

Transcription: Grand Canyon Historical Society

Interviewee: Jeff Ingram (JI)

Interviewer: Tom Martin (TM)

Subject: GRCA Enlargement, Part 2

Date of Interview: Nov. 29, 2014

Method of Interview: At Ingram's home in Tucson

Transcriber: Sue Priest

Date of Transcription: August, 2016

Transcription reviewers: Sue Priest, Tom Martin, Jeff Ingram

Keys: David Brower; Bridge Canyon Dam; Glen Canyon Dam; Wilderness; Martin Litton; John McComb; Rattlesnake bite

TM: Today is November 29, 2014. This is the second of two interviews with Jeff Ingram at Jeff's home in Tucson, Arizona. Jeff can you spell out your name for me please.

Jl: Jeffrey Ingram. 10/15/36. That's what all the doctors' offices ask.

TM: It's January of 1965. Did Brower come back around to you and say, Yes I got the board to cough up the money for our position, you're hired.

Jl: He did that in December. So even though I wasn't technically working until January the executive committee of the Club approved it in December.

TM: Where was your office to be?

Jl: Let me think, when wasn't it in my house? The first one was definitely just in a spare bedroom in Albuquerque. The house we lived in near old town. Then we moved not too far away but still in Albuquerque. I dedicated what was intended as a dining room area to my office. This was largely to save money. The idea was not to spend a lot of money. That's the house that had the little old garage shed in the back which I converted, put a heater into. There's a picture that I've got which appeared in the bulletin at some point because a photographer went around to all the local Sierra Club offices and took pictures. That's when I had an office outside the house but it was still on the same property. Then we moved again back toward old town to a house which really didn't have a space and they authorized renting a storefront. Which I did, over near the university. That's where I was the last year, year and ½. Probably a year.

TM: Did you get to spend much time with Brower?

Jl: I think the way to look at that is to look at the story of the fight over the Grand Canyon. There was the intense push to get me hired in late '65. Then the Grand Canyon was for him, I don't know what his biographer would say, but I would say based on my relationship with him, it was the issue that occupied him most from the beginning of '66. He had been involved before, don't misunderstand me, but from the time I was in, all the way through our river trip in September of '66. So that period from January through the summertime that was the big push, the big fight. That was the intense time. Can the Grand Canyon dams be defeated in some sense even though we didn't quite know what was gonna happen.

By the time we were on the river trip, Martin Litton's river trip that he ran, private river trip in September of '65, the fight was over. There was a lot of stuff that went on after that obviously.

TM: That was '66?

Jl: '66.

TM: '66, September.

Jl: So we're talking about nine months of a period that was pretty intense. I'm not sure how much you want me to recount the detail. And I think I'm not ready or willing to do that yet because of all the things I have left to write about. And I'm not gonna get to it, probably not even next year but maybe. The fight of the dams is the big obstacle and I have never been through those papers, back through those in any detail. However, on the blog I kept a semi-journal for the first year or so. So there is something already out on the blog that gives some structure to what was going on. But what was going on was Brower was peripatetic. He was traveling all the time to New York, to Washington. To various places to speak like Denver, which was in my territory. The whole point was to be that public figure who was dramatizing the fight over the Grand Canyon. The Sierra Club, too. But what we now call the environment in general. He had a philosophy but don't ask me to explicate it because I think that's the job of his writings that are left, his speeches. What he was as a mentor was a person who was saying compromises and what we do, that's what politicians do. We decide places are worth saving and we fight to save them. Saving being a liquid word which you pour in in different ways in order to find out how much... For instance, the Wilderness Act had been passed in 1964. This was the period where there were all these public hearings as the Forest Service went through the exercise of turning the primitive areas... There were areas classed as wilderness, as wild, and as primitive. The wilderness areas and the wild areas went right into the wilderness system. The primitive areas all had to be looked at. Public hearings held. Recommendations made by the agency. And little fights in Congress. Congress had to approve a boundary. Therefore, we had to look at each area and decide how much more we could get. That's what we were always doing. We'd argue about it even among ourselves. For instance if you had an area where you had a strip that maybe once had been logged, do you include that as getting the buffer inside the wilderness or do you leave it out so that the pristine wilderness is pristine. Of course we all know there's no pristine wilderness. Those were debates we had. Those were discussions we had. Because this was active, this period of actively converting those primitive areas into wilderness areas.

TM: How did that discussion go? Because I can see on the one hand people would say, look it's been logged so it shouldn't be in wilderness. On the other hand you'd say, Yes it's been logged. We made a mistake in logging it. Let's get it into wilderness and one day that forest will be a healthy forest again. So I can see those two positions. How did you all generally fall in on that?

Jl: I can't answer that because first of all I don't remember but second of all because I probably didn't follow all the areas in all the places. I remember a discussion with McCloskey and with Brower. Do we include an area which has been logged and is recovering? As I think about the areas that I was in a sense responsible for, although an awful lot of work was done by volunteer members of the Club and others, it's hard for me... I know my tilt was to say, save as much as we can and hope it will recover. In any case we don't want the boundary right up next to the wilderness. I think probably the concept of zoning as opposed to preserving. This was something that we did in order to mark off some area in which you

couldn't do stuff. You could do stuff, too, it was open for recreation and so on. But you couldn't log and you could couldn't mine. So that zoning made it easier to say, let's take this buffer strip and get it in there. I think that is what I would say was my philosophy. It was not a general position. You'd have to go to a wilderness historian. Brower made a joke at a board meeting and it had to do with a wilderness where they were arguing this point. His joke was on whether or not they should just keep the forest or move a little bit beyond it. His joke was, the early word gets the berm.

TM: [laughing]

Jl: At that time I didn't know what a berm was. But everybody laughed appreciatively at the board meeting.

TM: Those who know that bulldozers leave berms.

Jl: Yes. So in that sense you could see how he was somewhat sympathetic. And practically, he wasn't involved in drawing these boundaries, getting people involved and then testifying at local hearings. And even in Washington that was something that other people did. Mike McClosky was probably more of a man in charge of that program. I don't remember Mike interfering in the southwest. Maybe in the northwest because he had come from there.

TM: Jeff, you mentioned Brower's biographers are working on a biography that seemed to be taking two different tracks. What was your vision of that? I'm not sure what the two tracks are/the differences and what was your take on Brower that they're grappling with.

Jl: The question is, does your biography/does your analysis, which is one person doing a biography, by and large highly favorable. Because this is by a man who worked with Brower from the time the biographer was 18. Throughout his adult life he worked in Brower's organizations and with Brower. So this is a pretty favorable book. The other person is a little more narrowly focused in the sense that he's trying to say, so how did Brower accomplish what he accomplished? How did he do what he did? What did it mean to be a conservation leader? We'll find out if their books ever get published. The question here is do you talk about Brower's sexuality? The biographer finally decided not to. The other guy, I believe, has decided that he will because he sees it as having a very definite impact in things that Brower did, people he worked with, things that he emphasized, etc. I favor that point of view because if you're presenting a biography you're doing it for the reader in the future. Not to include something as important, and I'll illustrate why I think it's important in a second, seems to me is to cripple, cripple may be too big a word, is to make it hard for those future readers to make their own evaluation of what sort of person Brower was.

Let me think how to present this. It was clear to me from that first conference time in November of 1964 that there was something going on. The thing that I remember as my indicator was he invited me to lunch with this group of people and we sat around this table. He sat here at the head and I sat here. I remember him tapping me on the knee as he was doing/saying things. I remember close to the time when the executive committee had approved the job, Brower was talking about our going to a conference. I must have sensed something enough that I called Eliot Porter and inquired about what am I dealing with here, what sort of person he is. It wasn't that clear. So at this one conference which was in Pittsburgh... That's not the first time we traveled together, the first time was to Washington. We had separate hotel rooms. That's the one where there was a big dinner. At the dinner, which he took me to and I still had my beard, we met Wayne Aspinall that congressman who was chairman of the House

Interior Committee. We were all very chummy because that's the way you are/used to be in Washington. Even with deadly enemies you shook hands. He said, my goodness you've got more hair on your face than I do on the top of my head. So that was the Washington trip where I met many conservation leaders, lobbyists, people who had been doing this ever since who knows when. Some of them had been in government. I found them pretty old, pretty from the past. We were the young take charge or charge ahead generation. We were fighting to save the Grand Canyon. They couldn't help but sound more cautious.

The second trip was to the North American Wildlife Conference. I don't even know if they're held any more. All the organizations, all the conservation organizations come. It's a great big get together of all these groups. They pass resolutions. It's oriented, I guess, toward Fish and Game. But it's not a Fish and Game thing. On that one we had the same hotel room and he made suggestions, gave me a hug. Things that were very obviously sexually directed. I just said no. After we went to bed we talked for a while. There were at that point guidelines laid down which were maintained but which he would constantly press against. Because one of the characteristics of Dave Brower which was to our benefit/the world's benefit was that he was persistent and even aggressive. He knew how to push. He knew how to keep going. It's interesting that when you get that kind of energy and deployment of your personal resources it also went hand in hand with the fact that he was not moved by anger at something. Even though he, of course, could be scathing and critical of people who did bad things. That isn't what motivated him. What motivated him was he loved climbing mountains. That was an exciting thing. He was a great mountain climber in that period in the west. He loved the wilderness. Certainly he loved his family, his wife and his four children. There was never any doubt about that. And he loved a series of men. I know that because he told me. I can't prove it because I didn't keep notes. He didn't tell me names but it was a continuous topic of conversation.

The reason this makes a difference, I argue, is how do I ever become certain? Or how does anybody become certain that Brower hired in similar conditions. There must've been more than one. Even though most of the ones I knew were not subject to this same pressure. But again, I don't think anybody kept any notes. I don't think it's in any of his journals or oral history. There's apparently nothing in there about this at all. How do I know that he hired me because I was good at what I do or kept me on because I was good. So that's always... There's nothing strange about this. If you talk to any number of women who are hired by powerful men as secretaries or assistants or whatever, a lot of them go through the same thing. The difference being in this case it had to be even more hidden I think. It's interesting because it wasn't hidden and it was. There were no public displays. He would always give me a hug whenever. He had an interesting little tic. When I would come to San Francisco for a board meeting we would always get put up at good hotels. I stayed at probably all the best hotels in San Francisco. Like the Saint Francis and the Fairmount and the Francis Drake and so on. He would always drive over from his home in Berkeley and come and pick me up at my hotel room, give me a hug and then we'd go off to whatever meeting we were going to do. So that was an element in that relationship throughout that first year.

I think because of other things but also because the Grand Canyon was fading away and because he was getting more and more involved in what am I going to do about the Sierra Club board? Because they keep at me and they keep trying to slow me down. In 1967 I would think that was already starting. The criticism was public and there was antagonism. You'll have to go to a historian at the Sierra Club to get

stuff lined up so you can say, yes that happened in 1967. And then in 1968 this happened and so on. So this intense relationship was probably a year or so in length.

Helen and I, my then wife, discussed this quite a bit. The question was, is this a secure job? What happens if he changes his mind or whatever? Which never did happen. He was not that kind of a person. Just because things didn't work out I don't think he would ever get angry and dump... He wasn't a jealous person. It's just so interesting to see how positive a force, and both positive and force are important here, he was. He made mistakes, people will say. Trying to take over the Sierra Club was probably certainly one of them because once he left the Sierra Club/once he was fired the Club, I believe, never recovered. And I don't think he ever recovered. It's sort of like you take a heart and head and sever it from a body and somehow keep them both alive but they're just not the same. He provided a charismatic leadership that the club hasn't so far as I know, has never... And being big and powerful and so on is not the same thing as being a great charismatic organization.

TM: Just a couple questions on this. I'm just going to be open and honest about this. Did Brower have affairs with women as well? Was he bisexual? One question. The other question is, did he hug others? Was he a huggy kind of guy? Because hugging now is good to see you pat, pat. But in the sixties it wasn't then.

Jl: No, I don't recall that until the seventies

TM: I'm trying to figure this landscape out a little more.

Jl: It wasn't a thing for guys to do, to hug each other. It was an expression of his affection/of his interest.

TM: Did he do that with everybody? The Sierra Club board?

Jl: So far as I know, I never saw him do it. I don't think anybody ever saw him do it to me. Because it was always done out of sight. It was a way of communicating something which was private between us. I'm almost certain that he did not. Did he ever have affairs with women? Did he ever get involved with a woman other than his wife? I would say not. He never said anything about that. He talked to me about several of the men that he had had affairs with. If bisexual has any meaning in all, it has to apply to him because he had four children. And then he had these affairs. If you think of the time he grew up and developed, that makes entire sense. The chance of him being what we would now call openly gay was zero. That just wasn't what people did in 19... He was born in something like 1914. So here he is growing up in the twenties and thirties. He's a young man. He's a mountain climber. All kinds of opportunities. It was also an inhibited age in which you had to be careful about such things. In fact his job as an editor at the University of California Press was terminated when he was caught in an unfortunate situation with a man. Young man, maybe a student, I forget. The story he told me was that a man named August Fruge, who was a big guy in both the Club and the Press, maneuvered and got him named as executive director of the Sierra Club. He was the first person, there wasn't an executive director before that. I think that was the early fifties. Again, you'll have to go to other biographers because I'm doing stuff based on what I remember of what he said and other people have told me. Brower's biographer, whose name is Tom Turner, I'm not trying to be secretive, had also heard Fruge. I think it may be in Fruge's oral history. Anyway, there's something in there that indicates that this event did take place. Which is for me a little comforting because when I think back about all the stuff he told me and think back that his family does not want this in the biography. And think back about what Brower told me about his oldest son, wanting him to be guarded. Here's an oldest son who worships his

father, follows his father in some sense, and nevertheless has to deal with this thing he's discovered. Death of a Salesman kind of thing maybe. Not that it ever led to a rupture between them because they were all there. Let's not talk about that, that's an area I don't know anything about.

TM: Then let's keep focusing on the 1966 dam fight. My questions are two. What ended up really stopping the Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon dams in that summer? It sounds like by the fall that was now closed. And then about the river trip.

Jl: OK, the story of what happened to the dams is that they were included in a piece of legislation which grew and grew as people throughout the basin made claims. The Coloradan's said, if you're going to build this we want you to build Dolores, we want you to build Animas/La Plata. We want you to authorize those. And California said, if we're going to give you this then you've got to protect our allocation, make it juicier than yours. I can't even remember what they were now. But they were demands that they made. So here's all these water guru's/mavens/powers from all these states. These guys spent their whole lives trying to negotiate this arcane jungle of water law in the west and trying to gain enough of an advantage that their city or their state or whatever gets a little bit or a lot more water. Or can build a project which takes... Like the Frying Pan in Arkansas, that Aspinall would've been instrumental in, which takes the water over the divide. Or you go to Denver. A good bunch of Denver's water comes from the west side of the Rockies not from the Platte River which flows through it. So there's all these guys doing all this and loading this piece of legislation in the House Interior Committee. HR4671 Colorado River Basin Bill I think is what it was called. It got bigger and bigger and creakier and creakier. They held hearings at which we testified. That was where I testified by saying, you could build the CAP and not build the dams. The way the Bureau has shown the payouts, in fact you could do it without the two dams. Allan Carlin and Larry Moss came and testified about nuclear power. It was gonna be really cheap. Talk about jokes on conservationists. They pointed out that dams were not necessarily the future. Nuclear power was much more likely going to be the future. As it turns out in our country, neither one had been the future. Interesting.

So we made a splash at these hearings. We made a show that we weren't just coming and saying, the Grand Canyon is a pretty place don't destroy it. We were coming and saying, there are real physical alternatives. You don't have to build those dams. They are superfluous. Let me digress here because this is an important point. If you think about it the Bureau of Reclamation had shot itself in the foot. The Bureau had taken Bridge Canyon Dam and tied it to the CAP. In other words, it had said in order for us to build it, it has to be part of a reclamation project. Which means you can't just go and build hydroelectric dams, we have to have a dam which is tied in to bringing water someplace. That's our mission. Once they did that, instead of having authorized the CAP and Bridge Canyon back in the late forties, it got put off because of all the water fights that went on through the 1950s and finally ending up in the 1960s. So it was put off until the mid-sixties. By that time we had Echo Park and are now having a growing/what became the environmental movement. Because the two dams were tied in that way, you had to ask the question how important are they to the central part of the legislation? Namely the CAP. Turned out they weren't. They weren't going to pump water. That had nothing to do with the dams for Central Arizona. They weren't going to provide the power because the power would come from the cheapest form which was base power probably generated at night or whatever. They certainly weren't going to use peaking power from the dams in Grand Canyon to push water to Phoenix. That wasn't going to happen. So they weren't needed for water or for electricity. What I had shown, which was true but not the Bureau's way, is they didn't need them to pay for the Central Arizona Project

either. In fact what they were doing was putting these dams out there so they would generate money in the future, to go off and get water from someplace like the northwest. Because the northwest had already made it very clear there wasn't going to be anything to do that, everybody knew that was a roadblock when it got to the Senate. But they said, let's just get it through the House and then when we get through the Senate Carl Hayden will work his magic and something will happen.

So we were making the argument that made its future looks cloudy. We were making the argument that the dams weren't necessary. So when John Saylor stood up in the committee, or as he would have stood up on the floor of the House if it had gotten that far, he would be able to say to all these other congressmen who knew nothing except that this was a very controversial dam/dams... He would've said, these dams aren't even necessary. We're don't have to spend money on that. We don't have to do this. So the arguments were on our side even though the votes possibly weren't.

So what was happening in the Senate during the summer... The bill had been cobbled together. This great massive thing. The committee had approved it and it was ready to go to the House floor. During the summer Udall and all the people, by that I mean Morris Udall as the chief House proponent of the dam, and all the other people who were involved in this, all the lobbyists from Arizona, who knows how many 20, 30, 40, 50 people. They were all going around lobbying individual offices. We had a lobbying operation too. We went to Washington three/four times. There were various of us. There were a couple of Washington representatives, a northwest representative who would go and lobby. I remember I did Texas. The idea was to go and lobby in the sense of saying... Which meant that even though Udall could count votes better than we could and knew the House far better than we did, nevertheless we were an irritant. We were a potential stumbling block. Particularly in the hands of somebody like Saylor who could use this and perhaps turn the tide against the dams if it ever came to a vote on the floor. Why was this important? It was important because California was locked into this legislation only if the dams were in there. Why? Because the dams would produce money to get water for California from the northwest. If California didn't have that then they said, that part of the bargain is gone and we don't like it and we won't support it.

TM: Didn't they want senior water rights. Didn't they want the whole CAP?

Jl: But that had to do with the Colorado. We're not talking about that. We're talking now about the future. They knew that wasn't enough water for them. It's now true. They're in drought but even without that drought they're having to change how some of the water is allocated.

TM: So their support for the bill then stopped even though the CAP had senior rights.

Jl: This is a controversial thing. It's sort of like the business about the IRS being sicced on the Sierra Club back in the spring. The question then is, did Morris Udall do that? Did Stewart Udall do that? Nobody truly admits it, maybe some people later hinted they did. The same thing is true here. Did California use its weight, which was considerable/a huge delegation/had key people on the Rules Committee, which was the gateway on the floor for the bill, all the bills have to go through the Rules Committee, get a rule so you can decide how you're going to debate it on the floor. There were senior Californians, one or more, on the Rules Committee also on the Interior Committee itself. And the fact that it was a large delegation. It would've been not unsurprising if they decided if their water guru's in and out of Congress got together and said, what do we think about this? If this gets out on the floor are we going to be able to keep all our pieces? Them deciding no we can't. And therefore saying to Morris Udall, or maybe not

even saying to him, it's not going to go anywhere. It's August anyway and even if it gets done, it's not going to get out. That is a possibility. That California said, you can't keep this big, huge, creaking load of all this stuff together. It's going to come apart on the floor and we're going to lose. Then that bill's going to get passed and it'll go the Senate. They're going to adopt it and we're going to be stuck. That's one version of what happened in July and August of 1966 which was the death of that piece of legislation and of eventually the dams.

TM: One could say that California and the California legislators in the House stopped this bill.

Jl: One would not want to say that because it's too much more complicated. They would be saying, what stopped it? John Saylor stopped it by threatening.

TM: That testimony?

Jl: We stopped it by saying the dams are... We're never going to accept them. We're going to fight and make it difficult all along way. Behind all of that there was the northwest. The northwest was, without ever saying a word... That's not true... There was a very important key person, Tom Foley, who was the congressman from eastern Washington on the House Interior Committee. He made it very clear the northwest was not going to let the... He was a protégé of Henry Jackson, the senator who was chairman of the Interior Committee. I'm sure they were in as much communication as they wanted to have. So if Foley said something like, I don't think you'll do very well in the Senate, they could take that for gold and Jackson would go to Hayden and they'd strike some kind of deal. That deal would not include anything that would threaten the northwestern hold on the Columbia River. For California, having the chance to get to the Columbia River and get it brought to Los Angeles was one of their demands. So you can say the northwest did it. California did it. The conservationists and John Saylor did it. Why did the dams not make it? It was done because it was tied into a reclamation project or as a hydroelectric plan. Bridge Canyon quite possibly could have been approved in the 1950s just by itself. But there was nobody to push it because... I shouldn't say that, the story's more complicated. The Bureau couldn't push it because they had to tie it to a reclamation project. You can't make a blanket statement and say the dams were defeated by A or B. It has to be some combination and what that means is it had to be in the minds of all those congressmen. So when Morris Udall said, will you vote with me? They'll say, sure but I've been hearing this from my friend from California or I've been hearing this from the conservationists or whomever. So I've got some questions. If you add up as yes's on the floor, people who said I have some questions and then you project, if you're California, the arguments on the floor about your fears, you're apt to say that's not a yes that's a maybe. It's easy to see it converted to a no. It was in many ways a really good example of legislation and how it could get put together and then come apart. That's what it did, it came apart.

I can finish that story up by saying that in the fall, Secretary of the Interior Udall decided that in order to get a bill... This was '66, an election year. So 1967 would be a new Congress. Probably not a lot of change but nevertheless a new Congress. They'd have to start with a new bill, they couldn't take the old one. They could have reintroduced it but they wouldn't do that. So anyway, Secretary of the Interior Udall waited until the Commissioner of Reclamation, a very dominant, aggressive sort named Floyd Dominy, was in China consulting. He ordered the Bureau of Reclamation to prepare whatever number of plans to fund and provide power for the Central Arizona Project. As many different alternatives as they could. If we take the dams out of the bill what can you dream up Bureau of Reclamation to get this done? And they came up with 30 different plans/different ways of doing it. That was what led to the decision to

buy into a coal fired power plant that was being planned by SRP, I think. I don't think it was APS. The idea was, we'll take a chunk of federal money and instead of building a dam with it we'll take that chunk and we'll give it to the people who are going to build the coal fired plant in return for a guarantee that we can get the power we need to pump the water. That was called the prepaid power plan. That's how they were able, in early 1967, to introduce a bill in the Senate this time. The administration came in with a bill that had no dams in it and had this prepaid thing. That was the bill that Hayden then steered fairly quickly through the Senate in 1967. Meanwhile the House was still trying to fiddle around with a bill that had dams and the rest of it. But they were doomed. It wasn't going to happen because by the time the Senate had passed the bill, which had nothing about the northwest in it, there was not going to be any studies about how to get water. So the question was, what was the House going to do? And eventually they accepted. They actually had to twist Aspinal's arm. Hayden did. By the end of 1966 the administration had the information it needed to introduce a bill that had no dams in it and didn't need the dams.

TM: I want to wrap that up a little bit more because it sounded like part of all this strategy was a change of Congress in an election year. It sounded like that election happened. The bill didn't get out of the House. Was it reintroduced in the House without the dams the following session? How did that happen?

Jl: No. The bill that was introduced in the Senate in '67 in the new Congress was a... I'm not really sure, they may have called it a barebones bill, but it didn't have a lot of stuff in it. It had the CAP and it had this prepayment provision in it. That was, from our point of view, all we needed. It's what got past the Senate. We did testify. There were hearings in both the House and the Senate that year. I went back to Washington off and on to monitor things. We didn't have to lobby because there was nothing going on. The efforts in the House to put together another piece of legislation, where could they go? Because here was this bill which had all the power of the Senate behind it. Which was past the Senate and they had to deal with it. If they dared bring their bill to the House floor people like Saylor would stand up and say, I move that we substitute the Senate bill and throw this piece of junk out. They had to go through the process of swallowing the bitter pills. That's what took most of 1968.

TM: And when that finally passed it was in 1968? Both houses signed by the president. Then that was it?

Jl: That was the formal ending. That's the legislation which contains the provision that there can be no dams authorized in this stretch of the Colorado without Congress authorizing it.

TM: Let's go back to 1966 and the river trip. At what point did it get into your system that hey, there's a river down there. I should take a river journey. How did that trip come together? Who was on it?

Jl: I don't think I was that assertive. Martin did these private trips and I think even before that one, and I don't know this, I'm just guessing, he would take people down that he thought were important to take down. Influential. That was true of the trip that I was on. There was a fellow who was involved in a magazine about California. Not Sunset, which Martin was still. The idea was, if you're going to fight to save the Grand Canyon and the river, you need to know what it's like. Brower had never been down through the Grand Canyon. Therefore it was obvious to invite him. Invite me because I was leading the fight. Not leading, excuse me, I shouldn't have said that because I was one of the lobbyists. I'm pretty sure I was just invited. Martin put together the trip and I was invited. He took John Vail who later on became a commercial river runner on the canyon. He took Ernie Braun who was a photographer. The Sierra Club got a book out of that.

TM: What was the book?

Jl: Living River/Living Canyon? It's a paperback, glossy paperback, small. Not one of the big exhibit format books but a smaller book. Sorry I can't remember. So the idea was Martin says to Ernie Braun, I'll take you down, you take pictures and we'll do something with them to publicize this. There were also some people named Childress. A father and son. Clyde Childress was a photographer. I don't know if anything ever came of that or not. Martin knew him and they brought their own boat. Marj/Mrs. Childress came, too. I think it was a combination of friends and bringing people who needed to be down the river, see the river, wanted to see the river, would do something for the river. A combination. For Martin the ideal trip was all the way through. The motorboat came up from Lake Mead and picked you up somewhere in the slack water and towed you out to Temple Bar. It was all wooden dories.

TM: How many boats?

Jl: I would say five. Then you're going to ask me which were they? And I'm gonna have a tough time. There were Childress's boat. There was the Flavell, the flat one.

TM: The Flavell II

Jl: The Flavell II, the submarine kind of thing. John Vail rowed that. I remember when he got to the first rapid he said, I'm scared. I was on the boat with him when we went through it. So there were those two. Martin would have brought three boats. Does that make sense?

TM: So the Susie II might have been on that one. Maybe renamed.

Jl: Francois Leydet was one of the oarsmen. Martin of course rowed.

TM: Francois would then come out with a book.

Jl: He'd already come out with a book.

TM: He had. That was from '63 or '62.

Jl: That early? I think it was more like '64 or '65.

TM: They didn't run after the dam for a year. There was a hiatus in there.

Jl: That would've been '64 - '65. They ran the river and Francois wrote... They collected all these pictures. It's not an art book in the way *The Place No One Knew* is. It's much more of a big battle book. Francois wrote the text. I thought it came out pretty quick. It was after *The Place No One Knew*. That's an easy question to answer if anybody cares, because you can always look it up online, as to what its date of publication was. Anyway, that was a trip which took place before '66 then. The book resulted. Then Francois went again on this trip. There could only been 4 boats? Who would've rowed the other one? Sorry...

TM: Do you have pictures?

Jl: I never took pictures. Ernie Braun took pictures. There are pictures in this book that I'm talking about. If you're going to ask me whether I have a copy, I'd have to go look. We'd have to check it out, not something we want to do right now.

TM: Had you met Martin before the trip?

Jl: Yes, and I have always considered this to be my key contribution. I remember this as taking place in Washington because I remember it taking place in a hotel room. It would've been toward the beginning of the year, probably March maybe as early as February. So it could've been not Washington but New York because Brower and I came to New York to talk to the people in the advertising firm who worked for Reader's Digest. Reader's Digest wanted to sponsor a conference where people who are against the dams... They wanted to sponsor the conference at the Grand Canyon. Where people who are against the dams would come and invite newspaper/media people. Make a big fuss and a big splash. The advertising agency was willing to promote all this. It was in connection, I believe, with an article by David Bradley who was the son of the other Bradley who was so important in the Echo Park fight. It was very important to Dave because he was an engineering type... I'm getting out of my depth here. In any case, there was this thing and we went to organize it. The idea was, I suggested we don't have to be just against the dams. Let's be in favor of a park that includes the whole Canyon. Brower says, Martin you're the expert. You and Jeff sit down and figure out what should go into a complete park. We'll get a piece of legislation and we'll introduce it at the same time we have the Reader's Digest conference. That'll be a big coordinated splash/bang to the dams and put in the big bill. Martin said okay. We can do this, section one, and this, section two. We were including Indian reservations and all of the North Kaibab. It was a huge, big bill. In fact it was introduced by Congressman Saylor and a few others at the same time as that Reader's Digest conference took place at the Grand Canyon.

I think it sunk without a trace for that period because it was clearly not going anywhere. But we had our bill, we had a thing. We could say, what do we want? We don't want dams, we want a complete park. Whether we actively lobbied for it I don't know. Because the fight over an enlarged park was for the future, after the dams were taken care of. Which is what happened.

TM: What was Martin like to work with?

Jl: Did I meet Martin there? He was on the board and I had already been to San Francisco. I would bet that Brower introduced me to Martin earlier in 1966. When you asked how long did I know him, there was that period. I don't know how much he was part of the group that came to Washington and lobbied. I don't know if he did that or not. He traveled with Sunset which was probably more than a fulltime job. He put together this trip and given the time that he required to plan it, he must have started that in the summer. So he must've been talking about that. You were asking me what was Martin like?

TM: Yes, what was Martin like? When you guys sat down you were thinking, let's build Grand Canyon the way it should be geographically as a place. You were going to team up with Martin on that. That was after this '66 trip?

Jl: No, the Reader's Digest conference was right at the end of March '66. It was intended to influence the legislation.

TM: So it's another factor in this lets take down this legislation. We've got California saying no. We've got the Pacific Northwest saying no.

Jl: It was intended to be a much bigger media event than it turned out to be.

TM: Is this the one where Brower and a whole bunch of people are holding up the placards saying 'Save Grand Canyon'?

Jl: Yes, on the rim of the canyon. People came to that conference from Denver, Albuquerque, Phoenix. Driving up there which was a harder job than it is today. The idea was, we have an audience that was favorable to fighting the dams and in favor of Grand Canyon. And they'll talk to the news people/the media people and convince them and talk about their adventures in the Canyon and why they... It all got spoiled because the advance man from the advertising agency that was organizing this, came to Arizona and started talking to people. He was ignorant, he was completely innocent. He didn't know what he was doing. He started talking to people who were part of the Arizona power structure. So by the time we got to the canyon the Bureau of Reclamation was there. Goldwater and Udall came. It became a fiasco. It never really produced the kind of media... But maybe it couldn't have anyway because I don't think the media people were there to produce that widespread a splash. That's the part that probably didn't work. The advertising agency didn't attract the kind of people from Seattle, Chicago, New York, Washington, and Texas who would have made it a national event. So it's one of those little episodes which didn't matter. Particularly compared to the IRS attack on the Sierra Club which eclipsed almost everything else that we did.

TM: So about the trip? Meeting Martin? Trip pulls together. There's a bunch of people invited. You don't know these people?

Jl: By and large not. Bob Waldrop who worked in the Washington office of the Club I had met. Dave came in at Phantom. He had to attend a board meeting which took place at the time the trip was launching. That was good because he was able to report the good news about what was not going to happen to the legislation. Did I know anybody else? No, I think not. People like John Vail were new to me. This fellow from the California... I don't remember his name.

TM: You guys all had life jackets?

Jl: Yes

TM: Fire was built right on the beach to cook food?

Jl: You went and defecated on the beach and buried the toilet paper. Because of that in 1966... We were there in September so the 1000 people who went down that year had already mostly been. The beaches were certainly in worse shape after that summer of 1000 than they are after any summer of 20,000/30,000 today because there were no rules. There were no guidelines. Everybody said, hey we'll have a fire, hey we'll shit on the beach and all the things which we fought for through a good part of the 1970s. To get good environmental rules and guidelines on the river. None of those things were done. A lot of people like Martin, old-timers, excuse the expression, Ken Slight who was a commercial operator, they didn't like all this stuff. They wanted to have fires.

TM: This would have been the second year without a seasonal flood.

Jl: The water was still warm enough you could swim in it. I remember we swam a couple of rapids. The reservoir had not risen so the temperature had not dropped to the unbearable point that I guess it is now, or at least in the 70s.

TM: There would have been a lot of sand?

Jl: Oh yes, big beaches. We ran all the rapids. I think it's fair to say that's the first time Martin did that. When we got to Hance he was really nervous because Hance... We lined one boat. It was such a

miserable experience that everybody on the trip said, no more this is too dangerous. I remember I went through with Francois Leydet and he broke an oar. So we were drifting into Hance with one oar and he was grabbing for the other one and he finally got it out. Nobody flipped there. But there was a lot of boat damage. We repaired boats fairly frequently. There were flips. I can't remember how many. It was an adventure. Compared to what people have to do now in the sanitized river. It's probably very different.

TM: What else do you remember?

Jl: What about Martin? I would only say good things about Martin. Because in order to say bad things, I have to move ahead a few years. Where he goes from running personal river trips/private river trips where he invites friends and what he hopes will be influential people, maybe does one a year, to buying enough dories that he could launch a company and run it for profit by charging high prices. Long trips and the only way to go - wooden dories. The problem with that is that then he fell in with all those other felons who run the river trips. All the commercial operators. He gradually became more and more difficult. For me anyway. For us to get along in the seventies. But at that time I had no reason not to admire him. Brower had told the story about Martin giving a speech to the board of directors and convincing them to say, we're going to protect the whole Grand Canyon. I guess he's an alpha male. He liked to be in charge. I remember once Bob Waldrop and I, who did a lot of hiking, we were the hikers. Exploring places Martin had not been into, like Silver Grotto. He didn't know... We went up in there and discovered this beautiful place. At one point further down we took a long hike which went up and came down a different drainage and then we had to swim down and get to where they were. Could Stone and Galloway have been involved? Something like that. But in any case, he and Brower were both furious because we had gone off on our own and had all this great adventure. There was that aspect to him. If you're going to do this kind of thing tell me so I can say you can't do it.

But he had organized the trip. I suspect the food. I don't remember any distress. We always ate well. We slept outside. We repaired boats. All of this... this was 19 days to get to Temple Bar. For me it was the trip of a lifetime. I've since been on one that was even more of a wilderness adventure because there was no one else on the river. We didn't see many boats on that trip being in September. I remember there was a big motor raft rig of Jack Curry's Western River Expeditions that got stuck because the river was now fluctuating because the dam was controlling it. You had to be sure that you didn't leave your boats and then the river goes down and your boats are left high and dry. That happened a little bit I think. So, it was a fine trip. I really don't have anything critical to say. I'm so glad that Martin invited me. Maybe I invited myself, who knows.

TM: I'm curious about what you remember about the book because part of the strategy was to get a photo book of Grand Canyon in front of every member of Congress. That happened in '65ish?

Jl: The big one?

TM: Yes.

Jl: I don't remember anything because it was already published by the time I went to work for the Club. So it must have come out in '65. It's possible that they had it ready for the first hearings in the fall of '65.

TM: So another strategy piece of trying to alert the members to the scenic value of the place...

Jl: Right

TM: Another the strategy was to say, besides the scenery we don't need this dam. Another strategy was California saying, we don't want this structure unless we can get the Columbia. The Pacific Northwest people saying, not taking the Columbia. All this together. Saylor saying wait a minute, as a strategy to knock the whole thing down.

Jl: Right. Compared to many pieces of legislation this was not as complicated. But as far as water legislation/reclamation this was a very complicated bill. It had very many parts.

TM: Did that river trip help you understand the Grand Canyon better as far as its place in the water machine of the west?

Jl: No, that isn't what I got out of the Canyon. What I got out of the Canyon is embedded in the movie, which is called *Living River Living Canyon*, that I produced for the Sierra Club. It came out a year later in '67. That was what came out of my experience on the river. The original footage was all taken by Martin. He wanted a battle film. He wanted to show the pretty river and then have some message. I remember he wanted to end the film with an explosion. As if the Bureau of Reclamation were... The first dynamiting to start building the diversion tunnel. I cut all that out and made it a record of a river trip. Not a record of a river trip, but a river trip. Trying to focus on what was there. The Canyon as a beautiful place worth saving. A magnificent place worth saving. So that's what I got out of the trip. The whole business about understanding enough of the water situation in the west that I could testify in Congress, I did all that before I went down the river. I'd hiked in the canyon but that wasn't... That's part of the problem of lobbying for conservationists. That ties into the idea that you conserve the land and conserve the waters. That's what people were called back then. Their work and their attitudes were much more tied to a specific place or places. The Canyon being one. When I moved east and lived in Massachusetts near the shore, the people who lived there loved the estuaries. They would fight to protect the estuaries because that resonated to them. That's the kind of people that powered that movement through the 1960s. Once you get past Earth Day, once you get into environmentalism/once pollution/once the EPA, all of that stuff, it then becomes a much larger and more bureaucratic and less romantic bag of fish.

TM: Less power of place and more global thinking or certainly national thinking?

Jl: Problem thinking. Population control. That wasn't to say there weren't issues that were tied to places. There were. I left the Club in 1968 and did not return until 1972 when we moved to Tucson. I then immediately picked up Grand Canyon affairs. For me it was quite satisfying to focus on this one place. There was a whole range of issues that had to do with this one place. It's true in the 1970s that that was becoming old fashioned. It would be an interesting exercise to go through the minutes of the board of directors of the Sierra Club in so far as they ever talked about conservation issues. They often would get to those after they'd wrangled about administrative stuff for a day. They'd talk about conservation. It would be interesting to see, if you compared the 50s and 60s and 70s and 80s what the shift in content and substance was of what they were talking about.

TM: Let's shift gears a little bit. I'm interested in your hiking now, in the Canyon. Not wearing galoshes any more.

Jl: No, no galoshes. Heavy boots. Boots that weighed 5 - 6 pounds. Great things to protect your feet when what you were doing was beating them to death inside these gigantic but very trendy hiking boots.

TM: [laughing] What year, when did you come back to say, let's do a backpack? You did the down and up. First you did down Plateau Point. Then you came back and did the down, along and out. And then how did that progress?

Jl: Oh boy, that's really interesting. I think Helen went down the river with Martin in two pieces and quite possibly did it in '67 and '68. In the '67, where she came out at Phantom, I hiked down to meet them and hiked back out with her. Then the next year I hiked down with her to Phantom and hiked back out. The reason I remember that is because a very well known architect named Nat Owings, who was on the Secretary's advisory board for National Parks, was somebody that Martin got to go with his wife. One of their places was a house on Big Sur, on a point. You walk in and there's the ocean and the rocks. Money can do many things. They were coming out on mules and I came along and passed them. In those two years that may have been the only hiking I did in the Canyon.

The first backpack I took was as the southwest representative of the Sierra Club. At that time we decided to include Texas which was a bit of a stretch. But there wasn't anybody. The people in the Lone Star Chapter organized a backpack in Big Bend. Where did I get a pack from? I seem to remember Helen bought a pack for me for a birthday present or something. I don't remember what year it was, but it must have been early. I was so ill equipped. I had a backpack and I'm sure I had a sleeping bag. I don't think I was cold. It was fairly warm weather. I remember having this package of freeze dried soup/powered soup. I had no pot to cook it in. And no way of eating it. [laughing] That's all I remember about the lack of preparation. It was bad. I think it was one night and two days. I remember it was a very pretty deserty/mountain kind of trip. So long ago. I can't even remember if I've been back to Big Bend since then. So that was the first backpack.

By the time we get to the fall of 1968 I have backpacked enough that I'm pretty good. Two years. Among those hikes would have been one of the early hikes down the Paria which had just been saved by the Bureau of Reclamation as a scenic area. Vermilion Cliffs, Paria Plateau. Another one would have been in the north end of Petrified Forest National Park. In the Painted Desert, which as far as I'm concerned, is one of those gems of the southwest. Two day backpack. You hike out there. Camp up in the north end. Come back the next day wandering through all these weird things. You really don't see very many people doing that. With those kinds of things, and there had to have been others that I'm not immediately recalling, I must've known how to do it.

The fall of 1968 a photographer named Dave Bohn, who lived in California and had done the Glacier Bay book, the big format book/exhibit format book for the Sierra Club. He had done the photography/written the whole book on Glacier Bay National Monument. He wanted to go in and photograph. He used a big camera, bigger than a Hasselblad. He had all this camera equipment to carry. He wanted to get in there and really immerse himself. As it turned out what he really wanted to do was go to Kanab. What I really wanted to do was go into the western Canyon. Because I had never... It was a rare... All I'd done was driven across the north edge. I don't even know if I'd gone to Toroweap. I must have gone to Toroweap by that time. So the two of us arranged a three week backpack. We drove down to that Lake Mead National Recreation Area fire camp at the beginning of the Shivwitz Plateau. Where the road changes from drivable to almost impossible. We went down off the side. No

trails. We were extremely lucky. I think it took us two or three days to get down into Parashant/down into the canyon level. We were carrying packs. He bought the food. It was all freeze dried food. By that time I had a stove and I knew how to do things like that. Either his pack weighed 90 pounds... I don't think my pack weighed 90 pounds. I think his weighed 90 pounds because he had the camera equipment. Mine must have been 60-70, something in there. He had brought ice axes to use as walking sticks. I remember using them very little. Getting down over all the... It was such an adventure. Such an exploration of the Canyon. You learned every level. We got across the Supai... We didn't carry much water. There on the Supai was a pothole. The Esplanade. So we had some water. Then we found a slot in the Bright Angel to go down. Not having the slightest idea whether it went or not. We came to two drop-offs which we were able to go up on the talus and get around and drop into the lower part both times. We may even have been as far up as the Andrus- Parashant drainage. I think it took us three days. Then we went down Parashant to the river. Down along the river. Our original idea was to go along the river, around the base of the Shivwitz, and then up Separation and come out. It was very clear by the time we were making our way down along the shore that we were not going to do anything like that. We weren't fast enough. Poor Dave, this was not what he wanted to photograph until we got to Granite Park. We camped on our side of the river across from Granite Park. I don't think he'd found the kind of great landscapes that he expected/that he wanted to photograph. But for me it was wonderful. Because each day I would go up a side canyon as far as I could. Not as far as I could, but up onto the Esplanade often. There's a lot of limestone in that section and therefore a lot of hollowed out, sculptured side canyons, as you know. So for me it was a wonderful playground kind of a trip going along all that. We got down opposite Granite Park and I forget how long we stayed. I know I went up the canyon, explored it. 105 mile?

TM: 209?

Jl: Maybe, you know better than I do.

TM: It goes through the Redwall up to the Esplanade.

Jl: The maps we had were the black and white, nothing on them, 15' quads which were brand new. There was nothing on them except elevations and the contour lines.

TM: Contour lines at 80 feet? So seeing cliffs on those maps was very difficult.

Jl: Yes. I doubt very much we even bothered to try. I used them to mark my route. I still have them. One canyon I explored going up and there's side canyons which are quite beautiful. At the top there was another sculpted out part in the Redwall. Then I got up above it and I could see. I had been able to walk up that canyon and when I got up to the top of the Redwall/the Esplanade I could see that we could get out. At least we could get all the way across to a few cliffs. That was my first indication that we would be able to exit. We probably had to do it then because I bet we were already close to two weeks. Given the amount of time and how slow we were.

When I got done with this hike I talked to John McComb. John and Joanna were still together and great hikers/great canyon explorers. Not telling me anything about it but off to prove themselves. They drove down Diamond Creek. They were carrying a little duckie which they blew up. Crossed the river, went along to Separation, up Separation, over the Shivwitz, down 209-mile, then back along and across the river to... They did that in about five days. Which is the difference between powerful hikers and amateurs like me and Fred, Matt or Dave. So we didn't get any farther around than that one. We did

come out and it did take us two or three days to get up to the top. Even when you're there you still have a ways to go to walk up the Shivwitz. We did that. I remember we had no water once we got up there. But there was a big stock tank. Dave decided he would sieve the water. I went looking at the heads of the canyons and found a spring. Green spring? Don't know which one, one of the spring canyon that comes in there. There was all this fresh water which I brought over. The next day somebody came along possibly the park ranger or somebody else. He gave us a ride. That was the end of the trip. It was THE outstanding backpack.

I have the feeling I've been in the Canyon about 30 times. River trips, backpacking trips, the kind of hikes I was talking about down and up. I've done all the "developed trails", undeveloped trails except the Boucher. One of the first trips, I think it was a Sierra Club trip, down to the North Bass. You get down to the river at North Bass. Then you come back and go up some of the Arthurian, Mordred Abyss and all of that. You get to this steep, steep incline up through the Supai. It's broken and you can get up. Once you get up at this saddle from the point that comes down from the North Rim... It must be at a point where it comes around and this sticks out. We didn't want to go up here [pointing]. Later, people did. We wanted to go up here so we had to head that canyon which wasn't very much except the oak is awful. I remember battling that and we climbed up. That was a great... I did that twice. The second time seemed easier. There are beautiful little places along there as you get away from... The North Bass trail is fine but then you get in and you're really bushwhacking.

A Kanab trip down Kwagunt. We got down into Kanab by Kwagunt, down Kanab to the river, along the river, up Deer Creek, we came out and went up to Monument Point. I made a terrible mistake. I got disoriented and continued on walking to Indian Hollow, up that trail. They were over here and I was over here [pointing]. It was getting dark so I left my pack at the road and walked along. They were so upset because they thought they were going to get out. They'd all gotten out in the middle of the afternoon while I was wondering the Esplanade. Stupid. So I've done stupid things. Do you have other questions?

TM: There was a journey with a rattlesnake.

Jl: On the river trip with Martin we stopped at Hance. We did something that left us some time. Maybe they were fixing a boat. Bob Waldrop and I hiked up Papago Creek. It's beautiful. There's all this mottled Tapeats. Purple and tan rock in the floor of it. It was a wonderful thing. I always remember that is as this beautiful little thing. Some years later, it was 1974, I went with three other people down the Red Canyon trail. Camped at Hance again. I said, I wanna go back up and find that beautiful little part of Papago Creek. From there you have to go up a talus.

TM: Up the talus. When you guys went up in '66, did you just walk up along the shore? Was there enough sand that you just walked? Or did you go up that talus as well and in, in 66?

Jl: That's my guess, but I could be wrong. I know what you're talking about. You can't go along the shore anymore. It's squirrely. After all that's '66 to '74, that's 8 years and lots of water. Might well have done that. So I can't tell you how we got into Papago that time. That's a route for people who go down Tanner or even further and then come going up and over as a route.

TM: It is now because there's no sand there. But I wonder in '66 if the river was low, if the dam... You're dealing with dam management back then. The water's going up and down. If the water was down and there was enough sand it would've been an easy walk right up to Papago and then explore the drainage.

Jl: Maybe that's what we did. I don't know if we'd stopped above it. Would there be an easy entrance?

TM: If there was a concept to line Hance you guys might have camped the night before there. That afternoon at camp, OK we're going to camp here at Hance and do some lining and start this stuff. You would have headed on up.

[time out]

Jl: I did go up the talus in '74. Started up the creek and came to a little waterfall which I had to climb by putting my hands, one on the left side and the other on the more central part of the flow. There wasn't any flow, there wasn't any water. I was up high enough my head wasn't above the level. I put my hand to pull myself up on the bottom of the creek bed. That's when the rattlesnake struck. It was lying in/crossing the creek bed just above this little pour off.

TM: And some fingers arrived.

Jl: Yes, a hand. I probably reached up and that's when it struck. It struck right here [pointing] that fleshy part of the right... below the little finger.

TM: And then what happened?

Jl: I let out a huge yell. The other guys were still down at river level on the Hance beach. They heard. I turned around and started walking out knowing that's what I had to do. I wasn't going to sit down and wait for anything. I also knew I wasn't going to die. I don't know how, but maybe it was somehow I had a sense that this wasn't virulent. This wasn't raging. It struck and I stepped down and back and off. Then I could see this rattlesnake. That's how I know was a Blacktail not a Grand Canyon rattlesnake. I walked out and down the talus. Told everybody. Did the usual things you do when you've got shock like that. Then lay down while the three people discussed it. They said, if one of us goes and something happens to him that's going to be trouble. So two of us had better go and it better be the stronger hikers. We'll try and get out. We better take everything because we're not going to come back to get our stuff. The fastest way would've been for one guy to take some food and water and book it. I think that's an interesting problem. What would you do in that instance? Would you say, I can get up in 3-5 hours, whatever it took, I don't remember. But we usually do it with backpacks so it's not comparable. You could come out at Grandview, maybe they went to Grandview. Is it possible? Because Red Canyon is difficult enough and Grandview is easier? I have a vague memory they went up Grandview. Because they went with their packs and because neither one of them was... They were good backpackers, they were strong middle-aged people. They didn't get out that night. They had to stop, sleep, and finish the next morning. Meanwhile, I was on the beach. Don't remember doing anything. Maybe I stuck my hand in the river. Mostly I was in a little shelter, like part of a tent. I remember that because it was also open. The biggest problem was that I was uncomfortable. So if I lay down I would start getting itchy and nauseated. Then I'd have to sit up. I'd sit up for a while and that would get hurtful. Then I'd have to lie down. I did this from 9:00 or 10:00 in the morning to the next morning when the helicopter came down at 9:00. The discoloration/the enzyme dissolving the... flowed up through the arm and across. I don't think it got over to this arm [pointing]. The torso, chest/stomach area, was all black and blue. I remember discomfort but I don't remember any pain. Maybe rattlesnake venom puts its victims out of their misery without hurting them much. [laughing] Anyway, the next morning they had reached the top. A doctor came down in the helicopter. Checked me to be sure I wasn't allergic to horse serum. Then gave me an injection of anti-venom and put me in the helicopter. Took me up to the top and said,

there's no sense stopping here. So they took me to the Flagstaff hospital where I was an object of much interest to the doctors. They'd never seen a rattlesnake bite before. I was a sight because... It took me a week to be past most of the... My hand was numb for some time. The doctor in looking at it said, the only thing I'm worried about is you'll lose some flesh or the skin will split. Nothing like that happened.

Shortly after that I went back to Washington to lobby on the Park bill. That was the period that started the conference committee. That's where I told the little story about Congressman Steiger who was an opponent on the Park bill and most other things because he was an anti-environmentalist. He liked to denounce people. Quite a personality. I walked into a committee room where the committees were dealing was some piece of legislation. The public was allowed to come in, not say anything. I remember they were seated around the room and I came in and squatted down against the wall. Steiger was on this [pointing] side of the table and he could see me. He got up and walked around and came over and said, I heard you got... Are you all right? A very kind thing to do. So I always had a good opinion, not of his positions, but of the man.

TM: No residual effect?

Jl: No. The punctures disappeared so quickly that the doctor in the hospital, when he kept bringing people around to look at all this swelling, had to take his pen and mark the two puncture holes because they disappeared so fast. They were small.

TM: You were black and blue and swollen?

Jl: Black and blue and swollen across the upper part of my body. But not above the neck.

TM: You were in the hospital for...?

Jl: I think we... Helen came up with the kids. When did this happen? Sunday, did we hike up on Saturday? Or did it happen Saturday and I got flown out Sunday? I was in there may be three... We probably drove home on Thursday.

TM: 3 nights, 4 nights?

Jl: In the hospital. At most. Not more than that. As I say, I went to Washington the next week.

TM: Do you know who the doctor was that was in the helicopter?

Jl: No. But there's an interesting story that somebody told me at some point. They said, you know you're really lucky because the usual doctor is a real quack. But this guy, who is a relief or maybe an EMR guy, he was fine, knew his stuff. I don't have any idea who either one of them were. The other funny one is that the guy who stayed with me on the beach was not a particular backpacker. He came from the Midwest, I think, and was a friend of one of the other people. They'd told him you'll enjoy this little trip down to Marble Canyon. He was a psychologist. So for the period of time after the two left, which was 10:00-11:00 not later than that, until the helicopter came the next morning which was probably about 9:00, he sat a distance away from me. Never talked to me. Barely looked at me. I remember I would notice him as I went up and down. He was just sitting. I have no idea what he was thinking. He came to the hospital room once with the other two guys and hung back. He didn't say anything. It must've been excruciating because he didn't know what was happening to me. I was convinced I wasn't gonna die. I just had to go through this uncomfortable stuff. So here I am getting up and down and he hears this... And he doesn't know what to do. Obviously, a little comfort, a little can I

get you anything? Don't remember his name either. I know who the other two people were but not him.

TM: Who were they?

Jl: Dave Oxner who worked at the Park. He might have been in landscape but he was good guy. On our side, I will defame him by saying he was on our side. Very friendly, he and his wife both. I stayed at their house during that period in the 1970s when I was doing research in the files. I would go up there and if you don't have a place to stay for free it's going to cost you a lot of money. The other person's name is Richard Ach. Maybe it was Asch. He was the editor of the little newspaper they hand out at the park. Do they anymore? Probably not.

TM: Yes, they have The Guide, the newspaper with the maps.

Jl: Newspaper format. It comes out every month. So he was editor, he wrote the whole thing. They were both good people.

TM: Another two hours has zipped on by. Thank you so very much again for this. To be continued.

Jl: If you want to. After all, the park fight is in the blog and the river fight is in the book. You may know about that book.

TM: This is interesting for me to learn about Jeff Ingram the man.

Jl: I'm flattered.

TM: About your journey through life. Your connection to Grand Canyon. As an advocate for the Canyon. These details/this stuff is not in the book. It's not on the blog. That helps me get a bigger... gives the future a better picture of who you as an individual are. How the Grand Canyon has inspired you and molded you to be who you are. That's what I'm curious in hearing about. Thank you very much for this.

Jl: It certainly gave my life a central spine/direction. I don't know about direction. I think of it more as an enveloping environment. If you have this kind of environment you become a wealthy man. If you have this kind of environment you get to spend your time thinking about the Grand Canyon. Maybe this kind of environment you become a bum on the street.

TM: It's a different kind of wealth.

Jl: Let's hope we can keep it

TM: Yes. Thank you again.

Jl: Uh-huh.