting enough, probably about four or five years ago, there was a report in the paper that a paper girl spotted a mountain lion, over off 39th Street, near where my wife grew up. And now I think those sightings are pretty rare because they follow the herds. You know that’s—I guess predation is mule deer, probably they’re, you know—

CB: Following them down into the valley a little bit. Which was theirs to begin with almost? Can you tell me a little bit about your grandparents?

KS: Yeah, they both, well my grandmother grew up here, was born in Eagle, Idaho, in 1912, and of course it was all farms back then, and around Boise. I think her mother used to work for the old Independent Telephone office as an operator, phone operator, when she was younger. But her family has been here for a long, long time. I think, my great grandmother, her mother, came out here I believe in 1884 form Iowa in a wagon. My grandfather grew up over in Oregon on Sucker
Creek, on a dry farm. I think it was a 150-acre dry farm I believe. And his family came from Maine, out here to Idaho to farm, and so yeah, they were good hard-working people.

CB: What were their names?

KS: It was Dorothy and Stuart Emery. And when they moved in over on 21st Street I believe it was, I don’t know if that was their first house, but when they bought that little house, there on 21st, which has since been torn down and a new house has been built there over the past two or three years, they moved there in ‘42, and it was all farms, just the lane, Dora Lane, was the only access into their property at that time, so it is interesting how much it’s changed. I drive by there once in a while just to take a look at the old property, it’s, can’t even recognize it any more. It’s all been split, and a new home’s been built on it. But yeah, they were good hard-working people; you know, grew up through the Depression and kind of instilled some of those values in me, which I still appreciate to this day.

CB: Sure. What kind of activities did they partake in? You had mentioned that you and your grandfather would, he kind of first introduced you to the whole fishing and hunting scene, can you tell me a little about that?

KS: Yeah he really did. He was really the catalyst for me becoming an outdoor enthusiast. You know, starting at a young age I was always taken fishing and then of course when I turned twelve that was my first hunting experience at that time, kind of given the family beginning rifle, so to speak. It was a thirty thirty lever action. I remember this rifle so well. And that was my first hunting rifle, and it was primarily deer hunting at that time. And most of it we did out in the Owyhee
country out of Grassmere, which is incredible country if you’ve ever had the chance to experience it. It’s not very accessible, it’s just such wild country and I would even say to this day that it is probably some of the most remote and probably inaccessible country in the lower forty-eight, in some respects.

CB: That is over beyond the Owyhee range?

KS: Yeah it is. Well, yeah it’s that whole area out there encompassing kind of the southwestern corner of Idaho. Okay, kind of between, oh gosh, starting from, you know where Silver City is?

CB: Yes.

KS: Okay, that range heading south and kind of bordered between you know, the Oregon-Idaho border over towards gosh, Mountain Home on down to Elko. That area out in there.

CB: Was that a place that your grandfather went? You know, you said he grew up in Oregon, that being on the border was he ever exposed to that area?

KS: He was. Yeah, Sucker Creek’s right over there, kind of outside of, actually before you get to Jordan Valley, off 95 over there, Leslie Gulch is over there which is an incredible area as well. But yeah, he, I think from a young age has had exposure to that country and did a lot of hunting over there, and so that was his natural inclination to go there, go back to what he knew, where his roots were. Yeah, it was incredible.

CB: Did you ever go on any extended trips? You had mentioned fishing kind of over in the mid part of Idaho?
KS: Yeah, mostly it was weekends, I think, you know, probably every summer we took that week or two vacation with my grandmother, and we’d go to various parts of the state, but never too far north, it was probably more the central and southern part of the state, where we tended to gravitate to for our outdoor adventures.

CB: Did you enjoy, you obviously enjoyed that outdoor experience and being exposed to it. What would you say was one of your most favorite activities, hunting, fishing, hiking, or camping in general?

KS: Yeah, I would probably say more of the fishing and probably camping experience, just because we did more of that. Hunting, you know, was kind of a defined season. I always looked forward to it and enjoyed it a great deal, but I definitely had more exposure to the fishing and camping and that kind of whole adventure.

CB: Do you remember what kind of fish you guys would catch?

KS: Yeah, mainly just rainbow trout.

CB: If you could, let’s see, just from starting out in Boise, wandering, making your way to school, eventually getting there, what schools did you attend here in Boise?

KS: I started out at Lowell Elementary School, and went on to North Junior High, and Boise High School.

CB: Go Braves.

KS: Yeah, go Braves, and Boise State University. And it’s so interesting because you have a lot of opportunities to go elsewhere after high school. A lot of my friends went elsewhere. I actually did a year in California at Pepperdine University in
1980, but came back home. You know, I just, I’ve done a lot of traveling through my life, lived abroad, lived in Europe, spent a year in Ireland, spent about six months in Germany, you know, did a little traveling in the Coast Guard in the military as far as like going to Alaska, but I always gravitate back to Idaho and I just think it’s a testament probably more so to my upbringing and the quality of life we enjoy here with our environment that just keeps calling me back over and over again.

CB: So you were active in the Coast Guard?

KS: Yes.

CB: From what years?

KS: Eighty-six through roughly ‘89, yeah, and I was stationed primarily in Kodiak, Alaska, and I was a fireman.

CB: What was that like up there?

KS: It was wonderful, again it was the primary fishing hub for the west coast and for the Alaska fishing fleet, so the Coast Guard’s main duties there were aids to navigation, fishery laws and of course the main component or a component of both of those were search and rescue operations, which they did a number of because of the weather conditions and the seas being so rough, and so many vessels in distress or going down. But I was actually stationed to the fire house and became a fireman which I enjoyed and had some paramedic training, but again you had that abundant outdoors there on Kodiak Island and I had a chance to explore some of it and do hunting and fishing there as well. And just thoroughly enjoyed the experience.
CB: What were kind of, what was some of the wildlife that you saw up there?

KS: Well, amazing enough, I never saw a Kodiak bear, and they were all over the place. And they would actually tree people in some of the civilian communities, but for the most part you know they stayed in the outback or they didn’t really come in. And one thing they had an advantage of was the numerous salmon runs, and they would get so fat, so satiated on eating all of these salmon that they could care less about humans. I knew guys that would go up hiking and watch them feed and get within ten yards of them and they could care less.

CB: Wow, oh my goodness.

KS: I know, I know. And of course everybody carried a gun. A large revolver, usually a forty-four, or a forty-five, a large caliber hand gun, if not a rifle, cause they’re just, you know, I think there is a book called Alaskan Bear Tales, that go into the savagery of these bears and what they can do. You know the hunter or the woodsman putting in, unloading his rifle into a charging Kodiak bear and the bear killing the man or whatever. Probably a lot is fictional. It fuels some of that.

CB: Adds to the lore of the—

KS: It does, to the mighty grizzly. Which the Kodiak is certainly.

CB: Have you been back up there since you left?

KS: I haven’t and I have always been curious, I mean its, geez, it’s probably been what, over twenty years so, it would be interesting to go back up and just see some of that again.

CB: And so you said that, was it after you came back from the Coast Guard that you attended Boise State, or was that before you went into the Coast Guard?
KS: I’d actually got my undergrad from Boise State, and then wasn’t really sure what I wanted to do, I mean I got a baccalaureate of science and political science, which you know, it was a good liberal arts degree, but I really wasn’t certain what I wanted to do with myself, and you know, I looked at various options and probably played with a few things, but decided maybe I needed a little more focus, a little more discipline and so looking at the Coast Guard I really liked their mission and what they did. They are very small service maybe forty thousand members, and it was under the Department of Transportation which was a little different, so Elizabeth Dole at that time was my boss, and it was actually interesting because it was the only service that allowed you to grow a beard, you could have full facial hair as long as it was trimmed and well maintained, so that was kind of appealing, you know, and certainly being in Alaska. So I enjoyed all that, and liked that, but yeah, I had my degree before I went in, which you know a lot of people said why did you go CS? And I just, I really didn’t want to be an officer or look at that six year commitment, I was just looking at doing a couple years and just getting a little more experience under my belt.

CB: And you found that?

KS: I did, yeah, you know it was interesting. It gave me much more discipline and responsibility. I mean the responsibility they give you in the military, no matter what branch you go into as a young person is just amazing, and yeah, I was driving half a million dollar fire apparatus. Structural fire trucks, of course that crash fire rescue vehicles, which were these large green, lime green monsters, that fight air craft fires, you know I mean, we’re talking equipment that’s you know is
three quarters of a million dollars or more, that you’re essentially in charge of, you’re driving and utilizing, so just that alone, that responsibility, was just amazing.

CB: And so you came back and you decided to go on for your masters?

KS: Yeah, actually it was quite a few years later, yeah, I’d done, I guess I was in my wanderlust phase, after the Coast Guard. I wanted to see more and do more. So in the early nineties I actually had a chance to go to Europe and do some backpacking and ended up in Ireland of all places. I always wanted to go to Ireland, you always hear the, you know, the folklore and the mystery of the Emerald Isle, so I wanted to go there and experience that first hand. So I ended up there and ran into a group of people that were from a community called Dunshane, which was in the Irish countryside, which was about twenty five miles, I want to say, southwest of Dublin out in County Kildare. They had a training college there for people with special needs. And I ran into them up in the mountains, called the Wicklow Way, there’s a trail up there and there’s youth hostels along where you can stay in. And I ran into these people at one of these youth hostels, near Glendeloch, where St. Kevin’s Tower is, which I had to see of course, and they invited me back. They said “Why don’t you throw your pack in our van and come back and spend some time with us and see what you think?” Which I did, and I ended up spending a month with them. Yeah, then I, you know, of course I had to come back to the States. While I was home we corresponded and of course every year they open it up to what they call co-workers, which are mainly younger—I’d say post-high school students, usually take these positions,
just to get abroad before they head off to university or whatever. Or they’re just younger and they don’t know what they want to do with themselves so they end up taking these positions, within the European Economic Union. And so I ended going back as a co-worker for a year in ‘93 through ‘94 and spent a year with them there. And since I had a degree and some educational background, they asked me to be the headmaster, so I headed up the school, yeah, with about eight to ten students. It was very small and of course we lived on twenty-six acres out in County Kildare and we tried to be self sufficient. We had our own dairy, and we ate our own cheese and we had various workshops. It was considered a training college, so we tried to train the students in some vocation, whether it be pottery, or basketry, or you know, even working in the dairy or whatever. So they could take that to another community and in a sense have a vocation, and be part of another community because that was just essentially a training college, they’d be in it for three or four years and then they’d move on to an adult community that they had set up. So, but yeah it was a wonderful experience, and so during this time I did a lot of traveling, living abroad.

CB: And did you ever run in, did you go fishing, did you take advantage of kind of the, what the landscape had to provide?

KS: You know, I did a lot of traveling within Ireland, went out to the Ring of Kerry, which are considered the Irish Alps, and I think I do remember seeing some deer, they’re quite demure, they’re quite small. And you know when I lived in Germany I also noticed the deer there. I don’t know if they are a red deer, kind of a species, they are kind of small and demure. But they had them in pens, in kind
of the local park and I lived in the north of Germany in what they call the Ruhrgebiet, the coal mining area and I lived in a town called Dortmund, which is actually quite large by our standards. But yeah they didn’t have—if you really wanted to see wildlife then you went to a zoo or you went to these little kind of parks where they had them penned up and you could feed them by hand. So I always found that interesting. It seemed like they didn’t have anything comparable to what I enjoyed back in Idaho.

CB: What took you to Germany?

KS: Actually met a young girl, German girl when I was in Ireland, and she said “Why don’t you come back to Germany?” And I actually returned to Idaho for a while and we corresponded and I ended up going over there for about six month. And I think she would have liked me to have stayed, but I just didn’t care for it. Again, Idaho just, you know when you grow up in this environment and have this kind of quality of life, and this access to wilderness, and just you know, the abundant, you know, natural resources that we have here that you can get in and enjoy. It is just, it’s not even comparable, you know and here I was living in this kind of northern industrial city to some extent and just didn’t find it to be a very happy, fun place to be.

CB: Did you have any background in German language?

KS: Very little. Surprisingly enough a lot of the co-workers in Ireland were German, so you would pick up a smattering of German. And then of course when I lived in Germany I actually took some classes, some language classes and worked on it
some more and picked up little bit. But nothing to the extent where I was fluent or
could have lengthy conversations with people, more just asking directions.

CB: Which way to the supermarket?

KS: Gleaning little bits of information so I could get around.

CB: Sure, wow, and so you ended up back in Boise after that?

KS: I did yeah, I ended up again back in Idaho, and you know this is probably ‘96 by
this time. You know feeling like I wanted to settle more and just you know
looking around and working some odd jobs and you know doing my own thing.
And then in ‘97 decided to go to grad school and part of what propelled me to do
that was just the government saying, “Look your GI Bill is running out, if you
want to utilize it you better hurry up.” So, I ended up enrolling in a masters of
education curriculum at Boise State and graduated in ‘99 with a masters in
education from Boise State University.

CB: Did your time in Ireland have any influence on that education role?

KS: I think it did, yeah, I really do. I think it did and you know I had the chance to do
some other teaching just here and there, nothing traditional or conventional by
any means. It might have just been with some outdoor activities or courses. One
summer I worked with the Idaho Commission for the Blind, with the SWEP
program, a student work employment program that they offered for visually
impaired high school students on their way to college or whatever. And I was
actually the recreation counselor for that program, and so I took them rafting.
Started off on the Boise River, small, we did the Payette, and then we did the
Main Salmon, a two-day trip. And then I worked with the AMAS [Alternative
Mobility Adventure Seekers] program through Boise State. With that, we did some camping, just got them out and kind of gave them some more experiences with regard to Idaho, the outdoors of Idaho, because they were from all over the state, but a lot of them had never camped before or done really any fishing, none of them had really done any rafting by any means.

CB: Boy, those are great programs; AMAS is now with the City of Boise. Do you remember Joe Neil? He took over that program.

KS: Okay, I was trying to think who was running it at the time, and this was actually prior to me going to Ireland that I was doing this.

CB: Oh, okay so in the early ’90s. How did you get involved in that?

KS: You know, I’m trying to think, I don’t know if they advertised the position. They might have advertised it and I saw the advertisement for it and just went in and interviewed and I guess they liked what I had to say. And of course, you know, at that point I was heavily involved in the outdoors, had done a lot of river rafting and camping, and you know, hiking etc. I think they were really interested in the fact that I had that experience and I was willing to take eight or ten visually impaired high school students on some of my adventures through Idaho. So they paid me a small wage and gave me van with gas, and away we went.

CB: There it is. That’s great.

KS: Yeah.

CB: And so you graduated with your MA in ’99, in education?

KS: I did.

CB: And what were some of your aspirations for, you know, your higher education?
KS: Oh, you mean prior to my masters, or you mean after?

CB: Well, after. Did you want to go into teaching; did you want to go into kind of academic advising?

KS: Yeah, I did. I wanted to be a teacher and I actually did a year at East Junior High, and to be truthful I didn’t like the public teaching experience very much. And I don’t know if it’s because all my prior experience had been in alternative arenas with the outdoor programs, and being the headmaster in Ireland, which was not very traditional at all. I mean being the headmaster I had to create the curriculum and cater it to the individual students’ needs, so it was a great experience from that standpoint. But within the public system I mean it’s very cut and dry. I just didn’t have a real great experience with it, and it was just a one year contract. I was replacing a guy who was in the Air Force reserves intelligence. He took a year to go to Saudi Arabia and hang out in Air Force intelligence.

CB: Was his name Mr. Woods?

KS: No, it was Mr. McCard I believe.

CB: I was an East Junior High, Boise High School student and I remember my history teachers were always in the Air Force and I remember yeah, they often times would talk about when they would go out and do their deployment or something.

KS: Yeah, so they gave me a year contract just to kind of fill in for him and I did. I mean, I enjoyed the teaching but I really enjoyed the students.

CB: Was it is history or social studies?

KS: World history and reading were the two subjects I taught. So, a year kind of told me that it’s probably not what I wanted to pursue as far as the public education
arena. But then, you know my wife she’s in her fifteenth year of teaching high school chemistry at Centennial and absolutely loves it. And she’s a phenomenal teacher, a wonderful teacher, and really enjoys the public system.

CB: And you had always, you expressed that you had always had an interest in history, you know from your early education days till now. And one of the things that I was looking over in my notes and saw is that you had mentioned you did a historiography on Lewis and Clark.

KS: I did.

CB: And I was going to ask if you could tell me just a little bit about maybe why you choose that or when in your career did you do that?

KS: Well, I’d always had a fascination with Lewis and Clark, probably from grade school. I don’t know if it was fourth or fifth grade when you kind of look at some of those things. And so when I was getting my masters in education my second year I had a graduate assistantship which gave me a stipend and helped me pay for graduate school. But I finished up a lot of my education credits by taking summer school classes so it left some room for me, so with this stipend and this room, I actually started taking some graduate courses in history and one of them I took was the historiography course. And of course you have to do a project and I did mine on Lewis and Clark. And so essentially what I did is I went in and I looked at a number of journal entries, not only from Lewis and Clark themselves but from some of the members of the party, the Lewis and Clark party. You know Patrick Gass and some of the other guys on their journeys, and just kind of compared journal entries. Because they were encouraged I think to write daily,
especially in the evenings, and everybody essentially kept a journal of their experiences during that two years that they were working their way to the Pacific and back. So, it was just fun to compare their perspectives on their experiences. And what I found probably to be the most incredible was just this unexplored territory that was essentially like a new found Eden. I mean encountering the species that they’d never seen before and of course Lewis did a phenomenal job of recording most of it and sending various species samples back to Jefferson in DC. But when they talked about the abundance of game, especially on the Great Plains, in the prairies where they were using their rifle butts to push it out of the way, you think, “Wow how immense!” You know, not only just the geography but just the game populations must have been that they encountered.

CB: Yeah, it just blows my mind to think. So I guess this is more of just a personal question of interest but I guess I never realized that they all did do, I mean a great majority of them wrote in journals, so there was a pretty high literacy rate for them.

KS: You know, and what’s interesting looking at some of the original journal entries, you know, obviously the punctuation and spelling varies from person to person, you know and obviously Lewis was probably the most literate and educated of anybody in the party and then probably Clark. And then, the other members I guess what would you call, the enlisted ranks, had various levels of education. Probably no one had what we would consider a high school education, and most of them were frontiersmen, you know, that they recruited for that. But yeah, it is
interesting to look at some of the spelling and punctuation, and some of those entries.

CB: But you enjoyed that aspect of looking at history.

KS: Very much.

CB: Do you think that your experiences with wilderness and kind of the great outdoors influenced that topic greatly?

KS: Oh I think so, yeah, I think that even without knowing it, subconsciously on that level probably there is a huge influence I just gravitate towards those things without thinking about it.

CB: Well it is interesting, just kind of as an observation when I first talked with you, you said that you know, you just kind of out of the blue you just looked up the Idaho Wildlife Federation and hadn’t really had a huge history with conservation, but from the sounds of it you’ve always been active in some aspect of wildlife, and maybe not so-called conservation but awareness to wilderness and wildlife.

KS: Right, right, and it’s interesting you know the older you get in your life the more settled you become in some respects and I think probably timing’s everything in life. And so at this time in my life, I am probably, I was probably thinking you know maybe it’s time to get involved in an organization that cares about the same kind of fundamental conservation principles and concepts that I care about. And so timing was right for me to look at the Idaho Wildlife Federation and to gravitate towards it and to join and eventually get on the board of directors.

CB: And prior to that you know you just mentioned principles and concepts, prior to becoming active with the IWF what were some of your own principles that you
held yourself to or you know you had talked about social responsibility, and just awareness of nature, what were some of those principles that you held dear to you?

KS: You know, I’ve always had a strong desire to in some way conserve our environment or be a good steward of the land and to be socially responsible as far as you know caring for our environment., And so that’s always been important to me. And you know now that I look at it I know it’ll always be important to me, I’ll probably do this for the rest of my life. But it’s something that is probably influenced from my upbringing, but when I look around from when I was young to I guess my adult years, I tend to think that the most of the people out there they think about the environment but I don’t know how much they really think about the environment and their impact upon it. I think because of our technological advancement through the years and of course the computer revolution and how high tech we are nowadays, and people’s lives are, they are so full. People are so driven, and there is so much stress now, and you know consumerism and you know, materialism and possessions become so important to people that they tend to overlook the human impact on the environment and really what we’re doing to our environment. Even from a population stand point. I really think that obviously we live on a world, in a world, or on a planet with finite resources you know, so we are exhausting our resources and yet our population keeps growing world wide. And so sometimes I wonder if people really even think about that. I mean certainly, probably more so in western industrial countries, I think population is probably kept more in check versus what we term third world nations. But you
know, maybe we are becoming a little bit more aware now with climate change, you know the global warming aspects and maybe people are starting to heed that. I mean I hope so.

CB: Sure.

KS: I really do, but yet again, I don’t know how much people really consider it on a day-to-day basis, probably not much. So I don’t know, it’s interesting. I have certainly seen a lot of changes. You know I was talking with Russ Heughins earlier, who is the executive director for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, and I said, “You know Russ,” and I mentioned this to you last time I think we talked, “the largest difference I have noticed from the time I was young until now is just the rapid decline in our game populations.” When I was younger it seemed like game was much more abundant, all across the board. You know, in our various travels throughout the state, my grandfather and I on our hunting or fishing trips just seeing, you know, especially in the summers, up around Lucky Peak, seeing the hundreds and hundreds of mule deer, I mean just populating the hillsides. You don’t see that anymore. I haven’t seen that in years and years, and in talking with Russ who’s you know in his seventies, I mean he is in total agreement, just the populations of just upland birds that he likes to hunt decreased dramatically over the years. And that’s all due to human impact, human encroachment upon habitat. And certainly Idaho is still one of the least populated states, but you know our population has grown quite a bit and we’re a mountainous region so you know, the population tends to sprawl in the lower lying areas, in the valleys.
CB: Yeah, I’m sure you see more of that, of the depletion of those natural resources and wildlife, when you look at it as kind of an isolated community and the impact that you know, like Boise has had on the southern Idaho population of animals and you know just air quality.

KS: Absolutely.

CB: We might be one of the least populated states but I am sure that our environmental footprint is just as much as somebody, someplace else. Maybe not to a point where like Los Angeles or something like that, but that it’s an interesting case study to look at.

KS: It is, but you know there’s days when our smog levels are very unhealthy and yeah, it’s terrible just the impact we’re having here in the valley with our growth with regard to population and impact. But also you have to look at, you know the emphasis I guess, especially with Bush, to you know, and even prior to him, with Dick Cheney going in and opening up some of our wildlife refuge areas to exploration whether it be for drilling for gas, natural gas, or petroleum, or whatever. And just the impact that has and from an outdoorsman’s point of view I don’t want to lose that. I don’t want to go into my areas and see a drilling rig or see some kind of infrastructure in place where it shouldn’t be, where it’s impacting the ecosystem or the habitat there. And that’s something to be concerned about. Because I think we’re going to see more of that because energy I think is you know the large emphasis for our future, now and for our future.

CB: Yeah, bring it all so we’re self sufficient, you know, producers of our own oil and energy and yeah, that’s very political as well and I think that you have a good
point. It affects just about everything from wildlife to politics, you know. You see that encroachment of those civil liberties and rights. And how would you define and this might be a little bit redundant but, you mentioned that you see yourself as a sportsman, and would you consider, what is your definition of that?

KS: You know, I think probably if you talk to someone in Idaho when they say sportsman they think, “Oh, obviously you’re a hunter or fisherman.” But I really think it has to be a little bit broader scope than that. I really think, I mean particularly with the Idaho Wildlife Federation we’re not just an organization for sportsmen. I mean a number of us are sportsmen who belong to it, but I think our vision is much broader than that and we want to encompass anyone who cares about conserving our environment, whether you be a hunter or fisherman or someone who likes to watch birds, you’re a bird watcher or you just like to go out and hike or camp. So, yeah, so I would think the definition would be much broader than just being some one who hunts or fishes but just in general someone who cares about the environment and conserving our natural resources, our wildlife you know, the habitat that we enjoy for now and for future generations.

CB: And you know one of the most poignant things that brought me to the Idaho Wildlife Federation was their mission and their focus on education. How important is that with the position you now hold on the Board of Directors for you and promoting the IWF as a citizen conservation organization?

KS: Yeah, it’s tremendous, I mean right now we’re in the process, because the Idaho Wildlife Federation you know it is the oldest conservation group or organization of its type in this state. It was really kind of the catalyst for the formation of the
Department of Fish and Game, you know in the late thirties. But you know over
the years it’s kind of waned in its importance. I mean there is certainly other
conservation groups throughout the state—and particularly here in Boise since it’s
the hub of government and politics—that have a much more influential impact
upon the environment and our state environment especially and where it’s going
politically. But you know we’re trying to grow this organization back to I guess
where it was years ago with membership and I guess with more political clout, if I
can use that word. But education is important for me because now I’m chairing
the development committee and I really want to make that our primary focus. And
we’d like to get into the high schools and attach ourselves to various universities
throughout the state and have an impact in probably both secondary and higher
education as far as bringing some of those younger persons into our organization
you know. And channeling their interest and enthusiasm about the environment
with projects with various organizations, whether it be BLM, or Bureau of
Reclamation, or the Forest Service or whatever. And you know maybe they don’t
have interest in being you know, an employee of BLM or the Forest Service in
whatever capacity, a biologist or whatever, but perhaps just by having that
experience of working a watershed project in the Owyhee’s with the department,
with the Bureau of Reclamation or BLM it gives them an understanding of how
important our environment is here in the state, both now and in the future. And
cultivate those interests and so they’ll always be involved in that.

CB: And so that’s the role of the development committee that you’re on?
KS: It really is. Well, it’s really two-fold to raise more funds, you know without funding you’re kind of dead in the water. Every organization experiences that, particularly nonprofit, which we are and grow its membership. So fundraising and membership are really the two things that we look at through the development committee. But the component I’m bringing with my educational background is that I want to get into particularly the high schools and the universities and bring those young persons on board. Because they’re the future and we really need to educate them and get them involved and passionate about the environment and conserving it. So I’m really hoping that’s going to be our focus and that’s what I am driving for is really conservation and education Idaho Wildlife Federation style.

CB: Yeah, I was in meeting with Russ he was, one of his biggest things was is being he said, “Considering myself as an old timer I need to bring in the young blood, the new blood.” And you being the new blood, do you have any observations of, or any maybe comparisons as to what the older members, or kind of, well let me see, kind of having a hard time, I can’t say older members because some of them even though their age might be old, they are fairly new to the organization, but just in anything that you have observed with group dynamics and any conflicts between interests within the IWF or for that matter conflict in conservation kind of as a whole in the Treasure Valley area?

KS: Yeah, I don’t see too much conflict on the board. I’m new and I’ve brought on board two other members who are actually younger than the existing board members, and really their role is more of an education role right now for us.
Being on, having been on the Board and been around for years, they are educating us on some of the issues that the IWF’s involved with or has been involved with particularly with regard to some of the law suits going on over salmon and dams and certainly the Owyhees and some other things. And so they’re educating us on our position or where or they’ve taken a position on some of these things which is good, we all need that. So they, we’re really sitting back and listening and taking all this in and really you know, trying to formulate where we’re headed. What our vision’s going to be for the coming years. Because in a sense they are passing the torch off to us. You know, “We’ve been involved in this organization for a number of years and now it’s time for us to kind of step back and let the younger blood come in.” And kind of bring in a new infusion of life to the organization and really drive it for the twenty-first century. So, it’s really been interesting and I really value their input, their insight, and what they’ve been through.

CB: Yeah, well and you said that you’ve brought in two more members. Were they friends or acquaintances or?

KS: Yeah, actually Rob Fraser and Katie Crandlemire and Rob is, he’s about my age, actually a little younger. He’s in his early forties. He is a project manager for Red Brothers Construction Company who I worked with for a period of time and so I met him through actually through work. And he’s not a native Idahoan, but he’s been here for number of years, went to the University of Idaho, cares deeply about the environment, has three young boys that he wants to raise here in Idaho and wants them to be involved in the environment. And he’s of course a big outdoorsman. He hunts and fishes and wants his boys involved in those activities
as well. So I naturally approached him about the position. He was very excited about it and didn’t even give it a second thought. And Katie I’d actually met through business and she’s a very, she’s a young dynamic woman in her mid-twenties and you know she’s into sports. She’s a horse woman, she hunts, she fishes, very involved in outdoor activities and just full of energy. She’s very smart and full of energy and very dedicated. And so when I approached her about it she was very interested and excited about the opportunity to apply and when she was accepted I think she was very happy that she had the opportunity to come on board. And so, you know, and then there’s one other young man, Stony Tuckness, who I believe is doing some graduate work at Boise State in business that Russ brought on board. Stony hasn’t been too involved. I think he’s, of course he has school and work and a young family. He has a new born baby, yeah, so he’s pretty busy with that and so I don’t see much of him, but yeah it’s going to be interesting to see where we can take this over the coming years. I certainly know Rob and Katie’s dedication and I’m sure Stoney’s dedicated. I just haven’t seen much of him.

CB: So this position that you hold, and the different committees, or the committee that you’re on, what would be your say your round about number of time commitment of hours?

KS: Oh, okay.

CB: I mean I’m sure it’s always on the forefront of your mind, especially with everything that’s going on you know contemporary society with politics and
legislation and your wanting to develop a new mission and role, but what would you say is the number of hours that you put in?

KS: You know it’s almost a part time job and I can’t say that I am dedicating twenty hours a week to it, because I can’t. You know I have a small business that I own with another fellow and operate and so that takes the majority of my time, but I probably give five to ten hours a week, you know. And a lot of that is with, via research or reading various articles. I mean Russ does a fantastic job of keeping us in the loop and keeping us informed with regard to what’s going on politically, or with regard to other organizations. And he constantly emails us different positions or perspectives from various organizations and what’s going on out there, which you know you’ve got to take the time to read and fully understand. And then course what position the Idaho Wildlife Federation takes, but we try to review that and I guess formulate our perspective or where we stand when we have our board meetings which are at least one a quarter, monthly if not quarterly. We get together, and then of course the development committee, we meet gosh, it could be several times a month depending on what’s happening, to quarterly. So, you know right now we’re in a big push to increase our membership and bring in some more funding, so we’re probably meeting more often because of that.

CB: What areas of funding do NPO’s such as the Idaho Wildlife Federation look at, I mean where do they, is it a lot of grants, is it sponsorship?

KS: Well, you know I don’t think they’ve done much with grants. I think they want to look at that, and I know Russ is looking to step down as Executive Director and so I know that they would like to hire a full time executive director. But they’re
unsure about the salary requirements, if they can meet those. But certainly they’d want somebody who was very good at or has experience with grant writing because that’s something they need to do. And everything we’re looking at is telling us that you know corporate funding really isn’t the way to go. It’s more with individuals, because individuals if they have a passion about something, especially with regard to the environment and maybe what the Idaho Wildlife Federation, IWF mission is, they’re more likely to give year in, year out. So it’s really the individual that we want to capture and bring into the organization who has a passion and you know, agrees with our mission and what we stand for. so that’s what we look at.

CB: Kind of to wrap things up, have you been involved in any of the field work that they go out and do yet? I mean I know that you’re very new.

KS: Right, right. You know I haven’t had a chance yet. And I am interested in doing that. Yeah, I really haven’t had the opportunity yet. And I don’t know if it’s because, you know and I’ve heard this from Russ a little bit, we really want the board members to be active on the board and that to be your primary function as a board member. And so in a sense it’s not really creating a division or schism between board activities and our projects, outdoor activities, but, because I think right now we can’t afford to do that. We have to really be involved in every aspect of the IWF from the board room to the field-based projects. So, but I haven’t had much opportunity yet, and I am looking forward to doing some of that. But I know, especially if we get into some of the schools and start getting the high school students or even college students involved that there will be more of a
need for us to be involved in those various projects as well. ‘Cause hopefully they’ll look to us for some leadership or guidance.

CB:  Sure. And so you really see your role on, I mean I guess I should ask, what do you envision your role being say in the next year? What do you want to bring to the Idaho Wildlife Federation?

KS:  Well certainly I want to fill our coffers a little more. Fundraising is important, but membership also and with regard to membership, I really want to increase our membership among the younger people, high school students, college students, and get them involved in some of these projects. Fundraising, I really want to gear towards not just covering our base budget, annual base budget, but being able to offer scholarships, even small scholarships to some of these students who want to pursue careers in conservation or environmental sciences, or you know biology, whatever it may be.

CB:  Gosh, that’s a great aspect or area to look at.

KS:  It would be wonderful to be able to do that. And I think it would be so beneficial for everyone if we could do that and I think that’s something that I’d really like to make part of our primary focus with regard to being a conservation education organization, you know allowing ourselves to offer, be able to offer college scholarships to students. And internships, paid internships, that’s huge. That’s something we hear all the time when we do, when we go to universities and they might be having a community fair. We just did one at NNU here in August. They had a community fair there along with their student orientation, and that was probably the main thing we heard from students stopping by to check out the
Idaho Wildlife Federation is do you offer internships, especially paid internships? You know being a college student you don’t have an opportunity to make a lot of money so anything that allows you to earn a little bit of money and do something worthwhile is you know a plus so.

CB: Sure, maybe find a career.

KS: Absolutely yeah, it’s certainly an incentive for them.

CB: All right. Well thank you so much, Kevin and I’ll be in contact with you.

KS: Thank you Carissa, it’s been an honor.

END OF TRACK ONE
END OF INTERVIEW

Transcribed by Carissa Black; audited by Kathy Hodges, January 8, 2009; corrections entered by Kathy Hodges, January 8, 2009.
Questions for Kevin Sligar:

- Where were you born / where did you grow up?
- Describe where you lived, what were some of your early memories?
- Can you tell me a little bit about your grandparents? Who they were, what they did, what influences did they have on you?
- Can you remember or describe any specific experiences you had as a child that involved or were influenced by the surrounding environment, i.e. camping, hunting, and fishing?
  - What kinds of outdoor activities did your participate in as a child?
- Did you take advantage of the outdoors; how did you view the land you used for recreation?
- How has Boise changed since you have lived here? From when you were a child until now.
- Can you tell me a little bit about your educational experiences
  - What areas did you study?
  - You mentioned a historiography that you did on Lewis and Clark, can you tell me a little bit about it? What influenced you to write about Lewis and Clark?
    - How has your education influenced your participation with the IWF?
- What was your first experience with so-called conservationism/environmentalism?
  - What led you to take interest in conservation? Start from the beginning.
  - Was there any particular person, event, etc. that played a key role or influenced your involvement with conservation and the environment?
- What was the first conservation organization that you were affiliated with?
  - What was your level of participation in the group?
  - What were your impressions of the group that you were affiliated with?
- What was your role or position when you first began?
- What were some of the different jobs you do for the IWF?
  - What were your first impressions of the group?
  - Who were some of the other people that you met through that group?
- Are there any anecdotes or stories that stick in your mind about the IWF?
- What did you think about the other conservation organizations at the time?

- What set the IWF apart from other conservation groups such as the Idaho Conservation League?
- How has the IWF tried to stay current with conservation issues and membership?
- What types of initiatives does the IWF take to ensure that it is fulfilling its mission?
- What did you believe to be the most important issues surrounding conservation during your involvement?
  - What issues stood out and stand out to you today concerning local and state wide conservation?
- Can you recall any other stories or experiences concerning conservation and certain events, people, or media?
December 6, 2010

Mr. Kevin Sligar
3319 N. 32nd Street
Boise Idaho 83703

Dear Mr. Sligar:

I want to thank you for meeting with our intern, Carissa Black, and for the wonderful stories and experiences that you shared during your interview. She told me it was a pleasure to interview you. I know future generations will enjoy the recording as much as she did.

Carissa mentioned that you would like a copy of your interview. I have enclosed an audio CD of your interview, I hope you enjoy it.

Thanks again for allowing your interview to be included in our contribution to the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions, comments, or concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hodges
Oral Historian
Idaho State Historical Society
Public Archives and Research Library
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Summary:

Carissa Black conducted five interviews with individuals who were involved as volunteers, members, or leaders with two citizen conservation groups: the Idaho Wildlife Federation and the Idaho Conservation League. Recorded under the auspices of the Idaho State Historical Society. Black conducted these interviews in 2008 as part of the work for her Master’s Degree in Applied Historical Research.

Historical Note:

Idaho is a sparsely settled state with a challenging landscape. Until recently, it has had a resource-based economy. The importance of natural resources – and how they should be used – has at times caused bitter conflict, and at others inspired cooperation. From perennial protest over land use to conservationists banding together to prevent mining in the White Cloud Mountains, the history of Idahoans’ relationship with nature is rich and intriguing. The Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project recorded the memories of individuals who were involved with conservation on local, organizational and national levels. The project included information and detailed history about two citizen conservation organizations, the Idaho Wildlife Federation and the Idaho Conservation League.
Conservation is intrinsically linked to Idaho’s economic history. Narrators talked about a variety of topics and hot-button issues including the White Clouds Controversy, the Frank Church Wilderness of No Return, the Wilderness Act of 1964, news media in the 1970’s and 1980’s, local conservation politics, politicians and the relationship between Idahoans and their environment.

The White Clouds Controversy was a key campaign issue during the 1970 gubernatorial election in which State Senator Cecil Andrus defeated incumbent Governor Don Samuelson. The mining company ASARCO had proposed a molybdenum mine in the White Cloud Mountains. Governor Andrus, one of the project narrators, discussed the impact of his election and the importance of being the first governor to be elected on an environmental platform, as well as the irony of being “the first donkey on the gold carpet in twenty-five years.”

In 1980, the White Clouds Controversy led to the designation of the River of No Return Wilderness Area, (later re-named the Frank Church Wilderness of No Return). Several of the narrators discussed these two key events at length, and talked about how they continued to shape issues faced by Idahoans and conservation groups.

Several narrators mentioned the role played by media during the 1970s and 1980s. Ken Robison, was editorial page editor of the Idaho Statesman during the White Clouds Controversy and the establishment of the River of No Return Wilderness Area. He talked about the newspaper’s increased reporting of conservation stories, and its influence on public awareness of the issues.

During the 1970’s and 1980s, the public looked towards conservation organizations to express support or outrage concerning local issues. The Idaho Wildlife Federation, formed in 1932, experienced both increases in both membership and financial support during the 1970s. In subsequent decades, its membership diminished as newer groups (such as Save Our Wild Salmon and the Idaho Conservation League) gained popularity. Three of the interviews offer insight about that change.

These oral histories were conducted with people who contributed to changing attitudes about Idaho’s environment. The project was conducted in 2008. The collection includes five interviews.
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The Idaho State Historical Society’s Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project collection consists of digitally recorded interviews, transcripts, indexes, summaries, and signed release forms from five narrators. The material was created by Carissa Black in 2008-2009. She conducted these interviews as part of the work for her Master’s Degree in Applied Historical Research.

**Administrative Information:**
Cecil Andrus, who was the 26th and 28th Governor of Idaho and United States Secretary of the Interior, talked about his experiences in Idaho and national government as well as conservation in Idaho’s wilderness areas. Andrus narrated his experiences from 1960-1995 and included topics such as: Idaho identity; State and local politics; the Department of the Interior; Idaho wilderness areas; Environmentalism and conservation; and cooperative politics. Andrus mentioned the role of the citizen conservation organizations in state and national government, the role of education and its impact of Andrus’ entry into politics, as well as private industries and political gain.

Copyright held by Idaho State Historical Society. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.

Russell Heughins who was a retired Air Force MSgt, and volunteer, member, past president and executive director for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho and the Idaho Wildlife Federation. Heughins narrated his experiences from 1975-2008 and included topics such as: his childhood in Massachusetts; travels with the U.S. Air Force; his educational track; environmentalism; and conservation. Heughins also discussed his career with the Idaho Wildlife Federation,
the goals and objectives of the citizen conservation group and the changes he has seen with conservation and the IWF over time.

Copyright held by Idaho State Historical Society. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.

OH 2577: Rick Johnson interview
2008 Nov. 13 Johnson, Rick, (narrator)

Sound Recordings:
2 CDs

Transcript:
None

Rick Johnson, who was the executive director of the Idaho Conservation Organization from 1994 through the time of the interview, recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho, in particular his work with the Idaho Conservation League and the Sierra Club. Johnson narrated his experiences from 1979-2008 and included topics such as: the Idaho Conservation League; the Sierra Club; state and local politics; environmentalism; and his tenure as executive director. Johnson also talked about his grassroots work in the conservation efforts in Idaho starting in Ketchum in 1979; the founding of the Idaho Conservation League; his work in Seattle with the Sierra Club; key moments and issues of the Idaho Conservation League, and its relationship with federal and state politics.

Copyright held by Idaho State Historical Society. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.

OH 2578: Kenneth Robison interview
2008 Aug. 27 Robison, Kenneth, (narrator)

Sound Recordings:
2 CDs

Transcript:
None

Kenneth Robinson who was a journalist and editor for the Idaho Statesman, an independent magazine producer and author recalled his experiences with conservation in Idaho. Robison narrated his experiences from 1957-1988 and included topics such as: the
Idaho Statesman; media; state and local politics; environmentalism; and conservation. Robison also talked about his own research on conservation in Idaho, the founding of the Idaho Conservation League and other various citizen conservation groups. Copyright held by Idaho State Historical Society. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.

OH 2579: Kevin Sligar interview
2008 Sept. 30 Sligar, Kevin, (narrator)

Sound Recordings:
1CD

Transcript:
28 leaves.

Kevin Sligar who was a retired United States Coast Guard Officer, member and who was active on the Board of Director for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, recalled his experiences growing up in Boise, Idaho, his childhood and interaction with nature, conservation in Idaho and the Idaho Wildlife Federation. Sligar narrated his experiences from 1964-2008 and included topics such as: his childhood in Boise’s north end; hunting and fishing with his grandfather; travels with the U.S. Coast Guard; his educational track; travels to Ireland and Germany; environmentalism; and conservation. Sligar also discussed his interaction and role as one of the Board of Directors for the Idaho Wildlife Federation, the future mission, goals and objectives for the IWF, including membership recruitment and funding for the non-profit organization.

Copyright held by Idaho State Historical Society. This interview was conducted for the Conservation in Idaho oral history project, a joint project of the Idaho State Historical Society and the Graduate Applied Historical Research Project for Carissa Black of the Department of History, Boise State University.
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Copies of Contact Letters
Mary Lou and Scott Reed  
2008  
853 N. Giesa Rd.  
Coeur D’Alene Idaho, 83814

Dear Mary Lou and Scott,

The Idaho Oral History Center, a branch of the Idaho State Historical Society, is currently working on a project to recognize conservation efforts in Idaho. I am in the process of gathering information about various conservation organizations and individuals that have made significant contributions to the preservation of Idaho’s natural environment.

Numerous individuals in the field of conservation, most noticeably Rick Johnson, mentioned that you would be an excellent source of information on the history of the Idaho Conservation League. It would be an honor to meet you both and record your unique history via your experiences with conservation, as founding members of the Idaho Conservation League and as outstanding citizens who have done so much in the field of conservation, preserving Idaho’s beauty and natural resources for future generations.

The Idaho Conservation League, with its rich history and numerous accomplishments in the conservation story of Idaho, is one of the organizations I am focusing on for this project. My goal is to collect a series of oral histories from both past and present members, directors and volunteers that will help me to elaborate on the growing interest in the story of conservation in Idaho. As environmental and conservation efforts become increasingly more recognized in contemporary society, the need for recording the oral history of conservation in Idaho, focusing on organizations and especially individuals such as yourselves, is considerably very important.

As project leader, I would like to tell you more about the project and see if we can set up a time to talk. I am located in Boise, Id. however, if you are interested in contributing your histories to this project(and I very much hope that you would), it would be an honor for me to travel to Northern Idaho to meet and interview you together for the Conservation in Idaho Oral History Project. I look forward to talking with you. Please feel free to contact me via e-mail or cell phone: Carissa.black@ishs.idaho.gov, or 208.440.6428.

Sincerely,

Carissa Black  
Conservation in Idaho, Project Leader  
Oral History Center Intern  
Carissa.black@ishs.idaho.gov
The Idaho Oral History Center, a branch of the Idaho State Historical Society, is currently working on a project to recognize conservation efforts in Idaho. I am in the process of gathering information about various conservation organizations and individuals that have made significant contributions to the preservation of wildlife and wilderness in Idaho.

The Idaho Wildlife Federation, with its rich history and numerous accomplishments in the conservation story of Idaho, is one of the organizations I would like to focus on for this project. My goal is to collect a series of oral histories from both past and present members, directors and volunteers that will help me to elaborate on the growing interest in the story of conservation in Idaho. As environmental and conservation efforts are becoming increasingly more recognized in contemporary society, the need for recording the oral history of conservation in Idaho, focusing on individuals and especially organizations like the Idaho Wildlife Federation, is considerably very important.

As project leader, I would like to tell you more about the project and see if we can set up a time to talk. Also, you might want to ask me some questions. Any help you can give me will be greatly appreciated.
I look forward to talking with you.

Sincerely,

Carissa Black
Conservation in Idaho, Project Leader
Oral History Center Intern
Carissa.black@ishs.idaho.gov
APPENDIX I

Copy of Personal Data Sheet
IDAHO ORAL HISTORY CENTER
PERSONAL DATA RECORD

NARRATOR’S NAME:

____________________________________________________________________

Address ________________________________

Telephone ____________________

Date of Birth ____________________

Place of Birth ____________________________

Year came to Idaho ____________________

Place first lived in Idaho _______________________

Year came to the area now lived in

____________________________________________________________

Schooling________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Military service (branch, rank, dates, MOS)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Occupation(s) (what, where, and when)

________________________________________________________________________
Principal activities and interests other than livelihood

FAMILY:

Spouse (1st): ____________________________
Date and place married __________________________
Date of Birth ____________________________
Place of Birth _______________________________________

Spouse (2nd): ____________________________
Date and place married __________________________
Date of Birth ____________________________
Place of Birth _______________________________________

Children: Date of birth Place of birth

Father’s Name:

Date of birth ____________________________
Place of birth _______________________________________
Date of death ____________________________
Place of death _______________________________________

Ancestor’s homeland
________________________________________________________________________

Occupation(s)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Mother’s Name:
________________________________________________________________________

Date of birth  ____________________
Place of birth ____________________
Date of death  ____________________
Place of death ____________________

Ancestor’s homeland
________________________________________________________________________

Occupation(s)
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Brothers and Sisters (married names):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL NOTES:
APPENDIX J

Copy of Legal Release Form
RELEASE OF RECORDINGS AND OTHER MATERIAL TO THE IDAHO STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY’S ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

We, __________________________________ and____________________________, (Narrator) (Interviewer)
hereby give, grant, and donate this (these) recording(s) and all other related material--such as photographs, copies of documents, indexes, or transcripts--along with any and all rights, including copyright, therein to the Idaho State Historical Society (ISHS). We understand that conferring these rights to the ISHS does not prohibit us from using this (these) interview(s) for original work of our own creation, as long as we give the ISHS proper attribution.

These recordings are considered a gift to the oral history program for such scholarly and educational purposes--including, but not limited to, use in books, articles, newsletters, public presentations, museums exhibits, lectures, websites--as at their sole discretion they shall determine.

The space below or on the reverse side is given for us to place any restrictions on this (these) interview(s).

Restrictions:

Date of Interview

________________________________________________________________________

Narrator’s Signature

Interviewer’s Signature

________________________________________________________________________

Narrator’s Address & Phone Number

Interviewer’s Address & Phone Number