TRANSCRIPT

...DATELINE... *the West*

A conference to examine media coverage of western issues and its impact on public policy.

December 6, 2002
Boise State University, Student Union, Jordan Ballroom
Presented by:

. . . DATELINE . . .
The West

December 6, 2002

Boise State University

Boise, Idaho

Presented by

The Andrus Center for Public Policy

The Idaho Statesman

Gannett Co. Pacific Group

The Idaho Statesman
IdahoStatesman.com

ANDRUS CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY

GANNETT

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Friday, December 6, 2002

9:00 AM **Welcome:** **Cecil D. Andrus**, Chairman, The Andrus Center
Margaret E. Buchanan, President and Publisher, *The Idaho Statesman*

9:30 AM ***Content and Credibility***

Understanding Bias, Objectivity, and Balance
Walter Dean, a 30-year broadcast news veteran who splits his time between NewsLab, the Project for Excellence in Journalism and the Committee of Concerned Journalists.

10:00 AM ***Cowboys and Cattle Rustling in the 21st Century***
Conrad Smith, Professor of Journalism at the University of Wyoming, author of *Media and Apocalypse*, a study of the media coverage of the Yellowstone wildfire, the Exxon Valdez oil spill, and the Loma Prieta earthquake.

10:30 AM ***Mediating the Western Environment:*** *Reflections on News Coverage of the Spotted Owl Conflict*
Jacob Bendix, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Geography in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. Author of a comprehensive study of the coverage of the spotted owl controversy and other western natural resource issues.

11:00 AM **BREAK**

11:15 AM Panel discussion among Messrs. Dean, Smith, and Bendix with questions from the audience.

Moderated by **John C. Freemuth, Ph.D.**, Senior Fellow, Andrus Center

Noon **Luncheon**, Jordan Ballroom, Student Union

A Westerner's View of the Media
Senator Alan K. Simpson, former US Senator, Wyoming

1:30 PM ***Critters, Controversy, and Confrontation: The Media's Struggle to Report the West***

Journalists and decision-makers will consider a series of hypothetical situations in which controversial western issues are played out in a way that helps illustrate the tensions and demands on all the participants.

Moderated by **Marc C. Johnson**, President, The Andrus Center

PANELISTS:
Bob Barbee, former Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park
Tim Egan, Enterprise Reporter, *The New York Times*, Seattle
Bob Ekey, Northern Rockies Regional Director, The Wilderness Society
Gloria Flora, former Supervisor, US Forest Service
Rod Gramer, Executive News Director, KGW-TV, Portland
Peter Jennings, ABC World News Anchor

Rick Johnson, Executive Director, Idaho Conservation League
Tom Kenworthy, Denver-based Correspondent for *USA TODAY*
Scott Kraft, National Editor, *The Los Angeles Times*
Senator Brad Little, Owner of Little Land & Livestock Co., Emmett, Idaho and member of the Idaho Senate
Robert Manne, President and CEO, Pacific Lumber Co.
Sandra Mitchell, Executive Director, Hells Canyon Alliance, and Public Lands Director, Idaho State Snowmobile Association
Mark Obenhaus, ABC Senior Producer for *Peter Jennings Reporting*
Katy Roberts, National Editor, *The New York Times*
Patrick A. Shea, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Clinton Administration
Jay Shelledy, Editor, *The Salt Lake Tribune*
Congressman Mike Simpson, Idaho Congressman, Second Congressional District
Mark Steele, Editor, *The Caribou County Sun*, Soda Springs, Idaho
Jim Strauss, Executive Editor, *The Great Falls Tribune*, Great Falls, Montana
Congressman Pat Williams, Former Congressman from Montana, now Senior Fellow for the O'Connor Center for the Rocky Mountain West

3:45 PM ***Observations and Conclusions:***

A review of the conference day and reflections on the complexity of western issues and their coverage.

Cecil D. Andrus
Walter Dean
Peter Jennings
Alan K. Simpson

4:30 PM **Conference adjourns**

E V E N I N G

7:00 PM Public address by **Peter Jennings,** Jordan Ballroom, Boise State University Student Union. Reserved seating for conferees.

DATELINE: THE WEST

December 6, 2002
Boise, Idaho

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Morning Session: ***Content and Credibility***		
Walter Dean		3
Conrad Smith, Ph.D.		10
Jacob Bendix, Ph.D.		11
Panel: Dean, Smith, and Bendix		21
Luncheon: ***A Westerner's View of the Media***		20
Speaker: Alan K. Simpson Former U. S. Senator, (R) Wyoming		
Panel: ***Critters, Controversy, and Confrontation:*** *The Media's Struggle to Report the West*		25
Scenario I:	The Lewis and Clark National Monument	26
Scenario II:	Ending Grazing on Public Lands	32
Scenario III:	Conflagration at Glacier National Park	34
Scenario IV:	Environmental Protesters	37
Scenario V:	Manipulating the Media	40
Remarks by the Non-Journalists		42
Closing Panel: ***Observations and Conclusions***		45
Cecil D. Andrus		
Walter Dean		
Peter Jennings		
Alan K. Simpson		
Evening Address:		
Peter Jennings, ABC World News		50
Question Forum		54
Speaker Biographies		58

DATELINE: THE WEST

December 6, 2002

Boise State University Student Union

SPONSORED BY:

The Andrus Center for Public Policy

The Idaho Statesman

Gannett Co. Pacific Group

Cecil D. Andrus: I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome you to *Dateline: The West*, another of the public policy conferences sponsored by the Andrus Center for Public Policy here at Boise State University. I'm here to welcome you on behalf of the Andrus Center and also on behalf of Boise State University where we enjoy an affiliation here on campus. The Andrus Center is a non-profit corporation, so we beg, borrow, steal, and ask for a lot of volunteer help.

It's great to see so many of you here today. We have a full day planned, including this morning some really in-depth and informed discussion of issues like media bias and the ways certain issues of particular importance to those of us in the west get covered by the national media. We're going to have some fun today but also to explore a serious and important topic with an outstanding lineup of speakers and panelists.

This conference came about as the result of a series of discussions with a variety of people from coast to coast over the last couple of years. Those discussions often ended up with us wondering if the national news media, the big wheels, really understood how critically, from time to time, we view their work. We say, "That's not the way it is." There is a vastness west of the 100th meridian that you people don't understand. There is a culture out here that is different from Manhattan. More important, perhaps, we wondered if we could explore how national news coverage of our regional fights over issues like the Endangered Species Act or the national wildfire policy helps shape our national policies around those issues.

A great many people have helped with this conference. I want to mention them. When you see representatives of these organizations, just say thanks because without their help, financial and otherwise, a non-profit organization like ours would not exist. Our major sponsors are the *Idaho Statesman* and the Gannett Co. Pacific Group. They have helped us tremendously.

This conference continues a very successful partnership the Andrus Center has enjoyed with the Statesman. I didn't have that when I was governor, but Margaret, you were not here then. I still don't always agree with their editorial policy or their political picks in an election year, but I appreciate their help very much.

Let me acknowledge some very important help from our other sponsors. Those people that have helped us as sponsors are the Associated Press Managing Editors Credibility Roundtable Project, the Brainerd Foundation, the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, the Bullitt Foundation, the Key Foundation, the Lazar Foundation, and of course the Hewlett Foundation, which has provided long-time and very important help to the Andrus Center for Public Policy.

Let me give you just one example of the importance of media coverage in determining public policy, a positive one. Some of you remember that, back in 1988, I closed the Idaho borders to further importing of nuclear waste into this area for "interim storage," which had been going on for more than thirty years. We had finally had it. I said to Marc Johnson and others, "We're going to close the borders," and we did. I picked a fight with the Department of Energy. I wanted to get their attention and tell them, "Look, please keep your word, which was given to us in 1971." The legal folks said, "Governor, you can't do that. You can't close the borders." I said, "I'm the Commander-in-Chief of the Idaho National Guard, and we have M-60 tanks. I'm going to park one across the railroad track with the Howitzer pointed directly down the line." It got a little ink here, and there were words like "arrogant," "dictatorial," and other flattering phrases.

But we really didn't get the attention of DOE until, on a Sunday morning on the front page of the *New York Times*, there appeared a picture of an Idaho State Police officer. It was summertime, he had a short-sleeved shirt on, his arms were folded across his chest, and his biceps were bigger than my thighs. He was standing

there, and his cruiser was across the railroad tracks. We had impounded a carload of waste from Rocky Flats that had not reached the Arco Desert, and he was standing in front of it. That picture, in the Sunday edition of the Times, captured the attention of the people in Washington, D.C. and others. All of a sudden, they caved in and decided they would discuss the problem with us.

The point is that the picture, one exposure on the front page of the *New York Times*, had a lot more clout than any western governor might have thought he or she had. That brought them to the table. That changed things. Some of my attorney friends that are here in the audience can tell you that the Interstate Commerce provisions say that I didn't have the right to do what I did, but I did it. We entered into a Memorandum of Understanding and, through the followup help of Governor Phil Batt and some others, we are moving some of that transuranic waste out of the state of Idaho.

The point is that picture brought them to the table and that you have a tremendous amount of influence. My experiences with the media have not always been positive. I can tell you about rattlesnakes in Dominique's Restaurant, and I can tell you some other stories, but I'm not going to. I just want to say thank you for being here today. Thank you for your support of the Andrus Center.

It's now my pleasure to introduce the president and publisher of the *Idaho Statesman*, Margaret Buchanan, who will extend her own welcome to you.

Margaret Buchanan: That's a tough act to follow. Good morning, and thank you for joining us. The Gannett Company and the Idaho Statesman are pleased to partner with the Andrus Center for Public Policy for the third year to bring people like you together to discuss issues of the west.

This conference is about learning to serve you better. In the past two years, the conference has focused on fires and rural Idaho, but we know much of the public policy around those issues is made outside the west. Media coverage plays a critical role in how well people outside the west understand the nuances of the issues and the impact of public policy. I'm looking forward to learning from you today, and I know all the people from the Statesman who are here today are looking forward to that as well.

So thank you for taking the time to participate, and I hope you yourselves learn something today and that we can help further the resolution of issues in the west. Thank you.

Cecil Andrus: Thank you very much, Margaret, for your continued help and support to the Andrus Center and to this community.

Now I will introduce Marc Johnson, who will introduce our first speaker. You will see him this afternoon as the moderator of the panel.

Marc Johnson is a journalist in his own right with a graduate degree in journalism. He headed up the Public Television station activities and anchored here at Boise State University in the late 70s. He joined me in the Governor's Office, served as my Chief of Staff, left there, and joined the Gallatin Group, which is a corporate and public affairs firm with offices in Seattle, Portland, Spokane, Helena, and Boise. Marc is a partner and the manager of the Boise office. He also serves in a volunteer capacity as president of the Andrus Center for Public Policy. Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Marc Johnson.

Marc Johnson: Thank you, Governor. I told the Governor that I wanted to make the introduction of our first speaker this morning for two reasons. One is that I wanted all the panelists who are going to occupy these seats this afternoon to be able to bore-sight me right now so that they could say, "How the heck are you going to manage a twenty-person panel?" We're going to have some fun this afternoon, and I hope all of you will stay around for that.

The other reason is that I genuinely wanted to introduce Walter Dean. Several months ago, Rocky Barker – whom many of you know as the fine environmental reporter for the *Idaho Statesman* and who has been very helpful in putting this conference together - and I attended an Associated Press Managing Editors Credibility Roundtable Seminar at Northwestern University. Some people would say media credibility is an oxymoron, like military intelligence or political integrity or other words that don't fit together in the same phrase. Rocky and I were very impressed at that conference with our lead-off presenter this morning, Walter Dean.

We knew we had to move heaven and earth, if necessary, to get him here at this conference. He is a veteran broadcast journalist, worked for CBS news for 14 years and as a local TV news producer and reporter. He spent some time in the great state of Nebraska, as I have, which recommends him highly. He has been at the respected Pew Center for Journalism. He has taught journalism. Now he splits his time between NewsLab, the Project for Excellence in Journalism, and the Committee of Concerned Journalists. Mr. Dean has great experience and some remarkable insights into the craft of journalism, and I know he has brought some important and provocative messages today about media credibility, bias, and perspective. Please give an Idaho welcome this morning to our lead presenter, Walter Dean.

CONTENT AND CREDIBILITY

Walter Dean: It's great to be here. I managed to escape Washington yesterday morning. If you hadn't heard, there is some snow on the east coast. I think they got six inches in Washington yesterday, which is twice as much as we had all last winter. I have to tell you that the Washington metropolitan area is huge with Maryland and Northern Virginia. There are probably more SUVs in the city of Washington than there are in the state of Idaho. The difference is that you know how to stop them. They don't.

I want to set the stage for our discussions today by planting a couple of seeds. The first has to do with bias. While this conference has been titled very diplomatically "Dateline: The West," it might also be called, I suspect, "How the biases of the big city eastern establishment media cause news people to get our story wrong more often than they get it right. As a result, Washington is screwing up our lives and our livelihood." Is there any truth in that? I suspect there is.

Does that mean there is a media bias at work here? How many of you think that bias in the news media affects what you see on television or what you read in the newspaper? Quite a few. Many people seem to agree. In fact, a book about bias in the media was No. 1 on last year's *New York Times* Bestsellers List.

Let me ask the same question of the news media people who are in the room. How many of you think that the news media biases can affect what's in your papers and on your broadcasts? How many of the news people think biases affect journalism? A few hands.

Let me ask this question of both groups. What would a story without bias look like? Help me out. Can anybody give me an example of what a story without bias on television or in the paper look like? A weather report? Baseball scores?

Anything you create in journalism will have bias. I see some heads nodding. Does that mean that bias is perhaps not always a bad thing? Is it possible that bias can serve to create narrative texture or to provide context to a story? If bias is not necessarily bad, if it can also mean making a story perhaps more understandable, might it be that the issue is not about stamping out bias but rather about managing it appropriately?

Let's test this notion if we can, this notion that bias is a necessary part of journalism. I'm going to suggest that there are any number of biases in journalism that everyone in this room can buy into most of the time. Here's one: Peace is better than war. Democracy is better than dictatorship. Deceit should be exposed. Order is better than chaos. I can't imagine how many times I wrote, "The demonstration was orderly."

My guess is that all of us are inclined to embrace these biases because they reflect our society and our culture. They reflect what we believe to be true. Furthermore, if a story or a news organization ignores these biases, we would wonder what the heck was going on. For example, what if you heard or read these headlines: "Peace Finally Ends." "Tyranny Succeeds." "New Grand Jury Policy: Don't Ask, Don't Tell." "Rioters Applauded."

What's wrong with this picture? These headlines don't work. The stories they represent would never work because they are contradictory to what we as readers and viewers know to be true. Put another way, they discount our biases. At the same time, however, we know that these so-called "friendly" biases can be our undoing. While they may be appropriate most of the time, there are instances where they need to be questioned.

Is peace, for example, always better than war? Put another way, should every peace treaty be ratified? Are there no battles worth fighting? Is democracy the best form of government for everyone in all places at all times in history? Are the people of what was once Yugoslavia, for example, better off now than they were under Tito's Communist regime? Should deceit be exposed if it involves a President's love life? Order may be better than chaos, but at what cost? Wasn't the Boston Tea Party or the American Revolution somewhat chaotic? Is a loud and unruly demonstration less righteous than an orderly one?

OK, you say. You've told me about good and bad biases, and I can live with that. What I cannot live with is the unacceptable biases that creep into news coverage. If journalists cannot innoculate themselves against bias, are there ways of doing journalism to keep bias from inappropriately infecting the work of journalism? I think if the conversation gets to this point, everybody – the news person, the reader, the listener – has won because now you're talking about something that can be controlled: the way information is gathered and evaluated.

In the four years that the Committee of Concerned Journalists spent listening to hundreds of journalists talk about their news-gathering strategies and techniques, we've heard one thing above all else: The most important thing a journalist can do is to develop a strict discipline of verification. How good is the news organization at getting it right? Understanding the role that verification plays in the reporting process may be the key that not only unlocks the confusion over bias but another big idea about which there is much confusion: objectivity.

Objectivity is a concept most journalists take pretty personally. For many of us, however, the notion of objectivity has become so personalized that we have lost sight of what it is really about. The term "objectivity" began to appear as part of journalism in the 1920s as people came to recognize that the search for truth involves more than just getting the facts right. You also have to get the right facts. It's what distinguishes journalism from advertising or even propaganda. Objectivity came into use as a call for journalists to develop a better, more rigorous, almost scientific method of reporting, a strict discipline of verification, a systematic discipline precisely because journalists themselves could never be objective. They could never operate without bias. In other words, the journalist was not, could not be objective, but his method could be. It's the same sort of relationship as attorneys and the law, physicians and medicine, CPAs and their accounting standards. Perhaps that profession is not a good example, or perhaps it's a very appropriate example.

We boiled down what we heard from journalists into three concepts that form the intellectual foundation for the discipline of verification. The first idea is to never deceive your audience, what we call the *Rule of Transparency*. Tell your readers and viewers what you know and what you don't know. Tell them who your sources are and, to the extent you can, what their biases are. Tell them how you got the information and why you made the choices you did. The best way readers and viewers can judge a story is for the journalist to explain his methods, how he knows what he knows, and why he did what he did with that information.

Journalists are not very good about this. I'll give you two quick examples. A few months ago, you may recall, CNN obtained, purchased some Al Qaeda videotapes of Al Qaeda training and aired them in what I think you would have to argue was a real public service. They paid some thousands of dollars for these, and certainly there was, within the profession, a small firestorm afterwards because of concern and criticism that perhaps they were inadvertently funding terrorists by purchasing these videotapes. Only afterwards did CNN come out and explain why they did what they did. How much better would that have been if they had simply done that in the beginning, before they ran the story, and told their viewers, "Here's what we were confronted with. Here's the decision we made. Here is why we made it, and we're not unmindful of the risks we ran. We took these steps to try to make sure this money didn't go to terrorists."

The second example is from the *Washington Post*. Shortly after 9/11, they ran a story about the new FBI Command Center in Washington. It was a front-page story in, I believe, the Metro section, and in it, they ran a diagram of the facility. In very small print under the diagram, it said, "FBI Diagram." There was a small firestorm over that from readers who felt that the *Post* was giving terrorists a diagram of the FBI Command Center. Two weeks later, buried on page 23 of the editorial section of the *Post*, was an explanation from their ombudsman. The diagram was, indeed, an FBI diagram and was given to them by the FBI. In fact, the editors were so nervous about it that they went back to the FBI and said, "Are you sure we can run this thing?" The FBI said, "Absolutely. This does not involve anything that serious or that secret. We think the public has a right to know. Feel free to run it."

Again, we wondered, rather than explaining two weeks later in an ombudsman column on page 23 of the *Post*, what would have happened if they had taken a paragraph to explain what their little voice told them might be a problem in their original story so that when people were reading that story, they could judge for themselves what the news organization had done. It's an example of how transparency helps readers and viewers better understand a news story and, more important, understand the motives of the news organization. What we find, time after time, is that when these organizations do that, readers and viewers may not always or even often agree with them, but at least they understand them, and they say that they respect them for it.

The second big idea that we got from journalists was that journalists need to keep an open mind, not only about what they hear but about their ability to understand what they hear. You might call this humility. We call it open-mindedness. Don't assume, and avoid arrogance about your knowledge. We had a saying at CBS News that assumption was the mother of all screw-ups. It turned out to be true.

The third big idea we discovered in talking to journalists was originality. Most reporters we talked to say the place they got in trouble was the point at which they took stuff second-hand. You've probably heard or read about the consternation over the role news organizations play in election reporting. In fact, you were probably dismayed at the reporting of results before some of the polls around here are closed. Because that debate is now centered on questions of competitiveness and cost, we tend to forget – or perhaps people didn't know – why news organizations began independently tabulating election results in the first place. The reason was and is so that they don't have to get it second-hand.

Put another way, having an independent audit of the vote specifically reduces the chance of election fraud or vote-count manipulation. Never was this role of

watchdog and auditor more important than in the last presidential election. While you may not have agreed with the outcome or the ruling of the courts, you got to see and judge the process while journalists double-checked the math. This is an example of how these big ideas really do, in fact, relate to the real world.

But what about how the national media report news about the west. Let me suggest that as you talk to each other today, you consider the following questions: Is the issue more about getting the facts right or more about which facts the journalists choose when reporting western issues? How many of the issues you'll talk about today are really about values? What values are they? Who holds them? How might the national news media more appropriately report values and tension over conflicting values? Can you identify certain kinds of stories or reporting methods that are better than others in explaining values? What kinds of journalism help you form your opinions about people and issues? What values here are universally held? What values are not universally held but are nevertheless important here? What values or biases are appropriate for a national news organization to adopt when reporting regional issues? Are there values that local and regional news organizations embrace that would be inappropriate for national news organizations to reflect? To whom should news organizations be responsible? In other words, what should be their purpose or reason to exist? Whom do you serve. and what ultimately should your purpose be?

It strikes me that what you're really going to be talking about here today is values and process. I'm here to urge you not to get the two confused and to suggest that, as you talk today, you need to recognize bias for what it is and for what it is not. Getting the facts right isn't enough. The real challenge is to present the right facts. The question you must decide is what facts are appropriate for what constituencies. While you will agree on some values or facts, it is likely there will be many things, even among yourselves, on which you do not see eye to eye. You should be able to find some common ground in identifying some systematic yet realistic set of principles under which the news can be gathered, reported, and judged.

It's always interesting. I'm now able to travel around the country a fair amount and talk to a lot of journalists and a lot of citizens. It's true that many groups of people who gather at meetings around our country and, I'm sure, around the world simply want to make a difference by doing the right thing. We've talked to several thousand journalists over the past few years and asked them why they got into that line of work. Most often, they tell us it is to make a difference. I'm sure the same thing can be said for each of you.

When we ask journalists what the core of their purpose is, we get this answer almost universally and in almost these words: The purpose of journalism is to give citizens information they need to be free and to govern themselves. I would suspect that you could agree with that. So perhaps we can start this conversation by acknowledging that everyone here – journalists and non-journalists – cares deeply about your causes and about our democracy. Now all you have to do is figure everything else out, and you've got about six hours. Good luck.

Marc Johnson: Thank you, Wally. A great scene-setter for the conference today. Now to introduce the next two speakers on our agenda, it's my pleasure to introduce the Senior Fellow at the Andrus Center for Public Policy, a professor of political science at Boise State University, an experienced practitioner of environmental and natural resource politics in the west, a widely-published and respected author, and a good friend, Dr. John Freemuth.

John Freemuth: At the end of this, Rocky Barker, a Visiting Fellow at the Andrus Center, and I will prepare a white paper on this conference, some kind of resource kit for journalists as they come to the west on what we heard today, and some thoughts about how to better cover the west. You can look forward to getting that down the line as well.

One final point to consider when you write your questions: we're interested in questions about the role of the media. We're not interested today in having a public policy debate over prescribed burns or grazing on public lands. We want to talk about media coverage and how that affects public policy, so try to remember that in your questions.

It's my pleasure to turn to our next speaker, Conrad Smith. If you look in your program, you'll see biographies of everyone here, but I'd like to read his. He is a professor of journalism at the University of Wyoming, author of Media and Apocalypse, a study of how news organizations reported on the 1988 fires at Yellowstone National Park, the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska, and the 1989 Loma Pieta earthquake near San Francisco. He taught journalism at Idaho State University, Colorado State University, and Ohio State University before assuming his present position. In his 1984 documentary, "Against the Flow of Time," regarding efforts to establish a national recreation area in Hells Canyon, he interviewed, among others, Governor Andrus and Senators Church, Hatfield, and McClure. It was broadcast by 17 television stations in the northwest. He serves on the faculty of the Forest Service's National Advanced Resource Technology Center

in Arizona where he teaches federal land managers how to interract with the media. With that, I'll turn the mike over the Conrad Smith.

Conrad Smith: On this tape is a story that is the reason for the title of my talk, "Cowboys and Cattle Rustling in the 21st Century." That's my stereotype about how journalists not from the west report stories about the west. This is a story that characterizes the essence of what I see is the primary difficulty with journalists from urban areas reporting rural issues. My students from Wyoming, when I show them this tape, howl. They've told me that when they go out of state, people ask them if they ride a horse to class. People ask them if there is electricity in Wyoming.

Let me start the tape and hope the technology works.

FILM CLIP:

Narrator (Tom Brokaw)**:** For all the changes that have come to the American West, some things never change. Take cattle-rustling. It's still a problem, a big problem, and the solution? Well, in one corner of Wyoming, that hasn't changed either. Some ranchers have hired a fast gun. Not just any hired gun. This man is a modern legend, and Douglas Keiker has the story tonight.

2nd Narrator (Douglas Keiker)**:** Sweetwater, Wyoming. Butch Cassidy country. Cattle country. Ed Cantrell country.

1st Interviewee: We need to stop the cattle rustling that's going on. It's getting professional. Since Ed got in with us, it has declined quite a bit. It's a definite deterrent. He does have a fast gun, yes,

2nd Interviewee: I wouldn't want to have him catch me out in the middle of nowhere, I'll tell you that.

Keiker: Ed Cantrell. A deputy sheriff by title. By reputation, a hired gun.

Ed Cantrell: I can't remember ever backing off anything. I've shot two people here in Sweetwater County.

Keiker: A 56-year-old marksman who practices every day, hired by the cattlemen of Sweetwater County to stop cattle rustling. That's right, cattle rustling. Just like in the movies. Except in the movies, the rancher and the rustlers did not have interstate highways and tractor-trailers, which makes stealing cattle a bigger business today than it ever was. There are no precise figure, but rustling is a million-dollar problem.

Rancher Stan Jolly: After you lose $20,000 or $30,000 worth of cattle, you get mad.

Ed Cantrell: We do have suspects this time, some people right in the area that got a license number of a vehicle. I would think that the theft of livestock would be one of the easiest thefts to commit. The chance of being caught are remote. The quick transportation of horses and livestock benefit the legitimate rancher but also benefit the rustler. If I were in the rustling business, I would utilize the interstate. I think you could move the 82nd Airborne in here, and it wouldn't stop.

Keiker: One of the ranchers swore that Cantrell would catch every one of those cattle thieves. Well, he can't. Cattle rustling is simply too easy, too prevalent.

Cantrell: If a guy wants it, it's there.

Small-time rustler (caught for stealing one cow)**:** It's so easy; you're out in the middle of nowhere. The people don't live out there with the cattle. There are so many acres of cattle.

Roger Allen Marlowe (a big-time rustler who rustled cattle in five states)**:** You can make a quarter or half million dollars. I think it's a matter of picking the right place, knowing what kind of place you're looking for, no houses around, back to the main highway without running into anybody, getting on the Interstate and going home.

Keiker: Is there any way they can stop rustling?

Marlowe: No.

Keiker: Is there any way to cut down on it?

Marlowe: Might start hanging them again.

Keiker: Ed Cantrell. One man trying to patrol 10,000 square miles of southwestern Wyoming.

Cantrell: One tired skinny little man. The odds are in their favor.

Keiker: A 19th Century man against a 20th Century interstate highway. NBC News, Sweetwater County, Wyoming.

Conrad Smith: Well, you reacted the same way my students did. So what's going on here. A friend of mine, Jim Angell, AP reporter out of Cheyenne, now Executive Director of Wyoming Press Association, said that when he was with AP, what New York always wanted in his stories was "stuff from the west."

I did a study for this conference about how the media reported on the Bush forest-thinning plan, which

died in Congress in October. I'll talk about that later, but I want to set the tone by talking about the problem you have if you're in New York City and you come to a rural place to report a story. You have a different mindset, and I don't think "bias" is the word to be applied to journalism. I think all of us live with our stereotypes. What's the stereotype about California?

Let's talk about an event I paid a lot of attention to, and there are some people in this room that are heavily immersed in it. That is how the media reported the Yellowstone wildfire of 1988. I think that journalists have learned a lot since 1988 about the rural issue of wildfire. I live in the Denver media market, and the journalists there are much more knowledgeable about wildfire than they were in 1988. This clip shows how journalists reported wildfire in 1988.

> **Tom Brokaw:** "Old Faithful at Yellowstone, one of the most popular tourist attractions in our oldest national park, is under siege tonight. There are a lot of angry people who believe that the National Park Service is responsible and has let the fires burn too freely for too long. This is what's left of Yellowstone tonight. No one argues that it will take decades to fix, but already the process has started."

I think the national media reporters who came to Yellowstone in 1988 had a mindset: a house fire on Long Island. If the house fire on Long Island was still burning after a month, you'd begin to wonder about the competence of the fire department. That's the public scrutiny you heard about earlier. Why aren't they putting those fires out?

Since then, I was really impressed when I looked at all the stories about the Bush forest-thinning plan. Almost every reporter now adopts what I think is the scientific view. The problem with wildfires in the west is that wildfires in the past have been suppressed too aggressively and too successfully, and there is an awful lot of dead stuff there that would have burned in smaller fires. Now since it's been dead and dry and accumulating for half a century since World War II, it's making huge fires. So it's been quite a high learning curve since then.

What about this problem of being from an urban area and coming to a rural area? Boise is a big city by Wyoming standards and has three times the population of any city in Wyoming. Compared to media centers – and most are in Manhattan – it is tiny. The mindset that's appropriate to report stories in D.C. or New York or even Seattle doesn't really work when you're in a rural area.

Bill Greenwood is a good D.C.-based reporter for ABC. He did a story in 1988 about how the Yellowstone fires had cost the timber industry millions of dollars. That, in itself, is quite a story: logging in a national park. Bill Greenwood missed that one. The point I'm trying to make is that a reporter who may be very good on his or her beat can be completely out of place and get the context all wrong when they are out of that beat.

There is a myth in journalism that anybody can become an expert on anything quickly. It's not true. The reason for that myth is that journalism has to make a profit, and it's efficient to have general assignment reporters cover anything. Some stories are pretty straightforward, but some stories that affect public policies in the west are complex. You need to have some specialization to cover them. The reporter who did the best job with the Yellowstone fires is in the room, Bob Ekey.

Bob was working for the *Billings Gazette*. I suspect that the salary he made there was a little smaller than the people from ABC and the *New York Times* were getting. He knew the turf because he was reporting out of Bozeman, and he'd been reporting on issues connected with Yellowstone Park for years. He knew the turf. *The New York Times* did a good job in September when it sent its national reporter out to look at the fires, but it did a horrible job at first and used stringers from other areas. The local reporters knew the turf, and they did a good job of covering the story. The reporters from outside sometimes failed. For example, the story about the supposed "let burn" policy of the National Park Service. There were 10,000 fire fighters on the scene, and the fire had been fought aggressively for seven weeks by then. For whatever reason, most of the national media didn't know that.

Another issue I want to talk about is their sources. If I'm Bill Greenwood and I'm in D.C., I have established a lot of sources in Congress, and I can get some really good information. But if I'm Bill Greenwood with a lot of good sources in D.C. and I fly into Bozeman and drive down to Yellowstone Park, I don't have that network anymore. I have to start from scratch.

I may never have heard of the wildfire lab in Missoula, Montana, the center of research on wildfire. Not a single reporter covering the Yellowstone fires in 1988 ever mentioned that lab. I think that some of you from the west can address this. The forest fire lab in Missoula does not have one single public relations person. Is there anyone here from the fire science lab? No? I guess it hasn't changed.

There is a mindset in federal land agencies that the less you deal with journalists, the better. I think that's unfortunate. Reporters, when they are outside their

normal beats, are going to find whatever sources they can. If I'm staying in a motel in Cook City, Montana, the people most accessible to me are going to be those in the community who are really, really upset about that fire coming toward the town. I'm going to hear what they say, and I'm not going to know anything about the fire science lab in Missoula.

In all the stories I read about the Bush forest-thinning plan, only two reporters talked to anyone in this laboratory, which does more research about fire in the urban interface than any other lab in the country. When a journalist is outside his normal beat, he has to start from scratch finding sources. The sources you are going to find are the ones that are easy to find. Federal land agencies have more of an ostrich attitude than a pro-active attitude about meeting with the media. The culture is: Let's just deal with facts.

The two problems that occur when reporters from national news organizations come to the west is, one, they are outside their normal beat and their normal knowledge. No matter how intelligent or resourceful they are, they are starting from scratch. The other problem is that a lot of the sources that would be most useful to them in giving the context of the story and giving them the relevant information often are hard to find and not very good at making themselves available.

I'd like to show the first slide. I live in Laramie, Wyoming, and one of our students at the university was killed by a couple of thugs whose hobby was beating people up. He was gay, and the national media really latched onto that. This characterizes the mindset problem. The AP reporter in Cheyenne talked about how this victim, Matthew Shepard, was tied to a ranch-style fence, but the editors in New York didn't like that. They took out the "style" and made it a ranch fence. There it is on the cover of *Time* magazine. Actually, it's not a fence at all; it's a barricade across a road. That mindset of the 19th Century West really permeated that coverage.

It's interesting to see the national media come in and to see how different their perception is of the place you live in from your perception. The newspapers described this as "a ranch fence on a remote windblown bluff." They made it sound as though it was in the middle of nowhere, and that maybe there was some cattle off there someplace. Actually, it's a barricade across a road in a subdivision to keep people out of an area where a big fancy new house was being built.

When the national media people came to report it, they had this mindset, so they picked the camera angle that made it look like a ranch fence. They called it a "deer fence." Actually, it's a buck fence, and they thought "buck" meant "deer." I wrote a letter to *Time* magazine about that, and they said they stood by the story and had it on good authority that it was a deer fence. I suggested a deer would have to be pretty near-sighted not to walk around a 40-foot barricade. This is the view the national media used to make it look like the 19th Century west, as though perhaps John Wayne would come through shortly on a stagecoach.

My next slide is the same exact thing from another angle. There is the top of it; in the background is Interstate 80, the main highway between New York and San Francisco. There are houses all around. There are only a few angles from which you can photograph that thing where it doesn't look like it's in a subdivision, which it is. I don't think it's a deliberate bias; it's the mind set. If I've been raised on the east coast and have seen movies about cattle rustling, I see what I expect to see.

We had an AP reporter come to the campus of the University of Wyoming and write about the students driving sports cars and strolling along oak-shaded sidewalks beside ivy-covered building. That's what this reporter saw. I checked with the Botany Department, and oak and ivy cannot grow at 7200 feet in Laramie, Wyoming. But you have this mindset. We all need these stereotypes to make sense of what we see. It's not bias.

When I whined to my friend from the *Atlanta Constitution* about the media reports on this case, she had no sympathy at all because when reporters come to the south, they expect to see African-Americans lynched from every tree. We all have these mindsets. It's the greatest challenge to journalists outside of their home beats.

This tape shows what NBC did with that little barricade in the subdivision.

NBC TAPE:

"From Studio 3B in New York, here is Katie Couric.

Katie Couric: It's being called a "hate crime" by police, but those two words don't begin to convey the horror felt all across the nation when Matthew Shepard was murdered last October. A gay college student, he was brutally beaten and left to die. Tonight, in an exclusive interview, Matthew's parents speak out. While prosecutors have asked them not to discuss the upcoming trials of the accused murderers, the Shepards have agreed to share some very private and painful thoughts about the tragic loss of their son.

Mrs. Shepard: It's a very frightening concept as a parent when your son becomes a martyr and a public figure for the world. He's just our son.

Couric: Four months ago tomorrow, a 21-year-old freshman at the University of Wyoming was lured

to this place, tied to this fence, and beaten into unconsciousness. The symbolism was plain, and while the analogy to Christ on the cross was an obvious one, it was also simplistic. Matthew Shepherd may become a symbol for gay rights."

Conrad Smith: Comparing a fence in a subdivision to Christ on the cross seems like a stretch to me. If you're a journalist, you have to select which facts to cover. When you are in your home turf, you probably pick the same facts that any intelligent reader would pick, When you're outside your home turf, you pick the facts that you notice. If I've been brought up on John Wayne movies, I'm going to notice the John Wayne facts. I'm sure I do the same thing. We all do it. You couldn't deal with the glut of information if you didn't put it into categories.

So what do we notice? I bet none of you noticed the air vents in this room. They're there. What we notice is determined by our expectations, by our knowledge, by our culture, etc. The west is culturally different from the east. Rural areas are culturally different from urban areas. This is always a problem when you're dealing with how the west is reported.

I'll spend the rest of my time talking about the national coverage of the Bush forest-thinning proposal. It was about 95,000 words. I got on databases and looked for stories about forest policy in the west. Many of you are involved with forest policy in the west. I found about 75 stories and about 33 opinion pieces, some of them columns, some of them editorials. I looked at three news organizations on the east coast, three in the Rocky Mountain West, three on the west coast, USA Today, the three television newscasts, CNN, and National Public Radio.

It was really very interesting. The thing I found that most pleasantly surprised me is how much more reporters know now about wildfire than they did in 1988. Most reporters on wildfire are really pretty knowledgeable about the issue. That was definitely not true in 1988. It's been a big story, and there have been a number of big fires since 1988, and a number of reporters over time have really come up to speed on the issues surrounding wildfires. That was very heartening.

In a conference called "Dateline: The West," you might be interested to know that most of the datelines were from the east. D.C. is by far the most frequently-used dateline in stories about the Bush forest-thinning proposal.

This brings me to another challenge for journalists. It was treated, almost universally, as a political story. Of course it is a political story, but it was usually treated as only a political story. It was usually written about by reporters who cover politics and the president. So it was cast in terms of politics. You have two sides: those in power and the loyal opposition. In the Bush Administration, the loyal opposition was the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society and other environmental advocacy groups.

My coverage starts early in June. The fire season was big, and the first big fire was 100 miles south of where I live, near Denver, the biggest fire in Colorado's history. That fire brought a lot of attention to how wildfire is destroying houses that people are building with fuel and in fuel. There are something like 7 million or 10 million houses made of wood in forests that traditionally burn. It would be nice to have a prescribed fire, but those houses are in the way, so you can't use the techniques that worked naturally 100 years ago.

In any case, the stories in early June started talking about policies to deal with forest fires, wildfires that are burning down houses in the so-called "urban interface." That's not really the right term since people are trying to get away from the urban areas when they build those homes. The stories talked about the national fire plan, and there's a story there. Lyle Laverty lasted about ten minutes in charge of that plan in Washington, D.C. No journalist has covered that, and I'm really curious why that happened.

The National Fire Plan proposed spending billions of dollars to thin forests to reduce wildfire risk in the urban interface. Initially, thinning was covered as a good thing. It was framed as a positive effort to reduce wildfire risk for people who live in the forest or on the forest fringes. The coverage was pretty much along those lines. There were references now and then that some of the western senators were suggesting a new policy that might use different techniques, but initially, forest-thinning was going to be by the federal land agencies. There was a little opposition. The environmental advocacy groups were nervous that it would be used as an excuse to log, but initially it was covered quite favorably.

Then on August 21st, reporters learned that President Bush was going to fly to Oregon to announce his forest-thinning initiative. It was going to involve timber companies. Well, if I'm a Sierra Club person and you say "timber company," I'm like Pavlov's dog; I salivate. Indeed, the stories were all framed as the Bush Administration in power and the environmental advocacy movement as the loyal opposition, and there were two sides to the story. One was that we're going to let the logging companies do this because otherwise it will take forever. We'll reward them by letting them keep a few of the trees. The other side was saying, "Oh no you're not. You're going to go in there and log all the big trees, way out in the woods far from these houses that might burn down, and you're just pretending." It

was called a Trojan Horse in some of the stories.

Immediately, the framing of how the issue was covered changed completely. The variety of sources in the early stories was all over the place. It included scientists, Forest Service people, and a wide range. But after August 21, when it was made public what the plan was, it shifted. Almost all the sources after that were: He said; she said; Bush Administration says; Sierra Club says; bio-diversity says; Wilderness Society says. It was really astonishing how totally the focus of all the stories changed as soon as the details of Bush's policy became known.

To me, the policy made some kind of sense. It would take forever to thin those trees if the land agencies did it, so letting timber companies do it maybe makes sense. But it was treated as though the whole plan was just an excuse to go log all the big old trees. From then on, virtually all the coverage framed it as a sneaky commercial handout. Indeed, I suspect, after reading all those stories, that all efforts to pass a bill, even a compromise bill, failed. The editorials before August 21 were either neutral or kind of supportive of the idea. After August 21 when Bush made his announcement, virtually all the editorials were strongly opposed. One of the newspapers called it "a big lie." One called it a Trojan Horse.

There were a few op ed pieces by Gail Norton. She was not one who opposed the plan. Some journalists call her the"Stepford Secretary" because of her skill at talking without saying anything. Cecil Andrus was a much better Secretary. He was called the "most effective and least pretentious" of Carter's cabinet.

Most of the stories in that period right after the Bush announcement gave no real information to help me sort out these claims and counterclaims. In the rush of daily journalism, that's probably all you can do: give two different views, the two ends of the continuum of opinion. After reading all those stories, I still don't know how to evaluate the two sides. I'm a member of the Sierra Club, and sometimes I wish I weren't. Even as a member of the Sierra Club, I still don't know whether the Bush forest-thinning plan would be a pretty good idea or a pretty bad idea. The stories gave me no information about how to evaluate the merit of those two claims.

This is what I would like to see in my ideal journalism. Most good journalists are motivated by a desire to change things for the better and to expose corruption.

I said that there are only two sources from the forest fire sciences lab. Jack Cohen, whom I know, and I know he's done a lot of research. His research suggests, for example, that the most effective thing is to thin the vegetation right around the homes, which a lot of homeowners in Colorado don't want to do and which the zoning laws don't require them to do. I would like to have seen more scientists evaluating what it's going to take to reduce this wildfire risk. That was almost never in the stories. It was a political story, covered by political reporters, and it was covered as the game of politics, the two sides, like a baseball game. The one thing I would like to have seen is more science. There was only one reporter who had a science background. It is a political story, but I'd like to see some of the reporters talk about what it's going to take to keep those homes in the woods from burning down. That's what was missing.

…and that's the end of my speech.

Cecil Andrus: Two of our distinguished guests have arrived and have been sitting in the back of the room for some time. I'd like to have Peter Jennings and his wife, Kayce Freed, join us in the front row. He will be introduced later this afternoon, but I won't do that now. Ladies and gentleman, this man is known to hundreds of millions of people throughout the world, and they have consented to join us today. Peter and Kayce, please join us.

A comment Mr. Jennings just made to me was," I'm sorry you invited me up front. Reporters like to sit in the back row." But, you are no longer a person who sits in the back row as a reporter. We're delighted to have you and your lovely wife here.

John Freemuth: I would mention that we were quick-thinking enough to put the Canadian flag here on the stage.

Before I introduce Jacob, just a couple of things. If the reporters in the room are interested in what he's talking about in regard to forest-thinning, I think he's right on point when he suggests "Talk to the scientists." A lot of it has to do with how big the trees are supposed to be that we're going to cut.

An example of this bias that I've seen as an academic is reflected in a study of fire policy by the Academy of Public Administration. The Academy is made up of academics and a lot of practitioners in government. The academics were represented by a couple of professors, and the one from the furthest west was from Indiana. No academic from the west – and there are many good ones – was invited to be on that panel.

Finally, we have someone in our audience who is participating this afternoon and who probably winced a little when he saw the Yellowstone fire videos again. You might want to visit with him when you get a chance. That's Bob Barbee, who, unfortunately, had to take all the heat as superintendent of Yellowstone when the fire happened. He might have some things to say about how the park looks today.

Now it's my pleasure to introduce our third speaker, Jacob Bendix, who is an Associate Professor of Geography at the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, a school most people think is the number one public administration program in the United States. He is a senior research associate in the Maxwell School of Environmental Policy and an adjunct Associate Professor of earth sciences. He is a native of the west coast, graduated from the University of California, worked as a Forest Service firefighter in California before earning graduate degrees at the Universities of Wisconsin and Georgia.

The research he will discuss regarding coverage of northwest forest issues was conducted jointly with Dr. Carol Liebler, Chair of the Department of Communication at the Newhouse School of Public Communication at Syracuse University.

Jacob Bendix: Thank you, John. Well, the problem with coming up here after the first two speakers is that they took all the good stuff. They made many of the points that I had in mind. I will say, though, that Walter Dean mentioned arriving here from Washington, D.C. where they got six inches of snow. I flew here last night from Syracuse, New York where, I have to say, we are not impressed by six inches of snow.

Well, many of you will remember that in the summer of 1989 when the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed listing the northern spotted owl as a threatened species, all heck broke lose. I think arguably through the early 90s, in the conflict over protection of the northern spotted owl, reduction of logging constituted the most visible environmental story out of the west to the rest of the country. As such, it provides an opportunity to look at how the national media cover environmental issues in the west. I will talk this morning about some of that coverage and comment a bit on my sense of what we can learn from it.

Walter Dean mentioned that we owe our audiences full disclosure, and I should probably start by admitting that my perspective may be somewhat idiosyncratic. I feel a little bit out of place here. I am not a journalist; I am not a mass communication scholar; I am not a policy-maker. I am a scientist. Most of my research is bio-geographic, fuel-based studies about the impacts of disturbances like floods and fires on western vegetation.

Several years ago, I found that I was complaining a lot about news reports on western environmental issues. To me, environmental issues have two parts. There are scientific facts, and there are policy arguments. The facts define the constraints within which policy can operate.

Now I want to be clear. There is no way that science can answer policy questions. Policy has to be determined on the basis of values that we as a society collectively determine. But neither can we make good policy without knowing the facts that constrain what can actually be done. I suppose I wasn't happy with how the science was coming through.

It occurred to me that, as a scientist, I was perhaps obligated to care about how the science comes through in the news, and as a scientist, I probably shouldn't just go on my anecdotal impressions but should try to systematically see what actually goes on. So for more than a decade, I have been, when time allowed, trying to look at media coverage of various environmental issues. As John mentioned, I have been doing that work with Professor Liebler over in the Newhouse School. So that's where I'm coming from.

I will talk a bit about what I see as some common beliefs about news coverage of the west. I am going to talk probably not as eloquently as Walter Dean did about bias and framing. I will talk some about television and newspaper coverage of the spotted owl issue, and then I will give you some of my sense of where all that leads us.

It will not come as a news flash that there are a lot of critics of mainstream news coverage of western resource issues. Environmentalists will complain that the corporate news media are part of the overall business establishment and are simply utterly unsympathetic to the environment. People involved in extractive activities in the west will argue that the news media are essentially a liberal institution and that most reporters are tree-huggers or, if not, then close to it.

If you spend much time in the rural west – and you got a sense of this from some of Conrad's remarks – there is a real us-and-them, here-and-there sense to it. A lot of people believe that media folk from "outside" are pretty clueless. They don't really know what is going on. They don't really have to understand or emphathize with the impact of environmental issues on western rural communities.

Myron Rothbart got to that some thirty years ago when he talked about a "liberal distance function." It's easier to be liberal about an issue when you live distant from the place where the impacts are actually going to be felt. I'm not necessarily saying that's true; I'm saying that it does, I think, reflect how a lot of rural westerners do feel about the media.

We started out this morning with some mention of bias and what bias is. It seems to me that when people argue that reporting is biased, what they are really saying is that they do not agree with the frames that are used. There is an awful lot of academic gobbledegook that is very sophisticated about framing. To me, it

pretty much boils down to this: Frames are the characteristics of news that tend to convey a dominant meaning. So things like the information that's presented, the quotes that are used or omitted, the sources that are used, how those sources are presented, the interpretive remarks that are made or spoken – these comprise the frame.

Each side of the dispute would like to see a frame that emphasizes the aspects of that story that support their view. So when it comes to the northern spotted owl issue, there was a variety of themes that were in accord with the pro-cut frame of things. The first of those – the obvious one – was job losses. We often saw this phrase: "jobs vs. owls." If logging were restricted to protect owl habitat, many people would lose their jobs. There were others: loss of tax revenue. If there was less logging, a lot of tax revenue going to support local communities would be lost.

Another was potential price increases if fewer trees were being cut. Another was loss of a traditional way of life in rural logging-dependent communities. There were arguments that the northern spotted owl was not, in fact, limited to old-growth forests but could survive elsewhere, so it might not be necessary to protect those forests. There were even some arguments that perhaps this was not truly a distinct species but was closely enough related to other spotted owl species that it did not merit protection under the Endangered Species Act.

Now on the other hand, themes contributing to the pro-save frame included the idea of the northern spotted owl as an indicator species. It's not just about the owl. It's the fact that this species' survival tells about the overall health of this ecosystem. There was much talk of ancient forests, a term that gives me, as a scientist, not the foggiest idea of its meaning, but it seems very impressive and evocative to people. There was talk about trees that were old when Christ was born and that it would be a sacrilege to cut these down.

There was a reassertion that the old-growth type of forest was, in fact, vital to the owl's survival and therefore required under the Endangered Species Act. There was a discussion of job losses due to whole log exports. The assertion was, yes, there may be jobs getting lost, but it's not necessarily because of owl protection. There are other things going on; it's more complicated than that. A variety of other environmental impacts of logging were described that could be avoided by protection of the old-growth forests.

Now we did two studies of news coverage to see which of these frames were, in fact, actually coming through. The first of these was a study of network television news. We looked at all of the newscasts on the three broadcast networks that were aired during a four-year period, 1989 to 1993. We also looked at newspaper coverage during five years, all of the stories that appeared in ten major daily newspapers around the country.

I am not going to bore you with all the details of what we did and what we found. There are published journal articles about these studies if you're interested. I do, however, want to highlight some aspects of them that are relevant.

For example, in the television stories, much of the frame that comes through is based on the news sources: the people who are talking on camera and the views that they express. It's pretty clear, looking at this table [on a slide] that, as far as the views heard on the newscast, the frame matched up better with the pro-cut view than with the pro-save view. Why is that? It's because of who the sources were. It's because of who was being interviewed. A strong plurality of the sources either worked in the timber industry or specifically as timber industry lobbyists, 35% of the sources on NBC to 48% on ABC.

On the other hand, the numbers of people from environmental groups who were interviewed ranged from 11% on CBS to 26% on ABC. There is a logic to this; it makes sense when you think about the news story as being a conflict between, in a sense, owls and loggers. You can't interview owls. You can interview loggers. They're there; they obviously have a direct interest in this; they are logical people to talk to. When you talk to the logical people, you can expect the views that you're going to get. They're worried about losing their jobs, and they're going to have a distinct point of view.

Interestingly, although most of the area in dispute was Forest Service land, there were very few appearances by anyone from the Forest Service in these stories. I think there was a total of four in the 46 stories that appeared during those years. No independent researchers, by the way. A couple of Forest Service biologists, but outside of that, no scientific researchers.

Now the frame of a news story is not just affected by who talks but by what sense we have of the people who are talking in terms of their expertise. How seriously should we take their views? When we looked at these news stories, out of 80 some sources, about 34 were identified as being "expert" in some way to talk about economic impacts or specifics of forestry, etc. They were all presented pretty equally, that is to say so-and-so is an expert with the Forest Service or from the Wilderness Society or what-have-you. No specifics as to their qualifications. They made them experts.

We were kind of curious about this, so we tried to contact all the people who had been identified as expert sources in these stories. Out of the 34, we were able to reach 22, and 20 of them were willing to send

us their resumes so we could read those and determine how expert they were. It was interesting. There was quite a bit of variation. Most sources did have college degrees in the appropriate fields, but all of those who had advanced degrees and certainly all of those who had done any research themselves and published it on forestry or owls were either from environmental groups (Maybe on campus we're just creating a bunch of pointy-head environmentalists, I don't know, but that's where they were.) or, in one or two instances, Forest Service biologists whose views were in support of the pro-save side.

If all of the more qualified or more expert sources were on one side and that's not identified in the stories, that, in another way, affects the frame. It's changing the impact of the story because we don't have the input as an audience of comparing and evaluating the sources.

We also looked at the reporter wrap-up, the concluding remarks at the end of the reported packages. These provide, we think, a lot of the frame in that they do give the last word on the story and, to the extent that they refer back to earlier parts of the story, they serve to give those elements particular prominence. Just to give you some examples, there is one [slide] that fits right in with the pro-save frame and could have come straight from the Wilderness Society. Out of 25 reporter packages, which therefore had that sort of a wrap-up, three fit the pro-save frame. Here is one [slide] on the pro-cut side and could have come from any of the timber lobbyists. There were 12 of those. The remaining ten were neutral.

In summarizing the television coverage, most sources were from occupations that tended to favor the pro-cut frame. Researchers were ignored unless they were from advocacy groups or government agencies, which ties back in with what Conrad was saying. The pro-cut frame – not due to bias but because it was much more concise and straightforward – was much more likely to appear in the reporter wrap-ups.

Quickly, we did also look at newspaper coverage in another study. We looked at ten newspapers around the country with slightly different emphasis because we wanted to see how distance from the west affected coverage. You'll note that the intermountain west is blank on that map. Also the usual suspects – the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times* – are not represented because we were trying to control for newspaper size. We limited to a range of 300,000 to 600,000 circulation.

As you might expect, there were many more stories right in the affected area in the Pacific Northwest. Fewer elsewhere. Interestingly though, physical distance was not apparently the cause of that. The primary cause of that, we found after looking at different social and economic connections, was timber employment in the communities in which newspapers were publishing and commercial connection with the Pacific Northwest, which we measured by looking at the flow of Federal Express traffic between cities. Those were actually better predictors.

We developed a pretty simple mathematical index showing the balance between pro-cut and pro-save sources, a positive number indicates that, on average, a newspaper had more pro-cut sources; a negative indicated they had fewer. There is some spatial variance certainly, but none of the variables we thought might explain that variance turned out to hold water. On average, the newspapers were pretty similar.

We looked at themes that fit in with the different frames, and here it is interesting to note that there are no negative numbers. Everything is, on balance, more pro-cut in terms of the themes that appeared. I think that probably reflects the appeal of that jobs-vs-owls idea.

In summary, there is variation in amount, and there is a variety of reasons for that. The themes discussed were more in line with the pro-cut than the pro-save view. The frames favored are not different outside the west. That idea of outsiders not having the same perspective did not hold up at all in our study. I do think there are some aspects of how we looked at this that could account for that. We could talk about that later if people are interested.

Where does this take us? First of all, where is the bias? The numbers that I've shown you would suggest, contrary to a lot of people's expectations, that if there is a bias, it is in favor of the pro-cut side. I don't believe, after watching those stories and reading the newspaper articles, that there are reporters or editors out there saying, "This side is right; let's write stories to favor them." I think what's happening is that you have a communication dynamic in which it is much easier to communicate a simple idea than a complex one, and the pro-cut side had an idea that was very straightforward and easy to communicate. Whether it was right or wrong, it was straightforward. If you set aside these forests to protect these owls, a lot of people are going to lose their jobs. It all came down to jobs-vs-owls. It was pretty hard to see a story that did not have that idea prominently in it.

The environmentalists had a much more complex argument that they wanted to make, talking about both ecological and economic complexity. It's hard to do that quickly, and it's hard to do that in a way that will slip easily into a news story, especially on television where time is precious.

Where were the experts? So much of this dispute was about what actually was going on in the forests. What did owls need? How threatened were they? How many acres of forest did they need to protect them? All those sorts of things. An enormous amount of research was being done through the 90s on that topic, and the researchers were almost invisible. I have to say that there were exceptions. Particularly the newspapers in the Pacific Northwest had some long and detailed articles. For the most part, however, it was hard to see the people who actually were trying to provide the facts as background.

A picture is worth a thousand lies. This [slide] gets into the issue of visuals, especially in television. There is no time to go into that. I have that picture on the screen, and I like it because when I show it to people, they tend to say, "That is a beautiful natural scene." I took it out of a Forest Service general technical report. It is a clear-cut that had been treated for three consecutive years with herbicides, which is not most people's image of a beautiful natural scene. Do not read too much into the pictures that we see.

The dilemma of scientists as source. We have this idea that scientists should be neutral. They should be these objective arbiters. Just the facts. That will give us the facts we need to make the right decisions. The dilemma from the scientist's perspective – and this may be why many of them are shy to come forward as news sources – is that you do research to see where it leads and perhaps give guidance to policy. But once you come up with your result – whether it's to say, "You need to save everything to save those owls," or whether it's to say, "Owls can reproduce in suburban subdivisions; go ahead, cut everything down," – if you go out and say it, you are no longer objective. You are no longer in the ivory tower. Now you are an advocate. If you appear on television, that little white script across your chest is going to say "environmentalist." So there is a catch-22 there.

I was going to conclude with a discussion of a current example that Conrad scooped me on: the Bush forest-thinning policy. I would just mention as one example, getting back to this idea of scientists not being sourced, that a group of scientists back in the fall of September or October wrote a letter to the President and to all the members of Congress, saying, "We are concerned that this plan represents an ecological over-simplification. You cannot assume, even though a century of fire suppression has led to too much fuel accumulation in much of the west, that this applies everywhere. There is enormous ecological diversity. What works in one place will not work in another."

Some of the top scientists studying fire on this continent signed that letter: Bill Baker down at Wyoming, Bill Romme at Colorado State, Tom Swetnam at Arizona, the list goes on, and there were 20 people who signed it. No mention on television. I have been able to find one article in the *Denver Post* that mentioned this and a passing reference in one *New York Times* article. There is more that could be said about that, but I have already overstayed my time.

John Freemuth: Thank you, Jacob. I think our three speakers have given us a lot of food for thought. Martha Hahn and Cyd Weiland are in the back of the room. If you have a question, please write it on the question card and give it to one of them. After we return from a break, we will then spend until noon with you and your questions. We will bring our three panelists back. I'll take a mike and go into the crowd for some nice give-and-take with our three presenters. Thank you.

[Continued after break.]

Cecil Andrus: Come right on in, ladies and gentlemen. We want to have the opportunity to visit with our three guests. Share with them your questions. Please get yourselves seated.

Freemuth: I have a bunch of questions, and we won't get to them all. We want to break right at noon to get everyone ready for lunch and the wonderful luncheon speech. I'll read a few of these and perhaps try to take some from the audience if I can.

First question: It concerns some people's perception of a new media. Do we have a problem of the new "right-wing" media, such as Fox and the *Washington Times* approaching issues of natural resources. Has this changed how you study it? Research results? Coverage? Any thoughts on the non-liberal bias in media?

Conrad Smith: Considering how few people get their news from Fox compared to other sources, I'm not inclined to worry.

Walter Dean: If this is supposed to be a marketplace of ideas with a broad variety of ideas from a broad variety sources, that, in theory, should be a good thing, not a bad thing. I think the objection to Fox is that they say they are something, and many people see them to be something else.

Jacob Bendix: I confess that I don't spend enough time watching Fox to legitimately hazard an opinion about it.

John Freemuth: Well, we've dismissed that one. I know in the audience there are many federal and state

public affairs officers who are the interface with the media. I've seen many questions here from them about suggestions you might have on how they can do their job better in working with media to tell the story they are trying to tell without having it reduced to a different story or to a sound bite.

Walter Dean: Let me set the scene this way. At the Project for Excellence in Journalism, we just completed the fifth year of our annual television news project. Over five years, we've studied about 35,000 stories from 150 television stations throughout the country. Five years ago, the average local television reporter did 1.4 stories a day. This year, the average local television reporter does 1.8 stories a day. That is what you're working against in local television, the fact that the stations have added so many broadcasts and, because of the economy and the depressed revenue from advertising, have cut back staffs. They are going through the motions of churning out a lot of material to fill broadcasts without allowing reporters to do very much of anything in the way of research. I would suggest that you have to do the reporter's job for them. That means research and basically putting everything in their hands, doing the kinds of research that they should have to do.

A little bit of that is also true with the broadcast networks and some print publications who, for budgetary reasons, have had to cut back. CBS used to have Bob McNamara in Denver. The Denver Bureau is no longer, and he is now in Dallas. The cutbacks in domestic bureaus among the networks have been significant, and they are now concentrated in these media centers: Washington, New York, a few people in Los Angeles, etc. So, regrettably, you have to do their work for them.

Conrad Smith: If you can help a journalist do his or her job by making information into a story, you're going to be able to tell them just about anything. My other comment is that, on the local level, you need to establish relationships. If you have a relationship and invite him out to a controlled burn, you will be the first person that journalist calls up on the phone when he or she has some question about a bigger issue. So build a relationship, and make it into a story.

Jacob Bendix: If the message you're trying to get across has scientific components, science tends to be fuzzy and messy. My perspective is probably similar for me when I'm teaching a freshman science class. The more you can do to reduce your message to essential components that are easily communicated, the more likely it is that it might get through ungarbled.

John Freemuth: For Mr. Dean and for everyone, what is the bias against comprehensive stories long enough to inform the public vs. the bottom line realities?

Walter Dean: The bias of media owners or newsroom managers or broadcast managers is that citizens don't care about important news. In our research, we have found that, in fact, citizens do care about important news. For broadcasters at least, we are able to show an academically rigorous, statistical relationship between certain components – longer stories, better sourcing, more topics – and the ability of television stations to retain lead-in audience or to bring in people to watch their broadcast. Our challenge as researchers is to try to show statistically that quality works. That's what we've got to do, and we've not done a very good job of it generally. We are now going to try and do some work in the next couple of years to do this for print as well. We need to be able to go to news managers and say, " We know you want to do the right thing. Here is some data that you can take to the people who run your operation to show that doing quality is the best thing."

Conrad Smith: The big news organizations do present long pieces. One of the best pieces about the Bush forest-thinning proposal was a 3,000 word piece in the *New York Times*. Most newspapers don't have the depth of staff to do that. It's four times as hard to write a 1000-word story as to write a 500-word story, so it's easier to fill the paper with a lot of short stories. It's partly an economic problem.

Jacob Bendix: I don't do audience or market research, and so I can't speak to the economics. I will say that, anecdotally, I've had reporters tell me, "Sure, there's a news show that does stuff like that with long thoughtful pieces. It's called the News Hour, and nobody watches it. Do you want us to be like them?"

Walter Dean: And to that person, you say, "If you look at audience rating, there is one form of broadcast journalism where the audience is actually increasing: NPR and PBS." In the last 20 years, it's the one that's trending up. There's a lesson there somewhere.

John Freemuth: Jacob, in your talk, you suggested that when certain pre-eminent ecologists and others came out with their concerns about the Bush plan, they were collectively ignored in the media except for one story. Later, the Society of American Foresters came out with a rebuttal. I think it was probably collectively ignored by the media as well, which leads to the question that often each side in an argument – here we may be including scientists as well – draws on science

to back its claim. It becomes harder to evaluate that and thus to evaluate the reporting. How do we deal with that?

Jacob Bendix: Part of the difficulty – and Conrad alluded to it – is that the coverage so quickly degenerated into a back-and-forth discussion rather than more analytical pieces. I haven't actually seen the statement of rebuttal that you referred to. My tendency – and it's an academic's reflex, I suppose – when I see stuff like that is to question the source expertise. If I saw two statements from competing groups, I would actually investigate the people who signed them, and I would do a database search. I would ask, for each of them, are these people – since they are making scientific assertions – who have actually done research and published it in the refereed scientific literature, thereby establishing their credibility in my eyes as people to pay attention to? If that same letter had come – and similar critiques certainly did – from advocacy groups as such, I would not have been as impressed by it. It was the fact that many of the signatories were people whose names have been familiar to me throughout my career and known to be impressive, credible people. That made an impression on me. I do think that expertise matters. It's not just what you say but who you are.

Conrad Smith: I suspect that the problem was that they just mailed the letter instead of getting it to the media through journalistic contacts respected in the profession. I suspect that if that had been done through someone who had a lot of journalistic contacts, it would have had a greater chance of being covered. If it just came in the mail, well, you know how much mail you get.

Walter Dean: The best solution to all of this would be for news organizations to establish and nurture beat reporters and environmental beats where the reporters are as smart as the scientists. That's the real answer. My friend and colleague, Bill Povich, talks about when he was running the *New York Times* coverage of Three Mile Island, and there was a science reporter for the *Times* who was able to converse with the government scientists who were trying to figure out whether Three Mile Island was going to blow up. This was when Jimmy Carter went down at a time when they weren't sure it was safe. Bill said it was only because of the Times reporter's expertise that he was able to speak their language, able to understand and evaluate their science. It put the *Times* in a league of its own.

We nurture and establish cop reporters. 26% of all the stories on local television are about crime. We're great at covering crime and disaster. Political reporters are all over. Why can't reporters be nurtured to be experts on other things, including the environment? There is no excuse.

John Freemuth: Let me elaborate on that a little more because I think some of the people in the audience might like an answer to this generally. Any advice to scientists generally about do's and don'ts in getting their story reported in the media better or more accurately?

Walter Dean: Write it in English, talk to reporters in English. One of the things we discovered in looking at academic research is that it is impenetrable. It is written by academics for academic advancement. Much of it could be valuable to the journalistic craft, but it is not because it is simply impossible to understand.

Jacob Bendix: Most academics are uncomfortable being media stars. They worry that if they appear in the news media a lot, they are going to be thought by their peers to be self-aggrandizing and more interested in being a media star than in getting their proper work done. Most people worry that the message will get garbled. They work on complicated stuff, and by the time it gets into the paper or onto the news, they will be embarrassed. A lot of folks have anecdotal stories about experiences when they have dabbled in being sources, and they will share those stories. I'm not sure how you get past that.

John Freemuth: There is nothing more humbling than writing a piece you think is pretty well in English and then seeing that the subscription rate for that issue is 310 people.

Traditionally, August is a slow news month. How does this affect media coverage of wildland fire in the west? Does that have something to do with it?

Walter Dean: I used to make some of those decisions for CBS News, and I think it does not. We didn't sit around saying, "It's August. There's nothing going on. Let's go cover a fire." Usually, what happens is that lots of stories are trying to get onto the news agenda, and it's a matter of dropping things. It's not a matter that there isn't enough. It's that there is too much and not enough time. I think it's more likely that stories might be longer, and you might do a followup, a second-day angle. I think that might be more likely to happen.

Jacob Bendix: It's just an impression. I have not studied this. I don't have the impression the last few years that most of the coverage has been in August.

I think we've gotten a lot of coverage in a couple of bad fire seasons that started very hot and early a few years back. The Cerro Grande fire that got away from Bandolier National Monument was in late spring. The big fires in Colorado were relatively early in the fire season, at least when they started. Often the fires on the news are the ones in Southern California, and those come late in the fall when the Santa Anna winds are blowing. So I'm not sure you'd find that the fire stories were that concentrated in August.

Conrad Smith: I think this last summer, they were mostly in June and July.

Walter Dean: At CBS, we made a decision several years ago to cover El Nino. Dan Rather thought that was a heck of a story. With some people, the joke was that we had become the weather channel because we were doing all these weather stories about fires and floods. He felt, as the editor of the news organization, that this was an important story that ultimately affected a lot of people. Ultimately it did, but whether we did too many of them is up for debate. Some of our fire coverage was within the context of the larger weather story. That may have been, in the case of CBS, the reason that there was more.

John Freemuth: For those of you not from here, we're about 23 days into an inversion. We're going to be seeing all of you about May for our fires if this keeps up. This is bad. We haven't had any rain yet.

Can we realistically expect the national media to cover resource issues from any viewpoint other than loggers vs. environmentalists? The point here is that the Forest Service has issued its new planning regulations for about the third time, and that seems to be the story right now. What are the opportunities to hear about the complexities of what the agency is trying to do with its regulations?

Conrad Smith: I think it depends on which reporters are covering it. If the people knowledgeable about the plan have established relationships with environmental reporters, there is a chance of going beyond the two-sided story. But if you just issue a press release, it's going to be these people vs. those people.

Walter Dean: I think it depends on what people like Conrad are teaching in the Journalism Schools as far as definitions of news, what should be reported. Right up near the top of what constitutes news is conflict. If you can get people arguing, you have conflict, and there's your news story. That is seen in most cases as more obviously newsworthy than simply doing an analysis of the implications of a new shift in policy.

Walter Dean: In the last year, we've probably been in two dozen newspaper and broadcast newsrooms. In our newsroom training, we ask that people bring in employees from other parts of the newspaper or television station, just to perform sort of a reality check on the decisions the newsroom makes. It's fascinating. We give them an exercise, in the case of broadcasters, where we give them a bunch of stories and stay, "Stack your newscast, and tell us what's important." What we find always is that the newsroom tends to hold a different definition of news than the non-newsroom people. The newsroom's definition tends to be conflict, who got there first, live local late-breaking. The non-newsroom person in the discussion will say, "Wait a minute. That's not that important to me. I care about these other stories that you think are boring." That may be part of the reason for the disconnect between readers and viewers and news organizations. Think of the implication. If you hold a different definition of what is news than I do, it has tremendous implications for my craft.

John Freemuth: Why don't "outsiders" in journalism utilize local journalists as sources? Professional egotism?

Conrad Smith: I bet a lot of people came to reporters like Bob Ekey when they came in from outside. Did that happen, Bob, at the Yellowstone fires in 1988? Yes? Local reporters know the turf, and when national reporters come in, I think some of the first people they talk to are the local reporters, and they read the local newspaper. I perceive that is not a problem.

Walter Dean: That's the first thing we would do. You call the affiliate and then, frankly, you call the newspaper and talk to the reporters working on it. Those are the first calls you make.

Jacob Bendix: I was interested when Conrad said earlier that reporters don't have the contacts when they come in from the outside to know whom to go to as expert sources. Again, I just have this naive academic viewpoint, but if I want to find out about what's happening on the ground in an area, I look at the nearest large university where there might be people doing research. I call up either the department or the public information officer, and I say, "Do you have people doing research on this?" It doesn't seem as though it would be that tough to do.

Walter Dean: The other thing that happens is the first thing that's done is a Lexis Nexis search. If someone has been quoted before on a story, they immediately pop up in the research. But it becomes self-perpetuating because they get quoted again and again. What you end up with is 50 news organizations quoting the same person, introducing the same kind of knowledge into a story over and over again. It's because of our research methods. Fortunately, with the Internet, that's becoming a little less of a problem, but the big story in journalism over the next 20 years may be who controls the search engines on the Internet and how those search engines work.

Jacob Bendix: I would suggest that it would be useful if people simply looked at some of the other databases besides Lexis Nexis. You can go into any library and get access to databases like Agricola where you can do a search and find all of the academic research articles that have been published on a topic – fire or what have you. You don't have to be prepared to plough through all the impenetrable prose, let alone the equations in those articles. All you have to do is look through and see who is writing things that have titles that seem relevant and write those names down.

Walter Dean: But the news organizations have laid off their researchers. That's the first group of people to go so often.

John Freemuth: To what extent should the media be responsible for building the public's capacity to participate in agency decision processes? Or is that a responsibility at all?

Conrad Smith: In an ideal world where journalism is a public service, watching over policy would be one of their responsibilities as journalists.

Jacob Bendix: It's kind of like Mom and apple pie. I can't imagine saying it would be a bad thing. There may be people in news organizations saying, "Well, we have a lot of things to do. Where does this go in the priorities?"

Walter Dean: We would argue it is like potholes in the street. If you're going to tell people that the street is full of potholes, might you not also give them a number where they might call and get them fixed? We're not very good at giving people entry points to take action. You look at the research, and most people want to be able to fix a problem. That's the way this country works. People complain about it for a while, but then what's the next thing they say? OK, how do we fix it? If we don't give them that entry point to try and figure out what they can do to make it work, not only are we failing to fulfill our role in the democracy, we're just not being very useful to our readers and viewers, and they will leave us. We used to be the gatekeepers to control, but now there is no fence. We're still sitting there controlling the gate, but people can go right around us now.

John Freemuth: Groups and individuals in the west are sometimes characterized by terms such as right-wing, conservative white separatists, etc. Yet, we seldom see people characterized as left wing, liberal, or black separatist. Is the use of such terms biased? Does the media have a liberal bias about the west?

Walter Dean: Probably. Among their many other biases about the west.

Conrad Smith: Well, we're in Idaho. Everybody knows that the only people living in Idaho are the white separatist nuts in the Panhandle.

Cecil Andrus: That brings up a question that was on my mind while I was governor and is on my mind now: the Aryan Nation group that resided in the panhandle area of Idaho. They owned the property; they paid the taxes; they weren't caught – except for one time – violating a law in the state of Idaho. There were 16 of them in that compound. How do we stop the image being presented? Two of them were killed by the FBI in Whidby Island, Washington; two of them were convicted of killing a talk show host in Denver; and one of them is on Death Row in Missouri for killing a state trooper. So their numbers got down pretty low. They were led by a senile individual who, when he simply put out a press release saying, "We're going to have an annual meeting in Coeur d'Alene," would bring in more national media people than they had in the parade. How do we keep from sensationalizing a situation like that when, if the media had not put it on the evening news, there wouldn't have been anybody in attendance? How do we fight that battle?

Walter Dean: That's a difficult call because when I used to sit in on the conference calls at CBS every week, we would go through the bureau calls, and there would be KKK marches. They were always covered. They never got on the newscast, but they were always mentioned in the conference call because they had been news for the last thirty years. The problem with the Aryan Nation story is that some of these people actually took action, and that's why they are sitting on Death Row. That's a hard story. It's just like when we

had the sniper in Washington. I looked at the local news, and it was completely different from the news the rest of the country saw. I can tell you we went about our lives. I don't know the answer to that.

Cecil Andrus: I won't belabor the point, but I also had the responsibility for economic development and for trying to get people to relocate their businesses here. I went to Los Angeles one time, and a person who was a member of a minority group said, "Oh, no. I'm not going to move to Idaho. You have all those crazies up there who attack us because of the color of our skin." That was the image that was portrayed to him, and I had a terrible time trying to convince him that it was not so. I understand there is no answer, but it is a frustration to us Idahoans who really care a great deal. Then you flip on the evening news, and bingo – there it is.

Walter Dean: I think people in every region have those same kinds of frustrations where we have taken things that are not that large a part of their culture and blown them up into big stories. You talk to a southerner, and they will argue that we portray the south in ways that are no longer true – and they're right. The same thing with the northeast and the rust belt. I grew up in Nebraska, and you know how we were portrayed: boring. It's true, and that is because we take these little things, turn them into headlines, slap them on the air, and then go away. We parachute in and then we leave. Once they get on, we are immediately justified in doing follow-ups because, by golly, it's been on.

Conrad Smith: In Wyoming, we had the same experience with the Matthew Shepard case. Wyoming is probably less homophobic than Ohio where I was before, but we're portrayed as the state that lynches gay people. All the reporters I know in Wyoming were astonished at the way that story got legs because there are twenty cases like that. If it happens in an alley in Chicago, no one pays any attention. I agree. Once a story gets legs, you can't stop it with anything.

Jacob Bendix: I don't think that there is a place in the country where people do not complain about what they think the national media portrayal of their home area is. I've spent a lot of time in southern Utah. I do not advertise when I am there the fact that I am originally from California. I don't think it would play real well with a lot of people I interact with because their image of California, especially the Bay Area, is shaped by the kinds of things that get reported. I think it is a ubiquitous problem, really.

J**ohn Freemuth:** Been to St. George lately?

Jacob Bendix: There obviously have been enormous changes since I've been there. I am thinking back a few years when I give the Utah example.

Walter Dean: This is a perfect example because we report facts, but we don't report values. We are good about reporting an incident, but we're not very good about reporting the culture and values of the area around it. We just don't do that kind of work. If there is anything you can tell us, as journalists, today about how we can improve, ways we can better report values and culture, that would be something journalists here could take away and use.

John Freemuth: This plays off your point. About five years ago, BSU's public administration program hosted a meeting of all the schools of public administration in the United States and had their deans and directors. We almost lost that conference because of academics not wanting to come to Boise where the Nazis were. We were able to persuade them, and they came to Boise and had a great time. But these were people one would think would be educated about these things.

Walter Dean: A question for you. Do you think your local news media reports these things fairly?

John Freemuth: It depends.

Audience: I have an example. The local press doesn't always cover important stories. I've spent most of my career in small town journalism in Idaho and Montana. In Libby, Montana, the local vermiculite mine poisoned the whole town. The local press knew about it for years but kept it under wraps until the national newspaper came to town to do the story. They finally reported it under duress. That's the other side of the story.

Walter Dean: And that's a role that the big city, national news media have played pretty well, the watchdog role.

Jacob Bendix: Sharon Dunwoody at the University of Wisconsin has done a fair bit of research, looking at that kind of issue, whether the way environmental issues get reported in the local press is affected by the dominance of different economic interests in their communities and those sorts of things.

Andrus: I'll bring the morning session to a close. We have a luncheon right through those doors. Don't create your own door. Don't miss that luncheon speaker. We're going to feed you, and then you'll listen to Senator Simpson.

DATELINE: THE WEST

December 6, 2002

Transcript

Luncheon

SPEAKER

Senator Alan K. Simpson

Cecil D. Andrus: Ladies and gentlemen. Good afternoon. It's always a pleasure when I have the opportunity to introduce this great big long drink of water from Wyoming. This gentleman is just exactly what he seems. What you see is what you get. I've been in public life long enough that I have a long list of friends. I have a shorter list of adversaries. Then I have a very short list of people who are on both lists. This man is one of those. But we've always been friends, even when we found ourselves in adversarial positions. He fits very comfortably into the list of real people that I have met in my career.

He's a big Cody, Wyoming lawyer, a three-term member of the United States Senate, a coyote-killing cowboy from Cody. He's just as much at home in the coffee shop of the Erma Hotel in Cody as he is at Harvard, where he had an illustrious lengthy career, teaching those liberal students at that great institution a little bit about the facts of life. He learned a few lessons, too, but I won't go into that.

I first got acquainted with this man when I was Secretary of the Department of the Interior. He was a new Senator from Wyoming, and he thought you ought to kill every coyote because they were killing his sheep. He was for 1080, he was for traps, he was for 30-30 carbines, he was for everything that would work against that poor little canine.

He had a very distinguished career in Washington. He was one of the few who had the political courage to speak out forcefully on the need for immigration reform, and he was almost a lone voice for Social Security reform. As a matter of fact, when he was here three years ago, we filled both rooms with people who came to listen to this man and his version of what should be done.

When we started putting this conference together, I wanted to invite someone who would be forceful, entertaining, politically pointed, and – no, not insightful. (He's still trying to write my script.) There was only one man, and he is here with us today.

A lot of folks in public life shy away from being critical of the media. Al Simpson said, "By God, the First Amendment belongs to me, too, and I can use it as well as they can." He never hesitated to take them on. He's mellowed a little bit, but I'll just read you one quote from years ago.

"The press is only interested in conflict, confusion, and controversy. They are not interested in clarity. They are defensive. They're arrogant. They think they are going to lead us from whatever horrors we are in and that they alone can get us through to the next millennium."

Ladies and gentlemen, let me present to you a dear friend of mine, Senator Alan Simpson.

Alan K. Simpson: Cece, of all the introductions I've had, that was the most recent. I want to thank you for that. It was good; I liked it.

I wanted to get here in the worst way, and I did. I was in Newark yesterday, the last living soul out of Newark, flew to San Diego. Then Salt Lake this morning. It is cold in the Big Apple. Do not go to New York. It is closed in. But it's a treat to be here for what must have been, to this point, a splendid forum. I caught about 20 minutes of that this morning.

Many of us are gathered here because of this smooth-talking, crafty, sheep-killing son of a bitch, Cecil Andrus. I thought we would just clear the air on that.

Through the years, we have corresponded, and I hope no one has been collecting our correspondence. Those letters are public; they are somewhere. Don't try to lay it on me in years to come. I know you kept yours. Anyway, he and I had a lot of fun in Washington, D.C., learning how to disagree without being disagreeable. That is very tough to do. He's a very special friend, and I'll tell you one thing. If you know Carol and if you know my wife, you'll know that the two of us severely over-married in every way. These women have saved us from ourselves.

He told you what I've been up to. He did call me at Harvard a couple of times. I knew it was time to get

out. It was the Erma Hotel in Cody. I got my Saturday grubs on, my cowboy boots. They make me about 6'10". I look like a crane wandering through the swamp. Some guy comes up and says, "Anybody ever tell you you look kind of like Al Simpson?" I said, "Yeah, they do." He said, "Makes you kinda mad, don't it."

So then Marvin Kalb asked me to come up to Harvard. I said, "For what?" He said, "To teach." I said, "To teach what? I've never taught anything." He said, "Well, you've got something to share." I couldn't have got into Harvard if I had picked the locks. I did not graduate cum laude. I graduated "Thank the Laude" at every single institution. The reason they tossed me out of Harvard after three years is that I told this story. You'll love this story.

It's about sheep. This old boy is out with his sheep in southern Wyoming. This young guy drives up in a nice car and says, "Say, old fellow. If I can tell how many sheep are in that band, can I have one?" He says, "Sure, take a shot at it." The guy looks out and says, "692." The farmer says, "That's exactly it. Take your pick." So the young man takes an animal and starts down the road, and the farmer says, "Wait a minute. If I can tell you where you went to school, can I have that animal back?" The young man says, "Sure, that would be fair." He says, "You went to Harvard." The young man says, "How did you know that?" The farmer says, "You've got my dog."

There is one thing I want to warn you about in retirement, a warning to you, Cecil. When Clareene and all these loyal people leave you, there is a thing out there called "staff deprivation." After a year, Ann came up to me and said, "Al, your staff is gone. You have no staff. They are not here, and I am not one of your staff." Now that's a test of marriage, and there is biblical reference right there in the good book. It says, "Jacob died, leaning on his staff." That will be you, Andrus.

Now we're going to cut to the chase here. The role of the media in shaping public policy on western issues, summarized as "They just don't get it." No, that's not it. That's too easy. They don't have the time to learn about us. They are busy in their own work. I see that. I saw it in Washington. They don't know how we feel about things. They don't realize that in my state, 50% of the surface is owned by the federal government. 63% of the minerals are owned by the federal government. We can't do anything without the landlord, and then we get a new landlord all the time with new administrators, new theories, people who don't know what a public-land state is. If they're from Texas or Alabama or Arkanses, they have no concept of public lands. It's tough.

We see great vistas of arid and semi-arid land, and of course we deal with the myths and images of the west. Peter and I were talking about the myth of the cowboy. That will get you a good seminar started. We do that with our course at Laramie. My brother and I teach there now at the University of Wyoming.

It started, I guess, with Lewis and Clark. Grant sent General Sheridan out to "see what's out there." Sheridan wired back, "All this land needs is good people and water." Grant wired back and said, "That's all Hell needs."

This is a stereotype I'm giving you. When you're a Wyoming Republican and you get to Harvard, that means you crawled out of a cave and are creeping along, beating away sabre-toothed tigers with some kind cloth around your neck. It's an unfortunate stereotype.

The eastern media does not do their homework as to who we are and what we do and what we grapple with: precious water, coal bed methane, public lands, grazing on public lands, wolves, grizzlies. The coverage is not unfair; it is just unknowing. That's my view.

Some personal examples. I was a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I'm a green pea freshman, wandering around in there, and they are doing the Clean Air Act. The heat is heavy, and I'm voting because I'm representing a state that produces 350 million tons of coal. Whether I like it or not, that's my state. We produce more coal than Kentucky, Illinois, West Virginia, and all the great coal-producing states. And ours is low sulphur. So I was saying, "It seems to me you ought to be using low sulphur coal." Don't get into Robert Byrd's territory when you're talking about that.

So anyway, I sat there. The minute I would vote to recognize the benefits of low-sulphur coal and why it should be used, every reporter there would immediately leave, contact the *Casper Star Tribune* and just savage my rear end. Never talked to me. "Simpson voted today to destroy the universe, to pollute the earth." The first thing I learned was that nothing would get past Robert Byrd, so I why did I have to die?" So I voted for everything that went through there. The environmentalists said, "Simpson has just gone insane. He's with us."

So finally I said, "You people can't understand that we ought to do our debate here in the committee. You're going to pass this goofy thing, but Robert Byrd will hold it up. You'll never see it again." That's exactly what happened for years until George Mitchell came on the scene and moderated the essence of the Clean Air Act in a beautiful and fair way.

So I learned those lessons. You're dealing with Superfund and the Endangered Species Act, surface mining, the Clean Air Act. Of course, in Washington, it is called "strip mining." I said, "We don't do strip mining like West Virginia and Pennsylvania did. We put it all back." There are no cliffs; there are no ramparts.

It's a rolling prairie. You take 60 feet of overburden off, stack it in stacks and put it all back and plant it." That's kind of a stripper in reverse.

So I finally said to the staff, "Don't listen to me; go see it." So we finally sent the staff of the Environment and Public Works Committee to Wyoming, to the Powder River Basin, to see what we do. Anyone can go there and see it. But nobody understood that till they went. They don't understand what we do. Then they call you one of the"Dirty Dozen."

I served on the Clean Air conference committee. Chafee was doing a beautiful job. Mitchell, Moynihan, Liberman – a lot of us from both parties were working day and night on this. One night I came out after a meeting, and here are nine guys, looking as though they are around a campfire. All of the groups were represented. Cece and I referred to them as "the groups." They all are interconnected. They are interconnected with fundraising, with personnel, and with activities. I said, "What are you guys cooking out here tonight?"

They said, "We are so appalled by what's happening in there, and we are trying to figure out how to bring retribution on George Mitchell and John Chafee in their next election." I said, "Boy, you are the stupidest people alive. Those are the guys that help more than you will ever know."

But the groups are purists. Show me a 100 percenter, and I'll show you a guy I want to stay away from. They have B.O., gas, ulcers, heartburn. They give off an odor. 100 percenters give off an odor. There may be one here sitting next to you. You can tell. They are seethers. Zealots. That's a person who, having forgotten his purpose, redoubles his efforts.

Anyway, I avoided the sacrificial lamb activity there because I knew Byrd would kill all the lambs that came through, and it happened that way till George Mitchell came on the scene.

Grazing fees on federal lands or oil and gas drilling on federal land. The wonderful phrase, "the Cadillac cowboys." I know some of the grubbiest people you have ever seen in your life with a 40-cow allotment on a piece of scrub brush that can't even pay their taxes. I had to read about Cadillac cowboys all the time I was there. Yet, the whole cost of that when I left Washington was $70 million bucks a year. That was the subsidy, if you want to use that word. Every year I voted to give $5.4 billion to the corn guys and $2.4 billion to the wheat guys. I said to Grassley one day, "I know how to make more money in corn in Iowa." He said, "How?" I said, "Put up a second mailbox."

So there I am. I'm getting hell from the eastern media about Cadillac cowboys day and night. On the covers of Newsweek and the papers are pictures of drilling rigs on the side of the Grand Tetons. We really don't do a lot of drilling on the Grand Tetons or anywhere near them. Teton County is the only county in Wyoming with no oil production.

Every time we talk about anything to do with the public lands, there is a picture of the most beautiful of our public lands. But what they did in their courage, they killed off the honey subsidy. It was $3.5 million. That debate was tremendous; you should have heard it. Then they got rid of the mohair and wool support system. That was $110 million. There was a lot of energy in that. Sam Donaldson got caught, and I told Sam, "You're going to get caught with those things you've got down there." He owns some goats.

Anyway, so it goes. The courage it took to get rid of the honey program and the wool program was just awesome and didn't take a nickel off corn or wheat or peanuts. You can be the richest guy in America and own peanut allotments. It's all a lot of phoney baloney. And it was all put together to protect us from the loss of commodities when we separated from our king: peanuts, cotton, corn – all still there.

Grizzlies. Now Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, and Utah really pay attention to this. The Interagency Grizzly Bear Review Committee has said that the grizzly bear should be delisted. This is the group of feds, states, and others appointed to administer this massive and magnificent animal. OK, they have said it's time to delist them. Do you think we can get that done? Hell, no. The groups are fanning the fire again. The same stuff goes out, all interconnected, fueling the motion.

I learned one thing in Washington. You either pass or kill a bill using a deft blend of emotion, fear, guilt, or racism. I dealt with them all – immigration, Social Security, endangered species. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but no one is entitled to their own facts. You have to watch people. When people run out of facts, they will go to emotion, fear, guilt, or racism. They will make you feel bigoted, feel like a slob, feel like a bonehead – whatever they can reduce you to – because they have run out of facts.

Now the grizzlies are not in Yellowstone Park. They are all over the place. When you have to go fishing with your grandchild on a stream you've been on all your life with a 9-millimeter Glock, I would say the damn things should be delisted. They are all over outside the park; they are on the north fork, the south fork of the Shoshoni River. They'll tip over an oil barrel, which has no smell of food. They have learned that a barrel is something you tip over because there is something in it. Then they have to destroy that animal.

These are tough things. But literally, you fish now with a 9-millimeter Glock in Park County, Wyoming at least. Wolf reintroduction is another story. Barbee and I

had more fun there than you can ever imagine. He's a guy with a lot of guts, and he's here to share his expertise. He's a guy with a tremendous amount of patience. We really went goofy when wolf reintroduction came to our area once again. But of course you can take them in the act of depredation. I won't say it doesn't work, but it's not the greatest thing we ever saw. But that's the way it is. I just read one in the New York Times this morning, a thrilling little piece about a group of people in the park who heard the Druid Pack howl. The woman said, "It was like a holy experience." I thought, "Well, that's good. We should have those." But they don't need to be down next to Cody doing their holy experiences on sheep.

Well, don't throw anything. I just have a few more notes here. The next time you see a picture of a national monument being established, be sure that the photo op is taking place where the hell the thing is. I saw enough of those to gag. A national monument. You looked out, and here was this glorious landscape, and the actual place is just zero, BLM whiz-bang stuff. All I say is that the media should take a picture of the actual location of the next national monument. Not that I don't think we should have national monuments. We should.

One other thing that is particularly appalling is pompous paternalism from our media monitors. We just don't seem to know what the hell we're doing. We're lost in the swamps out here.

I say, "OK, you love Wyoming, don't you?"

"Ah, yes, I love it. I bring the kids."

"You love the wilderness here, don't you?"

"Ah, yes."

"Well, we have 44% of the nation's wilderness in Wyoming, outside of Alaska. Did you know that?"

"No, I didn't, but that's wonderful, too."

"Do you know who put that in there? It was a Democrat named Ed Herschler, and it was Al Simpson and Dick Cheney and Malcolm Wallop. Other states can't even get that done."

"I hope you take care of it."

"I've had five generations of my family taking care of it so that it looks the way you see it now."

It's a paternalistic attitude that says we don't know what we're doing and they need to lead us forward. We're the unwashed.

Secretary of Interior Cecil Andrus. You cannot be right in that job. It's impossible. Go look at the pictures on the wall of the Secretary's office. The average tour of duty is two years. It is the most revolving door of any cabinet position in America because you can't do it. You can't preserve and protect and still allow the things you have to allow by law. I watched him do it with rare balance and good humor. He was one of the best.

You heard my comment about conflict, confusion and controversy. I really believe that, but I think that there are things we can do. At the University of Wyoming, we have an Institute for Environment and Natural Resources, chaired for eight years by Bill Ruckelshaus. He is still our emeritus chairman.

We deal with all the heavy stuff. I tell my students that political correctness is like wearing duct tape over your mouth. If you have real biases, real prejudices, and real feelings and pretend you don't, that's like a fissure in the human core. It will work its way out in ways that you cannot even identify. So why not bring it out of the subterranean cavern and into the sunshine and deal with it right there. Just right there. Anything. Anything at all. That's what I emphasize to my students, and that's what I did instead of letting it fester in some dark place inside and pretending that you are the most genial, kind, sweet, magnanimous, civilized person when underneath is this stuff.

If we can work with good faith, good science, good sense, and good will, we can get there. There are plenty of problems in the world today, dealing with an unknown adversary with unknown results and tough things to handle. But the most grotesque job I ever had in public life was on the Park County Zoning and Planning Commission. I was accused of being a Commie pinko and a card-carrying Neanderthal slob because folks in the west believe that if want to put a two-story outhouse on your property and paint it purple, that's your God-given right. They practically bombed my house.

So I got into that, and we got some things done. We did a statewide land-use planning bill when I was in the Legislature in the '70s with a Democrat named Ed Herschler. We did a Clean Air Act, a Clean Water Act, a Plant Siting Act and other things that had never been done. We did them because we didn't want to be another Pittsburgh or West Virginia. But nobody knows that.

Our coal emission standards for clean air are six times more stringent than the federal government's. The government allows us to do our own mining laws because ours are more strict than they would have required.

So anyway, just some stuff I wanted to share with you. Time is running out. Our job is to make it work, to talk together, to argue together, get together, and to toss it around. Don't hold anything back. That's what Cece and I did. I'd say, "Cece, this is nuts." He'd say, "You can't stick one of these bombs in a coyote's mouth." "Well," I said, "reduce the size of the bomb or something." I said, "Did you ever see a coyote kill a sheep? They take little nip and cripple them and then come up and take two chunks and walk away." But then

we kept talking, and that's what has to happen. Stop bitching and whining, and don't be extreme.

Collaborate with each other. If we'd quit using phrases like Cadillac Cowboy and Granola Geeks, it would help. Give it up. We don't need to do any more of that stuff. It's ours to lose. Here in Wyoming, the best ranches are those that have a mineral supplement in their diet. Oil. That's a good ranch. Those people get very active in things.

Well, that's that. Civility. The final word. People say, "What happened to civility in Congress?" I say, "Nothing. What happened to civility in Little League? What happened to civility in the hockey game? What happened to civility in the sports contest? We are a representative government. Then I tell them that 15% of Americans are screwballs, lightweights, and boobs, and that's the same in your church or your business or anywhere. 15% are screwballs, lightweights, and boobs. You wouldn't want those people under-represented. They have to be represented in the Congress.

We need to listen to each other today, and I intend to stay here the whole day. Just remember this. There are a few basic principles. Number one: People have to eat and care for their families. Number two: The best human right is a job. The best human right of all is not some ethereal thing; it's a job. Number three: Try to keep open lands open, and be careful with the lands we have.

The greatest threat to the world is not methane gas and cows or propellant in the bottom of shaving cream cans; it's the population of the earth. You can't get anything done, wherever you're headed, without dealing with the population of the earth. And we won't deal with it because then you're dealing with ethnicity and religion and abortion and contraception. Then political correctness takes over, and you don't do anything with the greatest and toughest issue of our times. Hopefully the young people will be more courageous. It's been fun with the young people at Harvard and Laramie. There is a great generation coming on.

That's if we don't let AARP get all the money. That's 33 million people bound together by a common love of airline discounts.

I see the clock is running. I'll give you a quick comment on why I left the Senate. I was losing the most precious thing you can have in politics: patience. Into my office every day would come the executive directors, year after year, of the various groups in Wyoming. They say, "Al, the deficit here must be $170 billion. I know you and Cheney and Wallop are working. We just know you're going to save us." They would give me lectures for about 20 minutes on what the deficit was, and then they'd ask for their $80 million bucks or $800 million bucks. Or they would say, "We're not here for money, Al. We just want a change in the tax code." Or "This is a tariff, Al. You don't understand the difference between a tariff and a tax." I said, "I know. I flunked that course. I didn't realize there was such a tremendous difference between a tariff and a tax." And there isn't. Not a damn bit.

I finally found myself turning to my window and saying, "I think I'll just jump out." So I put a can of Bag Balm on my desk, that little green can.

They would say, "What's that?"

I would say, "It's an emollient. It's a salve."

"But what is it? What do you do with it?"

I said, "You apply it to the extremities of the bovine members of the quadrapeds that issue a lacteal extract."

They would say, "I don't get it."

I would explain, "The sun shines off the snow onto the udder, causes a rash, cracks the udder. The calf comes up to nurse; the cow kicks the calf in the head. It's not good. You put great dollops of Bag Balm up there. It cures zits, hangnails, people put it on their feet at night. It will stink a dog off a gutwagon, but everybody uses it."

They would say, "But why is it on your desk?"

I would say, "Because if America has become a milk cow with 280 million teats, we need all the Bag Balm we can produce."

Cecil D. Andrus: Wow. What did I tell you. I knew you'd enjoy that. For a while, you sounded like a tree-hugging posy-sniffer. That's what they used to say about me. Some of the industrial people would say, "Oh, that Andrus. He's a tree-hugging posy sniffer." And the environmentalists would say, "God, he's sold out to industry." So somewhere you tread down that middle ground. We have to keep talking to each other.

Ladies and gentleman, that's a great human being from Cody, Wyoming. He has shared a day of his life us because I asked him to. It might cost me a wee libation and a steak later today and a famous Idaho baked potato, not one of those counterfeits from across the line.

DATELINE:THE WEST

December 6, 2002

Transcript

PANEL:

CRITTERS, CONTROVERSY, AND CONFRONTATION

Marc Johnson: Ladies and gentleman, good afternoon. My name is Marc Johnson. I'm the president of the Andrus Center of Public Policy. I had a sneaking suspicion that following Al Simpson might be a tough chore, but we'll soldier on.

Following the panel, we will have a question-and-answer forum with the audience. Attached to your program, you will find question cards. If you wish, compose a short, legible question, and folks over by the door will circulate through the audience and pick them up.

I should say we are taping this through the good offices of Idaho Public Television and KIVI-Channel 6, the ABC affiliate here in Boise.

Our purpose here this afternoon is to explore further this issue of how the media covers issues in the west and whether and how their coverage might affect public policy decisions that are often made very far from Idaho. We are going to use a series of hypothetical situations, which never could happen. They are based on some issues that many of you will readily understand and appreciate. We have searched far and wide to assemble a panel of reporters, editors, former and current public policy-makers, people who have a genuine perspective on these issues.

Someone asked me this morning. "Why do you have such a huge panel?" Well, we invited twenty people, thinking that we might get 12 or 13. We actually are delighted that virtually everyone we invited was willing to participate. So we have a large panel, which means that I am going to invite panelists to participate readily in the discussion.

We have relied upon some hypothetical situations, which the panelists are aware of only in the most basic sense. They know the general subject matter, more or less, but they don't know where I, as the shaper of the story, am going to take them.

So let me introduce them as we go around the table. First is Rick Johnson, Executive Director of the Idaho Conservation League; State Senator Brad Little, the new chairman of the Republican Caucus in the State Senate and long-time leader in the livestock industry. Next to him is Congressman Mike Simpson, who just won his third term in the United States House of Representatives, a member of the Committee on Natural Resources. Next to him is Mark Obenhaus from ABC News, a producer for programs Peter Jennings has done, including one that aired recently and received a lot of comment in Idaho on wolf reintroduction. Next to him is Tim Egan, national affairs correspondent for the *New York Times*, based in Seattle. Tim has written two well-regarded books about the northwest and western issues. Next to him is Pat Shea, an attorney in Salt Lake city now. Pat was a high Interior Department official in the Clinton Administration. Gloria Flora had a 22-year career with the U.S. Forest Service. She is now doing consulting work. Her tenure was marked by a certain amount of controversy in Nevada toward the end of her career. Next to her is Tom Kenworthy, the *USA Today* reporter on the environment and western issues. Tom is based in Denver, Colorado now but worked for many years for the *Washington Post*. Katy Roberts has had a variety of jobs with the *New York Times* over a period of years. She was recently named editor of the "Week in Review" section of the *Times* and has in the past been the national editor and the op ed editor of the *New York Times*. Peter Jennings, senior editor and anchor of ABC World News Tonight. Scott Kraft is the national editor of the *Los Angeles Times*. Scott had a distinguished reporting career in a variety of places around the globe, including Paris and Beirut, if I recall correctly, before becoming a top editor at the Times. Robert Manne is the CEO and President of Pacific Lumber Company, headquartered in Scotia, California. Mark Steele is the editor of the powerful voice of southeastern Idaho, the *Caribou County Sun*, one of Idaho's better weekly newspapers. Bob Barbee is retired from the National Park Service. Bob had a distinguished career at many national parks around the country. Perhaps he is best known for the years he spent at Yellowstone during the fires that we heard about this morning. Bob Ekey is with the Wilderness Society, the regional director in Bozeman, and Bob had a career as a reporter before becoming directly involved in the environmental

movement. Jay Shelledy is editor of the *Salt Lake Tribune* and is remembered, fondly or not, as the one-time editor of the Moscow and Lewiston papers. Rod Gramer is also a person familiar to many of you in this room. Rod had a number of jobs at the *Idaho Statesman* and at KTVB- Channel 7. He is now with KGW in Portland as the news director. Pat Williams, Congressman from the great state of Montana for nine terms. He served on the Interior Committee, among others. Pat is now in residence at Missoula, Montana where he is Senior Fellow at the O'Connor Institute for Rocky Mountain Studies. Jim Strauss is Executive Editor of the *Great Falls Tribune* in Great Falls, Montana. Last, but certainly not least, is Sandra Mitchell. Sandra has been involved for many years with the Hells Canyon Coalition and works on off-road vehicles issues, advocating for snowmobile users in Idaho. With all those introductions, please welcome these panelists.

SCENARIO I: THE LEWIS AND CLARK NATIONAL MONUMENT

Let me set the stage for our first hypothetical. It's sometime in the not-too-distant future. President George W. Bush, after two terms in the White House, is retired back to Crawford, Texas. The new president was elected largely on a campaign pronouncement that she (I told you this was hypothetical) was going to roll back some of the environmental excesses of the Bush Administration. The electoral votes that elected this new president came not from the Rocky Mountain West but from the left coast – Oregon, Washington, and California – and from New England and places like New York and the rust belt. To carry out this mandate of rolling back the excesses of the previous Administration, this new president has decided, as a symbolic and very substantive first move, to create, under the Antiquities Act without any Congressional approval and certainly without much consultation with folks in the west, a massive new national monument to commemorate Lewis and Clark. This new monument will stretch all the way from Montana to Oregon and cover the entire route in those states of the Corps of Discovery. Of course the new Administration has leaked this story to the *New York Times*.

Ms. Roberts, for many years, you have been the Go-To editor on environmental issues for the Times. You've been leaked this story by the Administration. Interesting story?

Katy Roberts: It's interesting. It's potentially a page-one story, but it needs some fast, hard- nosed reporting. Is this just a symbolic move? It may involve a lot of acreage, but where is that land? What does it involve in regard to trampling what states and localities think are their rights?

Marc Johnson: You're going to report the story because it's been leaked to you by the Administration, aren't you?

Katy Roberts: Yes, but at the same time – not to be technical about this – if it's an Antiquities Act-related story, a lot of people are already going to know about this. If it's a Democratic president, a lot of the appointees will be environmentalists. The major environmental groups will know about this, and certainly, if proper procedures were followed, state and local officials will have been consulted on this. So we have to presume that this is a competitive story and that we can go ahead and call all the principals in it without tipping them off that we know this and thinking they will call someone else.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Shea is the Secretary of Interior. He is in charge of developing this policy for the new Administration. Pat, are you comfortable with those ground rules if you're going to leak the story to the *New York Times*?

Patrick Shea: No.

Marc Johnson: Why not?

Patrick Shea: Because I want to make sure we have a clear shot without having local or state politics interfering with what is really a national program. The tradition of the Antiquities Act, despite what it says in the act, is that presidents have acted in a unilateral way. Personally, I think it's been a benefit because we've had the Grand Tetons and several other national monuments that have become national parks. If we start going through a process, you're not going to have a clear shot at having the product.

Marc Johnson: Ms. Roberts?

Katy Roberts: That will be part of the story.

Marc Johnson: But Mr. Shea says he is not going to give you the story unless you agree to the ground rules he has just laid down. He doesn't want you sourcing it out.

Katy Roberts: Then we're in a difficult position obviously. It would be very difficult to call people to get comment, knowing that those people would then get on the phone and tell everyone else in the universe.

So you save that for the end of the day. But you still have to start making the calls.

Marc Johnson: Let's assume for the moment that the Interior Department is able to leak this story and get its spin on it. Why would you want to do that, Pat?

Patrick Shea: Because it allows me, as a policy-maker, especially in my relationship with Congress, which is the funding source, to define what the politics will be. If I leave it to everybody else to interfere at the beginning of the process, I'm going to be a bit behind the eight- ball.

Marc Johnson: As we heard this morning, you want to frame the story. Ms. Roberts, Tim Egan's on the phone from Seattle. He picked up word of this story. He's hot to trot. He wants to do the story. Let me in on your conversation. Tim?

Tim Egan: I have sources, and I should be able to talk to President Patty Murray because I knew her when she was on the Shoreline School Board. I would hope President Murray would give me an interview on this. I would say, "Katy, we've got to run it. This is a very competitive story." She would caution me against calling too many people because it would be out right away; then it's on the Internet. We don't live in a newspaper-run world anymore. That ended about a hundred years ago. Things happen with lightning speed.

Marc Johnson: But you would be arguing to get this on page one.

Tim Egan: Oh, absolutely.

Marc Johnson: Why?

Tim Egan: Because it's a huge monument, just in terms of social and cultural impact. There is a lot of stuff about the west that people don't know jack about. A lot of folks think they know a lot about Lewis and Clark. That's just one of those things that is coded into our DNA.

Marc Johnson: So you'd be going back and re-reading Steven Ambrose's book and you'd want a quote about the importance of Lewis and Clark to the development of the entire continental United States.

Tim Egan: There are better books than Ambrose's. I'd quote an easterner like Peter Jennings. Because you've given us a limited time frame on this, you really can't do the comprehensive, on-the-ground, interviewing county commissioners about what they think about this. You're talking right now, an immediate news story. Your question is whether page one or not. I have no control over that, but I would certainly argue in my civil discussions with Ms. Roberts that this is a page-one story.

Patrick Shea: One thing, too, is that it wouldn't be a single story. If I go to the New York Times, I would say, "This is what we want in the beginning, and then there will be additional things we will do on an exclusive basis with you because of your cooperation on this matter."

Katy Roberts: Well, this is news to me. In my many dealings with so-called "exclusives," this kind of story almost always leaks out, no matter what, whether we keep it quiet or not. We would have to make the calls. We could not run a story based just on what the Administration said it was doing.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Jennings, you probably take a look at the New York Times every day. Let's assume this story does break in the Times.

Peter Jennings: Why do you assume that?

Marc Johnson: Because Mr. Shea and Ms. Roberts really did cut a deal here to leak the story.

Peter Jennings: Emphasis on the fact that that is hypothetical.

Marc Johnson: Fair enough. Let's assume you see the story in the Times. Interesting story for your broadcast?

Peter Jennings: Huge story, huge.

Marc Johnson: Why?

Peter Jennings: Because I think, as Tim as said, it has a lot to do with some of the public icons of the nation, and we have just celebrated, if I get your time frame right, the 200th anniversary of the Lewis and Clark trip. We've just celebrated the Louisiana Purchase. All sorts of American history is deeply involved in this. And the idea of the size of this thing is fascinating. Moreover, contrary to some public perceptions, we cover western environmental affairs on a fairly long-term basis. So if we didn't have the story first, which we might well have, we would think it a competitive story from an area in which we are deeply interested.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Obenhaus, let's say that you're the producer in charge of preparing the package for Peter's broadcast. What pictures do you use? How do you visualize the story since there are no known videotapes of Lewis and Clark?

Mark Obenhaus: First of all, there are plenty of pictures of Lewis and Clark. You have tons of landscape. From the size of this thing, it is this immense route that you're talking about. You could even go to the library and pull out enough to do the story.

Marc Johnson: But you'd use landscapes, pretty pictures of mountains, the Clearwater River.

Mark Obenhaus: It depends on what's available and what kind of recording we're able to get, whether we're able to get to people who, as has been alluded to, actually have knowledge of the plan. Certainly we would make every effort to do that. As I understand it, we are not bound by any kind of constraints from any deal that has been established as you've described. I think we'd be trying to find as many people as possible who know about the proposal.

Peter Jennings: We would also think it a huge political story. We'd be interested in the pretty pictures and Mark would be looking through the library, but the first thing I would do would be to reach for my Constitution to find out whether someone is going to challenge this on Constitutional grounds, which I strongly believe, on just first hearing the news, they would.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Shea, let's assume that the story is out, and it's out largely the way you want it out. The President has to make an announcement now. Where do you put her to make the announcement. You're probably not going to put her up on the Lola Pass, are you?

Patrick Shea: No. What I would look for is advice from people who can look at pretty pictures. There would be several people who could do that.

Marc Johnson: You would carefully choose the backdrop though?

Patrick Shea: Absolutely. That would be part of the entire package. I don't think policy-makers sit back and say, "I have this one single issue I'm going to bring out." It's seen as an evolving scenario. But I want to make the point that the print media is where you go first because that's where the substantive story can be told in all of it its different details. Then once that has come out, you go to the electronic media; you do a sound bite with NPR; you have a nice picture of Yellowstone Falls; you may have a grizzly bear wandering through the background; you have things that will catch their attention.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Ekey, let's assume that you're the head of the environmental organization that hatched up this idea and sold it to this new Administration. Things are going pretty well. You got a front-page story on the *New York Times*, ABC is covering it on Peter Jennings broadcast, pretty good situation?

Bob Ekey: It looks good. We just have to make sure it follows through.

Marc Johnson: How do you do that?

Bob Ekey: The first thing we want to do is get people on the ground along the monument that can talk about it. Clearly, it's a monument because it has historical, cultural, conservation values. You want to get people on the ground talking about why those are important to them, that the process is sound, and that this is our last chance to save this route and the values that are there. So you go right to the values and talk about those things.

Marc Johnson: Do you call up a friendly reporter and talk to them about the story?

Bob Ekey: Sure.

Marc Johnson: Is Tim Egan a friendly reporter? Tom Kenworthy?

Bob Ekey: Yeah.

Marc Johnson: So you'd call them up and say: Here's the real story from my perspective. How would you do that?

Bob Ekey: Well, if that fits in, if the timing's right, and so forth. We call reporters a lot and say: We'd like to do some background with you.

Marc Johnson: What's background?

Bob Ekey: Background is that it's not for attribution, and it's not for publication. We want to fill you in and talk about how you're going to go on the story. It depends on where you are with the story. If it's already been broken by the *New York Times* or already on ABC News, you're calling a lot and talking about the

different dimensions of this and where it's going to go. You want to make sure that it doesn't turn into that national political story, that it's more about the values and why it's important to protect these places.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Egan is on the phone, and he wants to know the process. How did you pull this off, Bob? Lord, this is a huge accomplishsment. Whom did you have to talk to? How did you sell Shea on this? Tim, aren't you interested in that part of the story?

Tim Egan: I'm generally not as interested in the process as other people. I kind of leave that up to Washington because that's the "inside baseball" story. To me, it's kind of interesting, but it has the half-life of a Wyoming fly. I'm more interested in the bigger story, the bigger impact. I'm interested in the land; I'm interested in the history. So I really wouldn't ask Bob about the process. I'd be curious, and it would be one of the questions I'd throw at him. How did you get the ear of the president so soon? How did you get the president to sign on to this rather epic thing? But my main questions would be: How are you going to massage this thing? Are you going to have opposition? Do you have 60 votes? What should we look for in the next stage of the conflict?

Marc Johnson: We'll get to that opposition in just a minute. Mr. Kenworthy. What's your take on this story.

Tom Kenworthy: The first thing I would do is tell my editors I had that story last month. The news is out. It's been on ABC; it's been in the New York Times. We want to do a more complete contextual story, what we call a second-day story. We want to look at this history of how the Antiquities Act has been used. What are the chances that Republicans in Congress are going to use an appropriations rider to deny funding for it?

Marc Johnson: So you're starting to flesh out the story; you're starting to add some dimension to how this happened, what it means perhaps? Secretary Shea, do you want to talk to him at this point?

Patrick Shea: I would certainly talk to him. I do want to make one other comment though. I would have talked to Congressman Williams as Chair of the Appropriations Committee because we have a very close working relationship. I would not want him surprised. So there has to be a real political judgment made as to whether that conversation is going to be kept in confidence. Many of them are; some of them aren't. Then I would also want to have many local people who were involved in the decision-making process talking to USA Today and to other second-day media entities.

Marc Johnson: Congressman Williams, how is this playing in Montana?

Pat Williams: Unbeknownst to Secretary Shea, prior to his call and because I've been a long time friend of our new female black president, she called me a few days previously, and I think she had called several members of Congress from the west whose voting record was one of conservation. I know the story isn't going to break yet, so I would begin to prepare my schedule and my strategy to try to tap what I know to be the deep visceral demand of my constituents in Montana that the land and water be protected and preserved at all costs.

I have found during my nine terms in Congress that if you're up front with them and if you can speak to them with a western voice about the economic imperatives of our state and how preserving the land and water is essential, they will in the end fall down on the right side of this issue, but it will take caution and care and strategy.

Marc Johnson: Congressman Simpson, what's your take? What are you doing to get into this story? Are you holding a news conference?

Mike Simpson: You mean when I find out about it? As soon as I get over my pissed-off-ness? I wasn't on the president's call list because President Murray and Secretary Shea had decided to undertake what would be a massive decision that will affect the lives and livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of people in the west, and they are clearly trying to make sure that the one thing they don't do is involve the public that will be affected by this decision. That bothers the heck out of me. To me, that's the fundamental problem with this. As one reporter said, "I don't really care about the process; I just care about the results." The process is how you involve the public in this decision-making. As Mr. Jennings said, its Constitutionality is a question. I'm a member of that body Consitutionally charged with making public land use decisions. Here they are, going about using the Antiquities Act in a way that was never envisioned by the authors of the act, ways that I believe are clearly unconstitutional to affect the lives of millions of Americans and leave out the elected representatives and the people it will affect. I don't disagree with Mr. Williams on the importance of protecting the land and the water, but the way you go about it is important.

Patrick Shea: One thing I did as Secretary, after I finished talking to the *New York Times* and knew the story was going to be printed, was to call a couple of members of Congress who I knew would be critical because, quite frankly, what they were going to say would not play favorably in areas that were strong supporters of President Murray. From the political perspective, having their outrage would enhance the story. So we're solidifying our political base by creating the opposition.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Strauss, big story in Great Falls? You're not talking to the Secretary of Interior about this, are you? It's been in the *Times*; it's been on ABC News. How are you covering this story?

Jim Strauss: It would probably make page one in Great Falls since we are right on the Missouri River. In fact, with the *Great Falls Tribune* building 150 feet from the Missouri River, we would wonder whether we were part of this monument. Obviously, number one would be: What are the chances of this passing? For that, we would be relying heavily on the Gannett News Service out of the Washington Bureau to try to cover that Washington angle. In Great Falls, one thing we'd like to know would be the boundaries of this, but at this point we probably couldn't get those. We would be looking at how the Missouri River Breaks Monument was established, and from that, we would look at how that might be applied to the rest of the state of Montana. From there, we'd be looking at homeowners who have land on the river. We'd be looking at ranchers with land along the river. We'd be talking with fishing guides, rafting companies, who would all be affected by this. We'd be covering all those layers. In Montana, it's not a matter of whether it would be a page-one story; it's a question of how many pages that second-day story would be in a special edition.

Marc Johnson: Tim Egan, Tom Kenworthy, Mark Obenhaus. Are you guys interested in that part of the story?

Tom Kenworthy: Definitely yes. That's one of the biggest parts of the story. You want to know what the reactions are. You have to go get them. They are spread out along a huge tract of land, so you have a lot of work to do. One of the hardest things about reporting out here is that it's such a big area to cover.

Tim Egan: To me, this is why I stay in the west and why I am a westerner. There are a lot of people who know a lot more about Washington than I do. I know practically nothing about what goes on inside Congress and how things are set up. I'm interested in what happens out here, and I'm always trying to show how what they do there plays out here. So I'll be honest with you. I know most reporters would be saying: Most of this monument is going to be great rafting and fishing, so you know that, at the end of the day, you're going to enjoy being there as well. Anyone who denies that is lying to themselves. You enjoy covering stories in areas that are spectacular. Who doesn't like to go to national parks to cover stories? I like to see the way history comes through and plays in these conflicts.

There may be a third generation rancher who has decided that ranching doesn't work and that a monument is the only way to save the economy in this dead county. There are so many counties in the west that are just emptying out now. They are just holding on by a thread. I'm interested in those strands coming out.

Marc Johnson: Senator Little and Sandra Mitchell. How do you get into this story? Sounds like Tim Egan is giving you a little bit of an opening here. Senator, what do you do?

Brad Little: I'd put Congressman Simpson's number on my speed dial because that's where it will play out. Then we'd start running the numbers on how many jobs would be lost and the fact that we will gain some rafters and lose a bunch of $12 and $14 an hour jobs. We'd ask how we were going to pay for schools.

Sandra Mitchell: As the newly-elected Senator from Idaho, I think this kind of massive land grab, this arrogant action is going to make the Sagebrush Rebellion look like a walk in the park. It's going to start a fight, and a true war on the west will begin. It's going to be a war. The first thing I would do is to begin to call the media, folks that are sympathetic and willing to listen to us and present our side of the story.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Manne, let's say for the sake of the hypothetical, you're running a timber company that relies on wood from up along the Lolo Pass, and under this new designation, lots of trees are off limits. Do you try to get into this story, knowing how it is unfolding?

Robert Manne: I would not try to get into the story. I would obviously start to do a pretty detailed analysis of the impacts that are going to be made on the 1000 or so employees that happen to work at our company, try to see where we fit into the total context of this matter, and then take a position on it at that time.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Shea, you have succeeded, though, in framing this story as about culture, values, preserving this legacy of Lewis and Clark. Does Mr. Manne's argument cut any water, and will it cut any water with the press, in your opinion?

Patrick Shea: Having done the job before we made the decision about the economic impact as we saw it, I think we would match him news release for news release, some of which would come from government, much of which would come from other groups, Bob's group and others. We probably would have a list of 150 different cities along the Missouri River or along the Salmon, Snake, and Columbia that we could direct the press to to interview people and let them see what the total picture would be.

I always remember the story Senator Hansen from Wyoming told. He was a county commissioner when President Roosevelt announced the formation of Grand Teton National Monument. He led a group of fellow commissioners into the Courthouse and took it over and held it for six days. He finally marched out, grazed cattle on the new national monument. He said, "It was the dumbest thing I ever did because that was the best thing that's happened to Teton, having it a monument and a national park." So there would be an ongoing dialogue; it's not a one-sided issue, but I think we would continue that discussion.

Marc Johnson: Rod Gramer, Mr. Strauss told us how he would cover the story in Great Falls. How would you cover it in Portland?

Rod Gramer: According to your map, the million plus people in Portland would be living in a national monument, so I think we would try to figure out how that would affect house prices. Seriously, we would try to get into the issue. We would do the hard top story on the announcement, but then we would fan out to determine how it would affect the Columbia Gorge, how it would affect the farmers, the timbering, everyone up and down the Columbia River. We would do sidebar stories on those effects. We'd really try to get down to the human level and talk about that. In our newscast you have to deal with stories in pieces, so we would try to do a town hall meeting where we would bring the stakeholders and the public together and get into the issue even more. Perhaps we would do a long documentary on why this monument is important, and what the tradeoffs are.

Marc Johnson: That big a story?

Rod Gramer: A huge story.

Marc Johnson: A summary question on this part of the program – Ms. Flora?

Gloria Flora: Excuse me for jumping in here, but you're forgetting about a certain segment here that is caught in the middle so frequently, and that is the public land managers on the ground. Not only are we not informed as to when and how this monument is being shaped, but we don't know what the boundaries are, we don't know how it's going to affect existing uses. No one has informed us what regulations will be in place, what activities will be grandfathered in and which ones will be excluded; how that will affect existing uses; who will fund it; how it is going to impact our limited distribution of employees. Yet, we're the first people the public asks: How is this going to affect my grazing permit? Often we have to tell them we don't know.

Marc Johnson: You just have to tell them that all you know is what you read in the newspaper.

Gloria Flora: That's pretty embarrassing when you are supposed to be the steward of that particular piece of landscape.

Marc Johnson: This hypothetical, if it has any value, is that it illustrates what a lot of folks in the west see. It's the point Congressman Simpson was making: a top-down decision made or – in the view of a lot of people in the west – imposed on the people who live here. Does it bother any of you national editors and reporters that that segment of the story, the story we're finally getting to here with Senator Little and Ms. Mitchell and Ms. Flora is that they have to work like the devil to get into this story. I think they would tell you that. Mr. Jennings, is that a fair criticism at all?

Peter Jennings: Not particularly, I don't think. Without getting into any psychobabble, I think what we're seeing reflected in this story, wiser people in my shop will come and tell me this, is a continuing part of the American process. Long before Ms. Murray and her person of the same sex went into the White House together – reporters cannot resist one-upping each other – there has been a realization in the media that the western story is a national story and that what happens out here, particularly when it comes to public lands, is a story in which, since the 1960s and the Endangered Species Act, has become of greater interest to people all over the country, which is why I said – and even Tim picked up on it very quickly at the beginning – this is a national story, not merely a western story.

SCENARIO II: ENDING GRAZING ON PUBLIC LANDS

Marc Johnson: Secretary Shea, you are a busy fellow. The Administration has decided that it had such success with its Lewis and Clark Monument designation that you've been isntructed by the White House to begin to develop a process to phase out grazing on the public lands. The notion is that, at a premium, the government will pay ranchers to get off the public lands. How do you start to develop that story for public consumption?

Patrick Shea: Process, process, process. You have several land groups in BLM and in Forest Service, citizen advisory groups; you put out requests for studies about the health of the land; you talk about ecosystem management; you make sure that all of the people on your team at the Department of Interior are on board. There is something here we need to point out. The Department of Interior has 70,000 employees, so when you are going to implement a policy, you pick a known group whose judgment you trust and work with them. Part of the process is that the people on the ground understand what's going on.

Marc Johnson: So you're not just going to come out with an announcement that says: Get the cows out of the creek. There are too many Cadillac cowboys, in Senator Simpson's phrase. We're going to process this over time to get the result.

Patrick Shea: If she-who-must-be-obeyed indicated that was the path, then I probably would make that announcement if I agreed with her. But if I'm asked what's the best way to implement that kind of controversial policy, and it doesn't have an immediate political gain as the national monument did, then I'm going to process it.

Marc Johnson: So you would just drip-drip-drip on Senator Little's forehead with drops of process water.

Patrick Shea: Well, I'd try to get some of the salve that Senator Simpson talked about.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Kraft. You're the national editor of the *Los Angeles Times*. Is this process a story for you?

Scott Kraft: Well, it certainly could be. I would hope the Interior Secretary would leak this one to us after the debacle that followed the last one, during which we fired our two environmental reporters. Heads rolled after we had to claw our way back into that story. This is a very important story for us. We consider ourselves part of the west and not just because the northwest is a playground for people in L.A., but because people in our readership feel very strongly about the environment, land use, etc.

Marc Johnson: Assuming there is a lot of process going on here, and it doesn't add up to very much that's very obvious. How do you start to piece it together?

Scott Kraft: It is a little difficult to write a page-one daily on this kind of beginning of a process. But it would be pretty unusual for this Administration, with this president with her electric car and stuff, to do this. There would be a political dimension; there would be an economic dimension; there would be a human dimension, the stories that Tim Egan talked about writing. I think we would want to go talk to some of those 25,000 permit-holders who would be facing loss of their livelihood.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Shea, do you call up your buddies in the environmental community, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Ekey, and say, "Here's what we're trying to do. How can you guys help us?"

Patrick Shea: I've had several breakfasts, lunches, dinners, and treks with them so that they know. Having been a major part of the election effort for President Murray in the beginning, they continue to be in sync with her policies.

Marc Johnson: What would you tell them you needed them to do, in terms of the press?

Patrick Shea: I would tell them that the press will be contacting them, that they need to make sure it is diffused out among their membership as much as possible, and that, with particularity in the states that will have the most public lands in the intermountain west, there be thoughtful people that these reporters can talk to.

Tim Egan: Let me jump in for a minute. There is an obvious second-day, third-day, third-month story here while process is going on. It's the why. The Administration has to answer why they suddenly decided to phase out public lands grazing. Is it because it costs the taxpayers? Senator Simpson said, in one of his few true comments in all the witticisms today, that if you want to make money from corn, put out another mailbox. They get 25 times what anyone gets in public lands grazing. So the question is out there: why are they doing this?

Marc Johnson: You've got the Secretary right there. Ask him.

Tim Egan: Well, state your case. Why do you want to put an end to public lands grazing? Is it environmentally destructive or what?

Patrick Shea: Science has indicated that overgrazing in areas in the west has had a significant impact on the deterioration of water quality. Water in the west is absolutely essential, and you can grow, raise, and take care of livestock in other places in the world much more efficiently than you can on lands that have now taken on different value.

Tim Egan: You would have to prove your case. Where is this happening? That's what reporters would be trying to do, flesh it out.

Patrick Shea: Right. I'd be taking you to a Nature Conservancy ranch in Wyoming where they continue to graze in ways that are healthy for the ecosystem, and we would have several different range scientists who could talk about what impact restoring these lands would have on water quality.

Tom Kenworthy: The Secretary will have to explain also, I think, how you keep open the ranches, the home ranches, the deeded ranches that are tied to these public lands allotments. For us at USA Today, this could be a great sprawl story, which we love.

Marc Johnson: Senator, are they asking the right questions?

Brad Little: Exactly, There are 420,000 square miles of public lands tied to 170,000 square miles of private land. I hope Secretary Shea takes them to Brazil where they are cutting down the rain forest to raise cattle. That would make a good story for Mr. Jennings program.

Marc Johnson: Let's stop here for a moment and suggest that Congressman Williams and Congressman Simpson, in a really Solomon-like bit of legislating, have struck a compromise on this grazing issue. They have decided that. based upon their research, maybe 50% of the grazing permit-holders would take a premium to be bought out. Another 50% don't want anything to do with it. They want to maintain their lifestyle, run their cows on the public lands as they always have. The compromise would make the buy-out optional. It has a good chance of passing in the Congress, and the controversy has gone away. You're going to get a lot of ink on that, aren't you, Pat?

Pat Williams: Well, as someone who, by this point in the story, has just spent a year trying to work with my constituents about the national monument, I'm actually pleased to have something to oppose this new president on. This is what I am going to oppose her on, but I am willing to compromise in the way that you suggest. One of the reasons I am willing is that I've noticed that almost all the cattlemen I know in Montana sell out to every quick realtor that offers them a good price. So I know they want to get the hell out anyhow.

I also know that my hunting and fishing people and the small businesses that make hundreds of millions of recreation dollars, particularly from flyfishing in western Montana, are eager to support getting the cattle away from the creeks and rivers. So I go to my friend Mike, and I say, "Let's agree with the new president and Secretary Shea to remove or attempt to remove, through willing buyer-willing seller perhaps, those cattle in those areas that are doing the most damage, not necessarily to the environment but – let's put it in different political terms – to the economy of the new west." Then it will work.

Marc Johnson: Will you get any press coverage on that compromise?

Mike Simpson: Sure. You'll get a lot of coverage locally, but not nationally.

Marc Johnson: Why not nationally?

Mike Simpson: You have to show the national people where Idaho and Iowa are and what the difference is between them. But you will get local coverage. Pat, who is my friend, and I have started working now on a compromise, one, quite frankly, that will work. The first proposal is the typical way that the government looks at something: "We realize that overgrazing causes a problem so our answer is: Let's eliminate grazing." It's not: Can we reduce grazing? Can we have grazing in a reasonable manner?

So Pat and I are working on a solution where we can get cows off certain areas and still keep those families that want to stay in ranching in a reasonable livelihood that they prefer. Those that want to get out of ranching because they are fed up with being sued every other day can get out of it.

Marc Johnson: But in our hypothetical here, this has ceased to be a story about the environmentalists knocking heads with the cowboys. It's become a story about the process of making government work better. Ms. Flora, do those stories get much coverage?

Gloria Flora: They tend to get much less coverage than the stories that deal with conflict. Collaboration is not quite as exciting because it's tiring, it's messy, it takes a long time, it doesn't necessarily come to a conclusion, there are no clear winners or losers. That doesn't generate a lot of excitement in the media.

Rod Gramer: This story would probably disappear pretty quickly, Marc, in terms of newspaper front page or lead story on the television news. There would be praise on the editorial pages, however, where common sense, collaboration, and working together do get rewarded. That is where people like Mike and Pat would get recognized for their efforts.

Marc Johnson: Mark Steele, in the *Caribou County Sun*, you're going to carry Congressman Simpson's release about this compromise, aren't you?

Mark Steele: You bet. I'd take it a step further, though. Is it based on good science? Is taking animals off the land good science? I'd be asking my Congressman to have the National Academy of Science prepare a white paper on whether grazing is good, bad, or ugly and at least trying to forestall what would be a disaster to our neck of the woods. You can have all the $5/hour tourist jobs you want, but they don't replace the home ranches.

Robert Strauss: The 50-50 compromise brings up a whole new set of process stories. I guess number one would be: How is this 50% going to be determined? You talked just a little about it.

Marc Johnson: You're picky; you want the details of this.

Robert Strauss: Is it going to be just those who are willing to sell out at the lowest price? If that's how it is done, perhaps those who are selling out are the best stewards of the land. The ones who remain on the land may be the ones whose permits they want to revoke.

The other question is: Is the government going to determine that? Are they going to go into the ranches to see whether they are good stewards and are properly taking care of the land? If they are not, would the government make that determination and force them to sell their permits? If so, there would just be rage throughout the west.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Kraft and Ms. Roberts, before we move on to the next segment, the point illustrated by the hypothetical at the end is that it's easier to cover the conflict than it is to cover the process of working out the messy details of the compromise. Is that a fair criticism?

Katy Roberts: No. I've worked with Tim Egan for fifteen years. He grew up in Spokane, so he certainly knows where Idaho is. He has made a fine career out of being optimistic about western issues and has made those stories sexy – the collaboration stories, the compromise stories. We have strong competition from USA Today and from Tom Kenworthy, who has done wonderful work in Utah. We would expect him to be in the fray, too. The same with the Los Angeles Times. I think it just means the people aren't really reading the eastern press.

T**im Egan:** I think that's fair. Conflict is news, of course, but a compromise like this would be news, too. It would also open a lot of avenues for reporting, ones that I think our readers would be interested in.

SCENARIO III: CONFLAGRATION AT GLACIER NATIONAL PARK

Marc Johnson: Amidst all this discussion about grazing fees and national monument designations, we're into the first summer of this new administration. Mr. Barbee, you're smiling.

Bob Barbee: I just know what's coming.

Marc Johnson: Fires have blown up all over the west. Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Arizona, Colorado – big fires. But the BIG fire is in Glacier Park. You're the superintendent. Deja vu all over again. They're coming. Why aren't you protecting the grizzly bears? What about Lake McDonald Lodge? You don't have time for this, do you ? You're fighting fires. You're protecting property and lives. How do you deal with this onslaught?

Bob Barbee: Well, you apply for emergency leave. After that's denied ...

First of all, you realize that you're the superintendent, you're the manager. You're not going to be out there personally fighting the fires. We probably have the best fire fighting institution in the entire world, and they're going to be doing that. So once you agree with the fire commanders about what the values at risk are here and so on, your job is try to somehow manage the public relations aspect of this whole enterprise, and that is a daunting task.

You want to assure the public that everything possible is being done to get control of these fires, that the resources are available, and that this is the top

priority fire in the entire nation. You discuss the number of firefighters, helicopters, tankers, etc. that are available. Then, it's particularly important that you have props, so to speak. You have town meetings, you have graphics for the media to explain what's going on, and you make sure you have people that can do that. You'd better have a good public affairs person on your staff or several of them.

Marc Johnson: Don't you have to do most of that? You have to talk to Kenworthy. He's come up from Denver to cover this fire.

Bob Barbee: Certainly, I would talk with him, but if it's a huge fire, there may be 100 or 200 reporters there. You can't talk to all of them, but you can have press conferences and talk to a number of them. A really important thing is that you stick to a single message here: What you are trying to do is everything possible to get the fires under control and that you have the right people to do it. Don't garble up the message.

Marc Johnson: Good story, Tom? Are you going to get on a plane and fly up to Kalispell?

Tom Kenworthy: Yes. Because it's Glacier, it's a good story. The first thing I would do is call my desk and tell them our Seattle correspondent can't possibly cover this story, that I worked two summers in Glacier when I was in high school, that I know the ground.

Marc Johnson: When you get on the ground, what do you want to know from Superintendent Barbee?

Tom Kenworthy: I want to know what resources are at risk, what the fire behavior is, what the terrain is like, what the weather report is...

Marc Johnson: It's a breaking news story, a spot news story, a disaster story. That's what it is?

Tom Kenworthy: Yes, in that situation, you're going to do a spot news story immediately, but you're going to be right away thinking of followup stories after you get there. Fire stories, in many cases, tend to be very much the same. You have to use them to explore larger issues. How has federal policy changed since the Yellowstone fires of 1988 in terms of fighting fires in national parks? What does it say about forest management in the Flathead National Forest, which is just outside of Glacier and also at risk? You try to explore these larger things.

Marc Johnson: Assume for the moment that your editors are saying, "Tom, we've been covering these western fire stories every summer for the last ten years. Give us something new." Do they do that?

Tom Kenworthy: Yeah, yeah. They are tired of this story unless it's Los Alamos burning or Show Low, Arizona burning.

Marc Johnson: Or unless there is a big screw-up?

Tom Kenworthy: I was on the Clear Creek fire in 2000, and a hot shot said to me, "Ah, it's just country." That's the attitude of our editors sometimes. They say, "We've covered this story." So you have to come up with a new angle, and for me, it would be: This is the first test of the National Park Service's fire policy since the 1988 Yellowstone fire.

Marc Johnson: Mark Obenhaus, is this a great television story?

Mark Obenhaus: I think it's an old TV story by this time.

Marc Johnson: There are flames everywhere. The national park is burning up.

Mark Obenhaus: The drought has persisted, I imagine, and I think it's probably a story we have seen and seen and seen. If there is something new in the strategy for attacking the fire, that would be noted. But I don't see where you go with the story unless there is some aspect to it that is revolutionary in the way they are fighting the fire or in the use of new science or something like that. Otherwise, it's fire after fire after fire.

Marc Johnson: Are you going to over-ride him, Mr. Jennings?

Peter Jennings: A little bit I am. NBC is running the fire every night, and they have great pictures.

Marc Johnson: It's an excuse for Brokaw to go to Montana.

Peter Jennings: No, Brokaw would not go because he thinks it would make him look too much like Dan Rather. But I would be pushing Mark because, first of all, there is all this new awareness about the west because of the Lewis and Clark Monument. I would be pushing him to talk to Tom, among others, as we always push visiting correspondents to talk to good local

correspondents. We need to have a new angle time and time again because it isn't "just country" to people in many parts of the country. You have to keep pushing all the time to find an angle that involves the country as much as possible.

Marc Johnson: Mr, Ekey, are you going to get in this story somehow?

Bob Ekey: Yes, I think this is a great example of how media coverage affects policy in this country. When you have fires going, there is not a fire video used that doesn't have crown fires and 200-foot flames shooting up. When that's on TV every night, there is a lot of emotion that swirls around fire, a lot of fear that people have. There are two fire cycles: a natural fire cycle in which, every other year, we have big fires due to drought, etc., but there is also the political cycle of fire. After a whole summer of being inundated with these big flames and videos of that and of people's homes burning, the farther you can get away from that when the policy debate starts, the more reasonable the policy debate is going to be. It always seems as though these fires come on election year – 1988, 1990, 1994...

Peter Jennings: There's a story.

Marc Johnson: Good planning, Secretary Shea.

Patrick Shea: Quite frankly, one of the things that Secretary Babbitt, who usually refers to it as the Great Kabuki Dance of Washington, said in 1997-98, "We need to get the fire people out of Boise to explain to Congress that we need more funding." Fire is not just about fire. It's what precedes it and what follows it. So he saw this, and I believe, too, it is a great opportunity to educate people about the whole ecosystem. One of the reasons we have this problem is the policy of suppression. So this was an opportunity to make a significant policy change with a natural reality: fire.

Pat Williams: Peter Jennings said, "Now there's a story." I think there is a different story here, and, having been in Congress and going through the fires of Yellowstone, I think that raises in my mind the fact that there is a new story here, rather than just the old story about fighting fires – how it's best done, and how much it costs. The new story is how the west has changed since 1988, how people's understanding of fire as a natural event has changed.

A further but related story is the political culture of western politicians, and that is, how is it they get re-elected so often with such high numbers in a place that is in such transition. The *New York Times* the other day, in a lead editorial, used a quote of mine: "The only thing that burns hotter than fires in west is the political demagoguery of western politicians." It's sad, but it's true, and it ought to be a story.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Barbee, someone said this morning that the reporting generally on this fire subject is getting better, the reporters are more intelligent about it, they understand more about the nuances. Is that your experience?

Bob Barbee: Oh, I think so. I didn't pick up a paper last summer or the summer before, during the hot fire season, and see a lead story with a headline that says, "National Park Service has just ridden a flawed policy to hell." That really gets your attention. You don't see that kind of thing anymore; at least I haven't seen it. They deal more with what it's going to take to control the fire, how extensive it is, how many structures are being lost. I haven't seen a lot of scapegoating. I haven't seen a lot of attempts to try to target an agency or an individual for somehow being the cause of all this, with the exception of the Cerro Grande fire, the one that burned up half of Los Alamos. That would be a really tough one, to be the superintendent of that park. But I haven't seen that kind of high-octane hyperbole in recent years.

Marc Johnson: Congressman Simpson, is the reporting getting better on this subject?

Mike Simpson: First of all, I want you to know that the compromise on grazing between Pat and me has just come to an end. It's all off the table.

Yes, I think the reporting is getting better. In regard to the 2000 fires particularly, when Congress appropriated $1.8 billion of additional fire monies, I think one of the stories would be: How is this money being spent? Is it actually doing any good? What are we doing with it? Are we really protecting this wild-land/urban interface that we talk about about? How is it affecting people on the ground? Are we reducing the number of catastrophic fires? Can we actually do that? That's a big question. We've had hearings on it in Congress repeatedly over the last couple of years with the Forest Service, BLM, the Park Service – all talking about it.

I'll bet there are not very many reporters here aware of it, but before Congress adjourned just before the elections, the Republicans and Democrats, who are often at opposite ends on this, were very close to a compromise on fire management. It was based some-what on what Senator Daschle did on the appropriation. That was never reported on; obviously, it never passed.

At the last minute, it broke down because of the election, but we're going to get back to that. But it was very close to passing, and I bet not very many reporters know how close that was.

Brad Little: Marc, I have a question. What is the story about all the land that isn't burning, all the private timber ground, about the state ground? There is never a story about that. Does anyone ever add two and two together and say, "Why is it that this public land, which has all these myriads of laws over the top of it, all these interest groups taking care of it, keeps burning, and the rest of the land people are buying to hunt and fish on is not burning. Why isn't that a story?

Rick Johnson: It's been clearcut... and then grazed with Alan Simpson's sheep.

Robert Manne: I think nationally there is a gross misunderstanding about clearcuts, what's legal and what's not, and the whole concept of sustainable forestry. There is an educational process involved here.

Tim Egan: Well, the press doesn't write stories about banks that don't get robbed. We don't write the story about the airplane landing safely.

I want to say one thing about what drives the fire story. There is now 24-hour media. You have NBC, Fox, and CNN on 24 hours. They need to fill this thing. I've noticed since these three came on and the fires started, they're on all the time, showing flames. I'll have an editor that hasn't asked me about fires all summer, working out on his or her stairmaster with the TV blaring, come back to me and say, "What's up? The west is on fire." 24-hour cable shows this stuff constantly. Everyone thinks the New York Times is at the top of the food chain, and we enjoy the position. But cable drives this visual thing. Wouldn't you say, Peter, that it affects you as well when it's on constantly?

Peter Jennings: Yes, it's a lot of pressure, and it's made more difficult in this particular case with this particular fire because it's out there. Sometimes you look up at the monitors and say, "I wish I had more time for this story." Then sometimes, you look and say, "Thank God I don't have that time to fill."

In the case of this story, in the wake of the Lewis and Clark Monument story, my company, Disney, which still owns ABC News, having got over its experience in the Virginia battlefields, has bought a huge amount of land out here...

Marc Johnson: The Lewis and Clark Theme Park

Peter Jennings: ...now that's pressure to cover a story!

Bob Strauss: Just one quick thing in regard to what Brad Little said. We had one reporter this past summer to analyze fires in Montana, and we looked at federal, state, and private land. We looked at reservation and non-reservation land to see whether we could come up with some kind of pattern where there were more apt to be fires. In the end, the conclusion was that the more people that live in the area, the more apt there is to be a fire. That didn't seem to be a great news story. In the end, that two-months' effort led to no news coverage because we felt it was too self-evident to come out with. We could find no pattern beyond that though we spent a lot of time looking at it and went through a lot of databases.

Brad Little: The philosophy of fires is different. The timber companies would all be out of business if they had the intensity of suppression of the federal lands. The only thing even close to that on timber land was Mt. St. Helen's.

Bob Strauss: I would say once the fire has started, that's true. I would agree with what you're saying once the fire has started. We were looking for some type of a pattern.

SCENARIO IV: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTESTERS

Marc Johnson: Mr. Manne, this Administration has been enormously favorable to the environmental community. Mr. Ekey and Mr. Johnson have had everything pretty much their own way since this new President came into office, but there are some in the environmental community that are just not satisfied. They want to push the envelope a little more. They are willing to take direct action, to protest. They're coming after you. In fact, you have some protesters that have chained themselves to trees on your ground in California. Kenworthy and Egan are dying to come onto your land. Mr. Gramer wants to bring a TV crew onto your property, private property. What do you do?

Robert Manne: First of all, you presented that as a hypothetical case. As a matter of fact, it's something I live with weekly. The first concern on my mind is safety. These are not just ordinary tree sits that happen in the case you're talking about. So going through my mind are three things: safety of our employees, contractors, reporters, etc.; the hope that they get the context right this time in their reporting, so it's a lot about who we really are and who the protestors really are.

As I think about this and try to put it in the context of this morning's speakers, I couldn't help but think we're sort of that story at Pacific Lumber that, once it

gets legs, it never goes away. Everyone in this audience, when they know where I'm from, has an image in their minds, based on what they've read. Not that they've been to the north coast redwood region of California, but they think that, from me on down, we're a bunch of greedy people that disregard the environment and that, for the last fifteen years, have been cutting the last of the old-growth redwood tree on the planet. I'm proud to say we're still not cutting those trees. So there is a chasm between the reality of who we really are and who these protesters really are.

When you say "protest", there is a vision in everyone's mind, probably, of people holding hands, blocking logging trucks, playing bongo drums, holding signs, and dancing. You're assuming they are local people. Usually they're not.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Gramer wants to bring a TV crew on your land. You want to cover this story, don't you, Rod?

Rod Gramer: I do, yes.

Marc Johnson: Why is it a good story?

Rod Gramer: It's a good story because these people are stopping the logging by sitting in these trees. They are pitted against the logging companies that want to log their own lands but can't because of these protesters. It's a good story.

Marc Johnson: Do you let them on?

Robert Manne: Yes, we consistently let them on with the hope that they will take the time to understand the facts and get the context of it correctly. In fact, on August 27th, a few months back, I got a call from the TODAY show, and they said, "Tomorrow morning, we're bringing a crew out, and we'd like to go on your land and interview a tree-sitter, sitting 160 feet in the air. We want to do that with or without the company spokesman." So, sure, I authorized it. It's fine; I have nothing to hide there. All I ask is that the total context be put into the story, but instead, when you only have a two-minute segment on the TODAY show, we wind up talking about whether we use herbicides or Roundup, what kind of debt is on the company – total nonsensical type of reporting.

Marc Johnson: So the story is getting missed. What's the story here? Mr. Egan?

Tim Egan: I may disagree with my other colleagues. I don't usually do media stunts. I don't think this is much of a story. It's a story for other people, but I would put it way down my list because it's a stunt. I just try not to be manipulated.

Marc Johnson: They're doing it because they know Mr. Gramer will show up with his TV camera?

Tim Egan: Well somebody will show up. I don't want to blame Mr. Gramer.

Rod Gramer: I disagree with Tim because there is a story here. At least Mt. Hood National Forest tree-sitters did stop a major timber sale and had real effects. The day that timber sale was canceled, one of the tree sitters fell out of the tree and was killed, so it was a story.

Jay Shelledy: I'll blame it on Rod because it's partially his problem because it's TV's problem. It's a very easy story to do. You go out with a camera, you get the signs, you go back in, and you have video. The problem is that you ought to go out and go after the issue they're talking about, and that isn't so easy, and it doesn't show up too well on the evening news. The fact is we have a very quick draw on protests. We go out, we take care of it, we don't even dig into why anybody happens to be protesting, or what the other side is. We don't go past the protest.

I will tell you one other thing, and it's related to Walter Dean's presentation this morning. I don't think there is an area out there where we don't lose control of our biases when it comes to protests. If we happen to agree, the protest takes on a little more meaning. If we don't agree with it – I wouldn't walk across the street for Brad Little's protest. On the other hand, with Rick Johnson, I would think, "Well, he wants to save the land. I might go cover him."

Robert Manne: Can I put a little context on protesting in the north coast of California, sticking it in with your hypothetical case? These are not some random do-gooder organizations; these are not local people; they are from all over the country. They are well funded; they are well trained. They know how to manipulate the media into a stunt to suck them into that kind of an environment. Some of the tree-sitters have satellite dishes on their platforms; they have cell phones, computers; and they know how to maximize their coverage. They use fake names; they are not Martin Luther Kings, using civil disobedience to make a point, because they evade the penalties.

Marc Johnson: Ms. Mitchell, what do you think of these protesters?

Sandra Mitchell: First of all, I think the greater story and the one that should be covered is when they actually cut a tree in any of our forests or on private

land anymore. It's true; it is very selective. We have been involved in protests, and the media refused to show up. So it's very selective. I don't think it's a big story. I think the fire story is an old story; protesting should certainly be an ancient story.

Rick Johnson: Sandra, you were involved in a protest in my parking lot weren't you? That was covered well.

Sandra Mitchell: No, I just happened to be there, but I did enjoy it.

Pat Williams: Protesters make life for politicians difficult because Mike's job and formerly my job is one of compromise. Sometimes people harden in their positions. I've come to believe this though. I live in a nation of extremes, so I've decided in my life that I will just pick one or the other extremes like this: I can pick the old-growth tree-sitter if I have to pick an extreme – and I do – or I can side with the old Anaconda Company, which created ecological catastrophe in my home town of Butte, Montana. I can take people hanging off a bridge in Missoula, Montana to protest energy hikes, or I can take Enron. So I'll take the tree sitter, and I'll take the kids that are angry about high electric rates. Because I have to decide one way or another. Then my job as a Congressman was to bring both sides together and try to find the middle.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Manne, this discussion illustrates the difficulty the press has covering protests, whether it's the shovel brigade in Nevada or Mr. Manne's tree protesters in California. How do you walk that line?

Tom Kenworthy: I'm with Tim. I don't do protests. I don't do events where I have to wear press credentials, and that's one of the joys of living in the west.

Peter Jennings: It's not their call, of course. Easy to say when it's not your call.

Tom Kenworthy: But it's essentially a manipulative situation, an artificial situation. It's a created situation, and it's superficial reporting.

Robert Manne: I want the panel and the audience to understand the reality of this hypothetical situation. It's gone beyond people sitting in trees. There are reasons why we scan our mail every day for bombs and things in the company. There are reasons that the FBI agency has been in our company recently because the number one domestic activity in our country right now, beyond the international terrorism, according to the FBI, is extreme environmentalism. Just on November 25th at a speech at Oregon State University, our company was mentioned by a man named Coronado, who just got out of jail after eight years for burning Michigan State University's Research Center, and he suggested that he was surprised that the buildings of Pacific Lumber Company were still standing. We're not talking about tree-sitters. We're talking about people who pull automobiles up to the front door of our building, lock themselves down, and scare and traumatize the people in the timber companies. These are not ordinary tree-sitting demonstrations.

Marc Johnson: Let me raise the larger question with the journalists here though. The question that a lot of folks in the west will grapple with is that a lot of times these protesters or the environmental movement generally gets the benefit of the doubt from you guys. Mr. Kraft? Fair criticism?

Scott Kraft: There is some truth to that. I think on the question of protests though, the bar is very high for what makes that a national story. We don't cover protests in L.A. unless there is some other thing that makes them news. In this case, that might be news because it is such a physical threat to the people who work there. But we don't go out and cover every protest by any means.

Peter Jennings: I think quite a lot has changed. First of all, I'd like to pay a compliment to Mr. Manne. I heard all of my journalistic colleagues this morning telling various corporations how to behave. If all corporate leaders behaved like Mr. Manne, he would get his story out a heck of a lot better. I think there is no reporter here who would disagree with the notion that the corporate individual who tells the truth and welcomes you in has an awful lot better chance of getting his story told than those who try to keep you out.

In terms of activism generally, as we're talking about what not to cover, I was thinking about the World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle because this is the real world in which we live. Whether the activists and the anarchists are a traveling circus all over the world, they are having an effect on society. For journalists, that is a story. We all have a high bar. I have a higher bar even now for environmental organizations. I tend to ask, first, what is an environmental organization? Are they environmental activists? They needn't be sitting in a tree to be environmental activists. Among good mainstream journalism today, print and broadcast, I think the bar is high, This will sound really corny, but I feel lucky to sit in the company of guys as good as this.

SCENARIO V: MANIPULATING THE MEDIA

Marc Johnson: Last scenario. Mr. Shelledy, Senator Little is on the phone. He wants to talk to you about a story. It seems that he has discovered documents that he wants to share with you. He has the goods about a real conflict of interest on a leader in the environmental community. Are you interested?

Jay Shelledy: Sure, we're interested in all documents. I take back what I said.

Marc Johnson: It seems that Senator Little has come across a memo written by a member of Mr. Johnson's family business. Not him, not Rick, but Mr. Johnson's family business. The document seems to show that the company has been dumping toxic waste illegally. Senator Little wants to give those documents to you, but he doesn't want his fingerprints on them. Are you OK with that?

Jay Shelledy: Not necessarily. We're interested in all documents. Whether it ends up in print is another issue.

Marc Johnson: We're not at the point of deciding whether it's a story yet, but he says, "I'll give you these, but don't trace them back to me."

Jay Shelledy: We have a very high standard on absolute anonymity, having spent 30 days in jail in this state on that very issue, I'm personally very sensitive on that issue. I would tell Brad that we'll look at the documents. At this point, there is no need to know that he gave them to me. There is no real need. I don't see why I have to tell anybody where I got them at the moment.

Marc Johnson: Brad Little, what kind of a deal do you want to cut with Shelledy to give him the documents? This is potentially a real smoking gun.

Brad Little: Since Rick lives in my district, keeping myself protected is very important because he has a big family, and they all vote. Jay and I go back a long way; I was one of the guys trying to keep him in jail longer. But these are good hard documents; they're not bogus. He's a good journalist, and if they are bogus, he will find out.

Marc Johnson: Let's assume the documents get exchanged, Mr. Shelledy, and there is something worth exploring there. Do you call up Mr. Johnson? Remember, the accusation is not against him; it's against a relative of his. But he is a big deal in the environmental community.

Jay Shelledy: I don't know how you can hold him responsible for one of his relatives. The fact is that we would take the documents and go further on the story, check it out. Your best sources are documents because they are genuine. That truly doesn't have any spin on it other than what the words are. But if we had it, went out, and found in fact that the documents were upheld, we would do the story. There might be a call, because of Rick's position, to let him comment on his no-account brother-in-law.

Marc Johnson: Is the story the toxic dumping, or is the story the fact that Mr. Johnson's family is accused of toxic dumping?

Jay Shelledy: Well, you'd like to say that the story is the toxic dumping, but there is a little that goes with it. That adds to the equation. I would tell you that there has to be toxic dumping first before we would even go near Rick.

Marc Johnson: It sounds like the *Salt Lake Tribune* is about to trash your reputation.

Rick Johnson: As Mr. Manne did, I'd like to take this and turn it into something real. I used to work for a national conservation organization, and my boss was clearing out, on his own property in Spokane, Washington, a septic field. The logger that did that work for him gave that to a guy with Intermountain Forest Products, who then gave it to Rush Limbaugh. I'll tell you what. It was a story. My boss at the time was one of the leading lobbyists on the spotted owl debate. "Enviro Clearcuts Land" story was nuclear in our office. We were getting the calls; it was completely BS because it was a septic field. At the same time, it was a story, and it started with Rush Limbaugh.

Jay Shelledy: But the story, if the documents prove out, isn't that you take part of it and then add some more to it.

Rick Johnson: Well, it's going to be a story.

Jay Shelledy: Yes, and you might be part of it, especially if we would have called you anyway, if it were somebody else, to get your reaction to what was going on. If he is someone we were going to call on a toxic dumping story, I would surely call him if the dumpers are his family.

Rick Johnson: What if it's a toxic waste dump, and we, in our environmental organization, take the high ground and go after the family member?

Jay Shelledy: I'm sure we'd cover that, too.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Egan, do you have any problems with this story?

Tim Egan: Well, now you're getting into the what Bill Clinton called the "politics of personal destruction." You're a long ways from the issue. We all get drawn into this stuff. We think we're covering the issue, and then someone is going to throw a bomb into the thing to try to destroy one of the leaders. You have to watch that you're not manipulated. I don't think it's that big a story. I don't think it's a story at all. I'd pretty much take Shelledy's position; I think he asked all the right questions. If he's the crusader against toxic dumping and the story is "Crusader Against Toxic Dumping Has Family Problems," that compromises his position possibly.

But again, the story has just been hijacked. Instead of our talking about toxic dumping, we're talking about this no-account brother-in-law.

Marc Johnson: Ms. Flora, what's your take on this story?

Gloria Flora: Well, it's reminiscent of what we were speaking about in the last scenario. There is a loud handful of people doing something that's reprehensible, but they are very vocal and visible about it. It tends to draw attention. That, in and of itself, depending on the context, could be a good thing because it could help to shut them down; or it could be a bad thing in that people like to take hold of those instances and direct the spray toward a group or groups that they think need to be sprayed upon.

To illustrate that, I think the remarks made about eco-terrorists, the subliminal message that you see in some stories is: Therefore, all environmentalists are secretly eco-terrorists and could break loose at any moment and do something heinous. Likewise, you can look at the anti-federalists anarchists in the Shovel Rebellion, which one of you mentioned. One of the invited attendees was later arrested for planning to blow up the largest propane storage tanks in northern California. Someone could take that story and say: Everyone who is anti-federalist secretly wants to blow people up.

Marc Johnson: Let's shift focus just a little and talk about whether all of you are confronting a generation that doesn't care very much about the issues we are discussing. Your way of reaching your audience doesn't get to them. Young people don't read papers, do they, Mr Kraft?

Scott Kraft: Well, some of them do. I'd say that is a problem. Readers of newspapers tend to skew older.

Marc Johnson: I'm going to bet you're struggling at the Los Angeles Times to make your paper more relevant to the GenX crowd.

Scott Kraft: We are absolutely.

Marc Johnson: Where does all of this discussion, then, fit into that effort. These are really complex issues.

Scott Kraft: They are complex, but the challenge is to make them readable so people can understand them. These issues are important to their lives, and that is what we do, especially in the A section of the newspaper. I think we've made more of an effort to appeal to GenXers and other younger readers in other sections than in the A section. We haven't twisted ourselves in knots to appeal to them in the A section.

Peter Jennings: The latter part first. People read newspapers and watch television when they are invested in it. I don't think I ever read a newspaper when I was young. I probably should have read one sooner than I did. I think all of what we've said about Drudge, the Internet, cable, and everything else has a real measure of truth, but I think what Mr. Shea says is more interesting.

I grew up in Ontario where media literacy is required in schools. I've done several stories on it over the years, so I thought it could get going here. You can't, much to my surprise. But I think the sooner we tell people how we screw with their minds, the better off they'll be as citizens.

Ironically, today we've been talking about the one subject that I think children are deeply engaged in. If you do programs with kids and you give them a buck and ask them to split up the buck to give to various interests, they almost always give it to the poor and the homeless first. Second, they almost always give it to the environment. So getting kids on the broad issue of the nation's environment is, it seems to me, a heck of a lot easier than getting them interested in other subjects.

Tom Kenworthy: It's obviously an issue for all of us in the business, how you keep your younger audience. I'm not sure that anybody really has an answer. My

newspaper probably stoops to a lower standard than some of the others represented here, but on the other hand, we all have very aggressive programs to distribute newspapers in the classroom. I was down in Phoenix two weeks ago, talking to social studies teachers, and they struggle with it, too. I struggle with it in my own house. My high school senior son doesn't read the newspaper very much, but thank goodness he has an economics teacher who insists that he does it. I just don't have any answers on this.

REMARKS BY NON-JOURNALISTS

Marc Johnson: I want to wrap this up, but I want to give the non-journalists on the panel an opportunity to have a last word. Sandra Mitchell, do you feel any better about the state of American journalism after this discussion?

Sandra Mitchell: I don't think it's a matter of feeling better. I do think that just because the new media is conservative doesn't mean that the old media wasn't liberal. I think the new media brings a balance to news coverage in this country that has been desperately needed for years. So I am thrilled and delighted to see Rush Limbaugh, Sean Hannity, Bill O'Reilly – all those people out there talking – because it gives folks a chance to see both sides of the issue. That benefits us all.

Pat Williams: Next to government – which, we have to remember, is all of us acting together in concert, not some far away alien entity, but all of us acting together in concert – the most important institution in America is represented by these good journalists here. Without the media, this country is not informed, and without information, you can't make the right choices. America has been fortunate in that its people and their elected representatives have, for more than two centuries, for the most part, made the right choices. For that, we can in large part thank the media and journalists, who work hard.

Bob Ekey: I agree with my friend Pat Williams that the media is currently important, and they should be flattered that there is so much interest and such high expectations for the media. There are high expectations that things be reported well and better than they have been. One big question we've had a lot of discussion about over the last decade is whether the corporate ownership of the media, the profit margins, the cutting of staff, and so forth prevent them from actually doing the job right. All these people here know what they would like to do. The question is whether they have the resources to do it. As citizens, we might want to be pushing the media to do that.

Bob Barbee: I feel pretty good about the media.

Marc Johnson: Of course you're retired now.

Bob Barbee: Always in an agency, there is a subculture. It's not some kind of a homogenous group of people doing something. We have our debates and radicals and all the rest of it. There certainly is a dissident subculture of people that are always trying to feed stuff to the media, and sometimes they are cultivated. But my experience has been, let them go ahead and do that, and the media has been more responsible all the time. They are coming to me and saying, "What's the agency position on this?" I feel pretty good about it.

Robert Manne: I have a few thoughts. One, I represent small-town America here, the town of Scotia, California. It has about a thousand people, and we call ourselves "behind the Redwood Curtain" because we feel quite deprived on a lot of things, one of which is access to good media coverage. The Los Angeles Times can't get there; the New York Times can't get there; so we feel deprived. Anything that they can do to get their publications into small-town America would be great progress.

Second, I'd like to invite any of these media members to come behind the Redwood Curtain on the north coast of California and show them the good things we really do.

Gloria Flora: I come away with a positive attitude about media, but I can't say I entered this discussion with a negative attitude. For the most part, the reporters I've dealt with are insightful, ask penetrating questions, and offer some interesting perspectives that frequently allow me to learn something.

Frequently, however, the issues we are dealing with are merely symptomatic of much larger problems, and we never get to the mega-issues, the larger, fundamental core problems, because they are very complex, and Americans have an aversion to complexity. I also find that, in rural communities, we have what I frequently call "future shock." Alvin Toffler defined future shock as the shattering disorientation and extreme stress that people suffer when change happens more quickly than they can adapt to. I think that all of us – urban as well as rural – are in some form of future shock, due to the speed of technology, technological developments, and the complexities that face us in issues like globalization and its effects on us in small-town Montana.

My focus is on sustainability, and I think therein we can start to find a foothold on understanding and solving some of these mega-issues. We need to ask ourselves, "What in this issue can we alter to make our activities more sustainable over time?" We also have a tendency to look at things in a very short temporal scale. We need to expand our temporal scale and to really examine this question of sustainability. If we're truly concerned about children and our grandchildren, we're going to have to face those issues sooner or later, and sooner would be a lot better for everyone.

Patrick Shea: Two thoughts. It's paradoxical. We live in this flood of information, and yet we are not able to put the frame around it to understand it. From a policy perspective, I remember sitting in the Old Executive Office Building, having a discussion with some other policy people about the roadless policy. The first hour was really fun. It was focused on science. We were talking about the water degradation that happens from these forest roads and how we could improve it. As we came near the end of the meeting, I began looking around the table, and I saw two people I knew were going to go out and immediately talk to reporters, even though the premise of the meeting was that this was a discussion in which we weren't going to be talking about how to handle the reporters. Other people were going to do that.

In Washington, in Boise, in other state capitols, in Scotia, California, there are people now who are getting themselves in policy positions because they like the publicity, not the policy. One of the challenges for the media is how to figure out who is going to really articulate what the policies ought to be, not self-aggrandize or publicize themselves. When you had a Mike Mansfield, when you had Pat Williams – and I would say Congressman Simpson is of this quality – when you have people genuinely concerned about public policy, that's what you want. But the vast majority of the people I saw in the halls of Congress, as I was summoned to different meetings, were people interested in getting on Peter Jennings' show.

The real tragedy of our time is that, when my son heard that Mr. Jennings was going to be on the conference, he was truly excited. When I tried to explain to him that John Rawls [*www.policylibrary/-rawls/index.htm*], the outstanding philosopher of our time, died, it was sort of, "Well, OK." My job as a parent is to get him back to thinking about basic principles and ideas, but it's very hard. I do like the idea of having people understand from the media telling them, "This is what we're doing to your minds."

Mike Simpson: Well, actually, I've never had a negative view of the media. I agree with some; I disagree with some. I think it's good that we have more outlets, and more sources coming at us. People know we're smart enough to look at it and make up our minds on what we believe and what we don't believe. But there are a couple of things I'd like to touch on in closing.

One is that we in the west are the public lands states. I can't remember the exact figure. Something like 75% or 90% of the public lands are west of the Mississippi, and 75% of the people live east of the Mississippi. So we are greatly affected by those issues out here. We have a difficult time as westerners explaining those issues to the eastern United States. We've come to the conclusion that the only way we are going to make them understand how some of the laws affect us is to actually make sure that those same laws are enforced in the east. Quite frankly, in many areas, they are not. That's the type of story that we, as a western caucus, are trying to get out to the media because we think it's important.

Second, this is in regard to the scenario you presented to us prior to Rick's family destroying the environment, the one on protesters. We are protesters. That's as old as apple pie. We were protesters against England. I find it interesting that, on most of these protests, most of the reporters said, "That's not a story. We're not going to cover that." When it's covered is when it gets to be extreme, dangerous, buildings burn, doing damage, that kind of thing. I am wondering how much of the lack of coverage of legitimate protests on both sides of any given issue leads people to get more and more and more extreme in order to get the coverage. Do we cover sufficiently the causes that generate these protests? Or are we leading to more and more extremism by not covering them and by saying it's not a story? I don't know the answer, but it's a good question.

Brad Little: Well, I'm just amazed. I think Gloria is the person I agreed with the most as we've gone around this table. One of the problems is the profitability of the media entities. As we heard this morning, they've cut their research departments. These issues are complex. As a former board member of High Country News, where a feature story is about 7,000 words, the most radical environmental member of that board and I almost always agreed about the value of those stories, even though we came from totally different sides, because it was the whole story. It talked about the two things that Gloria alluded to, which are time – what's the effect over generations – and distance – what's the effect if you shut down coal production in Wyoming and move it

to Indonesia? Those two elements, which are very complex, are what the story is about, and it's very hard to get that story told, particularly in Peter's program. How long now, Peter, are you on? 12 minutes out of a half hour? Seems like there is 17 or 18 minutes of ads?

Peter Jennings: ...it takes a lot of research.

Brad Little: You've got them all laid off; that's why you can do it in 12 minutes.

Peter Jennings: Don't believe those guys you heard this morning.

Brad Little: I go to Pat's paper, to the Headwaters News where I get news. That's a secret. We don't want these guys to know about it because I'm getting the New York Times and the Salt Lake Tribune for free because I get it off your website. I get it every day. It's great stuff, and if you change the editor and I don't agree with him, I'll quit. But I like it right now.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Johnson? You've got the last word.

Rick Johnson: One of the challenges I think we have, those of us that work in the environmental realm, is that we represent thousands of people in our own organizations, millions nationwide. Many might not agree with everything we think but agree with a small amount. The challenge is that in a place like Idaho, we are often the only spokespeople for the environment. We are oftentimes the only ones really, truly trying to educate the public on conservation values – deep-seated, future-of-the-planet, biodiversity, energy development, clean air, clean water, wildlife, bedrock stuff – in this state. Frankly, since Cece stopped being Governor and we learned about his elk hunt every October, we don't hear from politicians the way we used to about the environment. We are not the good people to do that. Environmentalists are often their own worst enemy. We're frequently poor spokespeople; we're frequently shrill; we frequently fit the cliches that many try to give us. Yet, at the same time, there are folks like the ones in my organization, the Idaho Conservation League, that are working hard locally to get things done.

That story doesn't often get out because it's not as interesting. I do want to give the Idaho Statesman a plug. They put ten pages of coverage into the Owyhee Initiative, which is an effort to get something done. They put ten pages, no ads, into a very important issue on which we're trying to get something done. The west is changing, and the environment is part of that. The west has always been changing, from the very beginning, but the environment is part of that change as it has never been before.

I'll just close by saying something I say to many groups: Environmentalists are hell to live with, but we make very good ancestors.

Marc Johnson: Please join me in thanking all our panelists. We're going to take about a ten-minute break, and we'll come back and finish off this discussion today with Governor Andrus, Senator Simpson, Walter Dean, and Peter Jennings. Thank you.

DATELINE:THE WEST

December 6, 2002

CLOSING PANEL:

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Governor Cecil D. Andrus

Walter Dean

Peter Jennings

Senator Alan Simpson

Marc Johnson: Please come on back in and find a chair quickly.

We'll continue the discussion today about the media's impact on western public policy by calling forth these four gentlemen: Walter Dean, Senator Alan Simpson, Peter Jennings, and former Governor and Interior Secretary, Cecil Andrus.

If you have a question, John Freemuth has a microphone and will be circulating through the crowd, so we can get some of your questions quickly.

Senator Simpson, did you learn anything from all of that gas-bagging for the last couple of hours?

Alan Simpson: I thought it was excellent. It was appropriate; there was some feeling. It's my experience in these meetings that the longer you go, the more you get to the meat, and the more of the other stuff drops away. That's what was happening there. The last fifteen or twenty minutes, you got to the feeling world instead of the head world. It's all down in the gut, and it was very good. I thought it was great; I liked it.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Dean?

Walter Dean: I had a couple of reactions. First of all, I was curious. Did you all feel as though you were a part of this process? Did you feel as though you had a place in the discussions by the news people and the kinds of decisions they were making? Was there a place for you at that table? I sensed that, in some cases, there may not have been. That's the challenge for journalists: to make sure they keep a place at the table for readers and viewers.

Marc Johnson: Before you go on to your second point, what do you mean by that, "a place at the table for readers and viewers?"

Walter Dean: Our experience, as I said this morning, has been that, when we go into local television newsrooms, there seems to be a disconnect between the news people and the viewers. It seems to arise over the definition of what is news. The question is: How can newsrooms get a reality check from their constituents that they can use in making their judgments on which stories to choose and how much weight to give them? As it is now, we wait until we get research that says they either liked our broadcast or they didn't.

One question we're asking newsrooms: Is there any way you can mine your viewership not only for ideas about stories but also for ideas about what their definition of news is?

Marc Johnson: You had another point you wanted to make.

Walter Dean: On the issue of media literacy. We've done some study of media literacy. I'm less familiar with the Canadian model than with what I found on the Internet in this country. One of our concerns is that, in fact, too much journalism is being taught in terms of media literacy, which places journalism in sort of a cynical "buyer beware" attitude. Media literacy in this country grew out of the study of commercials. What are they trying to do to you? It teaches students how to de-construct journalism, which is proper. We would argue, though, that we need to also teach them about how to construct it. How and why is journalism built? How do you gather, verify, choose what facts to pass on, and how do you present that information in a way that's compelling and interesting? Our sense is that media literacy, in this country, looks too often at the cynical, de-constructing world instead of teaching people why and how to construct it. You don't need $100 million for

a printing press or a TV transmitter anymore. You can have your own website, and everyone can be a publisher.

Marc Johnson: Mr. Jennings, do you have any thoughts about what you heard from folks in the west who are represented on this panel?

Peter Jennings: I thought it was more interesting than what we're about to talk about here if we're not careful. Gosh, I sound like Alan Simpson.

First of all, I've heard and met some people I haven't met before. I really meant what I said on the panel. Reporters read people's bylines, whether they are photographers or other reporters. They want to know who is saying what. We want to know their backgrounds, their bios. So I knew some of these people just from their bylines. So I came away with the feeling that everybody was really on their game, paid very close attention to the game. But I thought the discussion was a little bit on the parochial side from the subject matter. I think there are a lot of issues in the west. I was surprised this morning about how much attention was given to fire.

Cecil Andrus: First, I'd like to express my appreciation to all of the people who came to Boise, Idaho. I was fearful when we set this up that Mr. Jennings and the others from the media throughout the world would think they had been sandbagged.

Peter Jennings: We did.

Cecil Andrus: That you had been put upon to defend the people east of the 100th meridian. That feeling was in the air this morning. It disappeared this afternoon. I agree with what Peter said about the quality of the people on the panel. I would hope that we leave here with a better understanding of both sides. Senator Simpson said it very clearly when he said we don't need the 100 percenters. They make sensational quotes, but they're not worth a damn to listen to or to work within making policy. What we need is to bring the two sides together. I saw that happening here today. A better understanding that this side isn't villainous; this side isn't disastrous. We recognize the other person's position.

I have to admit that I had never mentally focused on the business aspect of the national media, the impact of budgets. You only have so many people. You can only send so many people out on the road. We are pleading for you to understand us better, to know the background; yet when there is a sensational activity, the parachute concept takes place. I regret it, but I guess if I were an editor sitting at a desk and I assigned somebody to do it, I would say, "Get out there; get the story; get yourself back here, and get to work." We have to recognize out here in the west that that happens.

I am extremely pleased with what I thought was the coalescence of the different backgrounds of those here today. I would hope that our friends out of the immediate west will take away a feeling that we both gained a lot by being here. I know I have.

Marc Johnson: Questions, ladies and gentlemen?

Audience: I'm from Salem, Oregon. I'm the state editor there. One thing I did not see addressed during this conference – and I think it's been a failure so far – is the coverage of the growing diversity of the western United States, the story of immigration and how that is shaping this nation, especially in the west. I'd like to know from the panelists here why that isn't a bigger focus of national coverage and also why it isn't as big a focus as it should be in policy development.

Peter Jennings: Just do me a favor. I'm the only guy here that has to make a speech tonight. Don't blow it for me.

Alan Simpson: We won't. We'll be right there. Of course, we'll have had food and drink. Let me just mention in Wyoming that the largest minority group is the Latino community. People think it is the Arapohoe and the Shoshoni, but I don't think there are over 10,000 Arapohoe or Shoshoni on the Wind River Reservation. The largest group – it must be 10% – are Hispanic because of agriculture: sugar beets. It's very real. We had a wonderful seminar here, a PBS program on that issue. It's a real issue; it's new. Guest workers, permanent citizens. I won't go into it. It's like asking Noah about the flood to ask me about immigration. It's a marvelous issue, filled with emotion, fear, guilt, racism, bigotry, xenophobia, you name it. I've been through all the fires. They are worse than the Yellowstone fires.

Peter Jennings: Senator Simpson is right. It's one of the big and great stories of the west, which is immigration, both from internal and from external. As we saw in the wake of 9/11, a lot happened in Utah. We have a whole chapter on it in the book and on the nativist tendencies, which we've seen before in American history, with the waves of immigration ever since the 18th Century. We shouldn't be surprised at what we've seen before, but it's very very energizing in terms of the national development.

Audience: I just wanted to ask Peter Jennings to follow up on something. He started to say earlier, in talking about the one-two punch of the Lewis and Clark National Monument followed by the ban on grazing, that he was more interested in that in terms of a general trend.

Peter Jennings: I think I was just trying to follow along with the scenarios. As Marc will tell you, there is nothing worse than trying to do a Socratic exercise in which nobody follows along. But we are coming up on the anniversary of Lewis and Clark, and, as we know, the president is going to make a huge amount of news about it. I agree with Tim Egan, by the way, that Stephen Ambrose is only one source on the question of Lewis and Clark – though he is clearly a very popular one – and we're coming up on the anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase as well. A lot of stuff is happening in the west over the next couple of years, things that will make the west a hugely interesting story for us and for the rest of the country. I'm told – though I've not been able to track this down – that there is a new book coming out about Lewis and Clark, which will debunk quite a lot of the notion about how much they contributed to the Jefferson government.

Audience: I want to congratulate all those who put together this conference. I think the interchange between journalists and constituencies is terrific. I want to ask a question about the best ways to hold the media accountable for its performance. Media people are doing lots of things these days, which I applaud, in reaching out to viewers and readers, more letters to the editor, more op eds, more citizen panels, citizen members of editorial boards. Those are all terrific, and the work that Walter Dean, the Project for Excellence in Journalism, and the APME Cedibility Roundtables are doing is great.

There is another way that has been successful in many places: a news council. I am executive director of the Washington News Council, headquartered in Seattle. We are one of only three news councils in the United States. The other two are in Minnesota and Hawaii. There are news councils all over the world, and they have been very successful. We bring citizens and journalists together to engage each other in debates about journalistic ethics and performance. We also hear complaints about specific individuals or groups that have been damaged by stories and are unable to get satisfaction from the media organization. That's the first thing we encourage them to do: go and try to get a resolution if they feel they have been damaged. I'd like you comment on what you think of the news council model as a way to help solve some of the problems we talked about here.

Marc Johnson: Who wants to take a shot at that?

Peter Jennings: I'll get it out of the way right fast. The reason there is a news council in only three states is that the news media is very much against it. I personally am perfectly in favor of it. I think it's great whenever you can get readers/listeners and the business together, but in these three states, it is seen very much as a form of regulation. It's a bit like letting the camel into the tent; then you never get people out of your daily newsroom life. I'm actually surprised it's only in three states. I'm very much in favor of undertakings like the Project for Excellence in Journalism for people who are not in the media and who wish to have a stake in what the media does in a formal way.

Alan Simpson: Who was the cabinet person under Reagan from New Jersey, [Donovan] who said, "Who is going to give me my reputation back?" He was taken through the jumps by the media and the courts for years and was exonerated completely. Or Henry Cisneros. You could name all the fallen ones I've known who have returned from the fires, and – don't throw anything now – the media is the only unaccountable branch of society, and they always will be. We are all accountable to someone. They are a profit-making organization, more evident now than ever before. The pressures must be enormous. I see the pros – like this guy, Brokaw, and Copple – really are not comfortable. They can't say much, but how could you be comfortable when some jerk who is just interested in the bottom line is telling you to give up your profession? I watch the Neiman Center at Harvard and talk with them. We'd have visits between the Neiman Center for journalism, Bill Kovach, and the Institute of Politics, which I directed. Those were marvelous, searing discussions of their frustration. Kovach left the Atlanta Constitution because he was doing some stuff that impinged on Coca Cola. You don't mess with Coca Cola in Atlanta. He just said, "I'm out of here."

Peter Jennings: May I just make one point, Alan? There is tremendous business pressure, but don't forget, it is the Congress of the United States that decided to do away with regulation in broadcasting. It's not fair completely to say we are unanswerable to the public. To answer that gentleman's question, we are extra-ordinarily answerable. All you have to do is turn us off or change the dial or choose someone else.

Alan Simpson: Talking about accountability, that was his word. That's the troubling word to me. People ask me, "What is it you would do to curb or limit or restrict us? You're always hosing us, punching our lights

out, and all the rest." I said, "I haven't the slightest desire to curb or restrict you. I just tend to stick it in one ear and out the other. It's called the First Amendment." Then they flee to several phrases, usually with violin music. One is "the people's right to know." Well, it's the people's right to know the truth, not crap or rumor or innuendo. The other one is "the chilling effect." They've chilled us. They've run us like a morgue, in and out of the drawers. The chilling effect. I can tell you about the chilling effect. The other one is that wonderful one, "This letter is shortened." That's called censorship in any other league in time.

Peter Jennings: You feel better now. You got that out of your system.

Alan Simpson: Once I get a drink from old Cece, that tightwad, I'll feel a lot better.

Marc Johnson: Walter, what are you thinking as you travel the country about this question of media ownership, corporate influence, big money driving these really large corporate entities now? How is that affecting the credibility of the job they're doing, or is it?

Walter Dean: Well, from the broadcasters we talked to in local television, they believe that the FCC will eventually allow more or less complete deregulation, that a few strong broadcasting groups will survive, and that they will buy up everybody else. That will mean that there will be a few centers of where local news is provided, perhaps not as many as there are now in communities, but the thing we're struggling with is that we have all this news, but because so much of it's the same, does it really provide the public with what they need for a marketplace of ideas? The journalists are very frustrated. People got into the business because they said they wanted to make a difference, and they are finding that, as the statistics reflect, the average local television reporter now does almost two stories a day. They don't have the time or resources to do the kind of work they would like to do. That's very frustrating for them.

Audience: Thank you. I'm a recently deposed Republican legislator from Coeur d'Alene. Governor Andrus, I want to thank you for bringing up the issue of the Aryan Nation. I know this conference is about environmental issues, and I drove all the way down to be here. I'm glad I did. One thing happened here. The issue of the Aryan Nation was dropped with, "Well, we really can't do anything about it." But I would ask if you could find some way to help my daughter. She is a flight attendant and travels all over the world, but she refuses to wear her Idaho pin. Is there some way we can change that image that has been created?

Cecil Andrus: Let me take a shot at that and say to you that I feel the same pangs your daughter does about our reputation being tainted because of the activity of some irresponsible people who should not garner the spotlight the way they do. What can we do about it? It's up to me and it's up to you to point out to the other people that they are not Idaho. The Anti-Discrimination Law that we passed was one of the earliest ones. We have to face it. We can't rely on the media to do it for us. We can ask the media not to give them free publicity. If they want to talk about a parade that six of them are going to have, let them buy a full page ad in the *Idaho Statesman* and advertise it that way instead of giving them the freebies.

There are more of us who feel the way you and I do than the other way around, so you can feel good about that. We have to tell our story. Tell your daughter to give me a call. I'll tell her how to put her chin up and tell people what the truth is.

Peter Jennings: Can I just add to that? I'm the real outsider here. I come from the other side of the river. I haven't thought about Idaho and the Aryan Nation for ages. When it was happening, it was a story; it got blown out of proportion by some people. But I'm having a hard time imagining, having worked out here a little bit, that she can't go everywhere in the world representing one of the most beautiful dynamic new west and old west places. I don't get it. I think that's her, not us.

Alan Simpson: Let me just add a note. It was very painful for me to be in Washington when the Matthew Shepard murder took place with Wyoming every day in the press. The people of Laramie, hanging on the fence. What they missed was that – it came right during Homecoming – 600 people just came off the street, wearing symbols of tolerance and joined the parade. Football teams are supposed to be macho and anti-everything. They wore a tolerance sticker on their helmets for gays and lesbians. No one ever picks up stories like that. It's the strangest thing. Dallas was a bad place because Kennedy was killed there. We've kind of put that away. The Aryan Nation. Lord sakes, we live right next to these wonderful people. You have to go to Idaho to get to Alta, Wyoming. But I just say, "They buried the boy in Casper. Do you think they would have buried him in a hateful land?" That always gets them. It irritates the ones that are always trying to rub you up anyway. Then the other one is that we're not a group

of homophobes or screwballs, and you prove that. The Laramie Project is well worth seeing because it was a very balanced piece. It went on Broadway. They didn't know what would happen when it went there, but you just let them know who you are and who you're not. Be proud of your state.

Audience: I was reflecting on Walter Dean's comments. He said one of the only broadcasting entities that is growing in terms of its listenership is public broadcasting. To me, this has been a wonderful conference all day, but it's striking that a group that's absent here is NPR. To me, that's by far the most outstanding news organizations for getting into details, be they in the west or issues like education. My question is how much of your news do you four get from NPR or Public Broadcasting, and how important do you think that source is?

Peter Jennings: First of all, I'm not sure Walter is 100% correct. I hate to do that. It's true that the NPR audience is growing. I don't think it's true for Jim Lehrer's program in the evening. "Frontline" continues to be popular. I listen to NPR every morning. Every time I get a chance to steal a reporter from NPR – and I've stolen several over the years – I do it. I think that a lot of the jabber about its being unreconstructively liberal is just jabber. I think it is a fine news service. I listen to it every day, and I think probably Senator Simpson does, too.

Alan Simpson: We have it all through Wyoming now. It's the most popular of all media outlets.

Peter Jennings: And I think it's partly because in the universe of media explosion, with so much coming at us all the time, what we're looking for is context. I don't think of all the stuff we get every day as information; I think of it as data. So even on the evening newscast, you now find us striving, not always successfully, to be a little better at finding a niche in the media universe. The best way to go is context.

Audience: I'd like to have all four of you address this if you would. If there were one tangible action you could take or direct your entity to take, what do you think the national media could do to improve its overall coverage of the west, to give a greater understanding of its values and culture to the rest of the nation?

Walter Dean: I'd have more people stationed in the west. I don't know the situation at ABC, but CBS had to move McNamara down to Dallas. The more people you have on site on the ground, the better off you'll be.

Peter Jennings: I'm glad Walter clarified his statement this morning. ABC is stationed in the west. We have a bureau in Denver; we have a bureau in Dallas; we have bureaus in Los Angeles and San Francisco; we have a bureau in Seattle. So the west is pretty well covered by us. The one thing I always want to do when I go somewhere is put more stuff on the air from the place I've just been. I always learn so much. I will leave here, go back to my editor's desk. Judy Mueller, based in Los Angeles, loves this state seven ways from Sunday. I'm sure she'd be here within twelve hours.

Cecil Andrus: I think your question was broader than one station or one network. I think that Walter had it pretty close. It's a budgetary item for many of the media people. We've got to have them prepared to give their people some extra time in the western United States to learn the background of problems or stories or potential stories. They need to see firsthand what we see on a daily basis. But I understand why. It comes right back to the budgetary commitment that they may or may not make. ABC has made that commitment. The others are not quite as enlightened.

Alan Simpson: There is no politician alive who hasn't had that slingshot from the media. Cece had it. I'll never forget your final interview with the Washington Post. You said, "My God, I spent two hours with the person, and as I walked out the door, I made some cute western statement like you and I do, Simpson, and that was the headline of the whole damn piece." How would you feel if that were happening to you? I know that's corny but it's a good way to run a test. Run that little baby up the flagpole sometime.

Marc Johnson: Ladies and gentlemen, please thank our distinguished panelists.

Cecil Andrus: I just want to remind you that at 7:00 PM in this room, that wall will disappear. Mr. Jennings will be the speaker at 7:00 PM. Remember the books are on sale out front; stop and pick up your copy. We'll see you at 7:00 PM.

DATELINE: THE WEST

December 6, 2002
Boise State University
Student Union

EVENING PRESENTATION BY:

Peter Jennings
ABC World News

Cecil D. Andrus: Before I introduce Peter Jennings, there are a couple of introductions I would like to make. Before I do that, I want to express my appreciation to all the of the men and women who volunteered their services and time to help put this together. We've been working on it ever since Mr. Jennings was duped six months ago into saying, "Yes, I will be there." I think I caught him in a relaxed mood. He had just been out here visiting, and he thought, "Well, I can do something for that poor old bald-headed ex-gov." So here we are.

But before I introduce him, let me introduce two people. The first one was your First Lady for 14 years. She is my bride of 53 years, my wife, Carol. I think you understand that anyone who can put up with me for that period of time, particularly in the political field, deserves a medal. That's in lieu of a new stove with a hood.

The other lady is a new friend of mine, whom I had the pleasure of meeting today. Her name is Kayce Freed, and she is Peter Jennings bride. A great lady. She is a professional journalist in her own right and is a producer for ABC's 20/20 show. Kayce Freed.

For those of you that were here today, I hope that we benefited from the work that took place. For those of you here for the first time this evening, welcome. We appreciate your attendance. The day has been long, and I will not hold Mr. Jennings too long tonight, but I do have to tell you that he has, without question, one of the most impressive journalistic careers in the world. He covered civil rights from the American South to South Africa. He was in Viet Nam. Anyplace in the whole world over the last 35 years that needed covering, he was there. He did it well; he has received more than 14 Emmy Awards, several DuPont Awards, Overseas Press awards, and a George Foster Peabody Award. He currently, as we know, communicates with each of us every evening and with hundreds of millions of other men and women throughout the world as the senior editor and anchor of ABC World News Tonight, the flagship of ABC News.

He has just completed and published his most recent book, *In Search of America*, which is available for purchase as you leave. I could go on and on and tell you more, but he says, "Don't." Wait a minute, Peter, you've never been Governor here.

Ladies and gentlemen, our distinguished guest, and a man who has been very generous with his time today to visit with us: Mr. Peter Jennings.

Peter Jennings: Well, "duped" is about the right word. I didn't realize how much trouble I was in, Governor, until I got back to the hotel this evening. We had about an hour to dress, and my wife said to me, "Darling, happy anniversary." So you think you can get away with a new stove. Man, I am in deep trouble.

I want to beg sympathy from all of you. Seriously, how would you like to follow Governor Andrus? How would you like to give the evening speech when the luncheon speech was given by Senator Alan Simpson? I feel a little bit like Bob Barbee when the wildfires were coming to Yellowstone, and thousands of journalists were descending on him. When someone asked, "What did you do?" He said, "I asked immediately for emergency leave."

I want to thank you for inviting me because I really had wanted to come. Marc, I must tell you I did think I was going to come and learn, and I did learn some today. But you forced me to think about the west and about journalism.

I was quickly cast today as an eastern urban journalist, even though I was raised in rural Quebec. I did come to the conclusion that it is a good deal more complicated in both modern and historical terms than I had ever imagined. I had not, in all fairness, given enough thought to the west, at least in your terms. Today confirmed for me – in listening, not only to my fellow journalists, the great majority of whom are based

in the west, but also to various people representing other agencies here – that there was even more to learn, hour by hour, than most of us imagined.

And I was very taken aback when I found out that I had been invited to make a solo flight this evening. But with your indulgence, I am going to take it as something of a challenge. I know my way to the airport; I know the quickest road out of town.

It is clear by the title the Andrus Center has given this gathering that some of you in the west believe that we unfortunates that reside elsewhere do not understand you or at least are not sympathetic to what is rather generously described as the "western point of view." So given that I am the editor of a national program, I thought it only fair that you should hear my impressions of your neighborhood. You may think when I finish that I require re-education, and if so, I will welcome the opportunity.

It is true that the national media is an eastern enterprise for the most part, the Los Angeles Times and the Disney Company, for which I work, notwithstanding. I was again reminded – listening to, among others, Tim Egan from the New York Times, who is a Pacific Northwesterner – that it doesn't always matter where your news institution is if you have good reporters on the ground. But I do have to tell you that I do not think of myself or the news establishment as being unsympathetic to the west. We are not, as far as I'm concerned, in some longstanding feud about history and values out here. I think we would all agree that the meaning of the American West is a vital part of the overall American identity.

So where to begin. Well, as an academic undertaking, I at least settle partly on the concept of this region as it was laid out by the great midwestern narrator of western history, Frederick Jackson Turner. You'll find him mentioned in our Century book and also in our current book, *In Search of America*, for obvious reasons. Turner's thesis on the significance of the frontier in American history is very simple. What made Americans was the existence of free land in the west, and it was the settlement of the land and the connection to nature that made Americans egalitarian and democratic. It was Turner who helped to develop the whole notion of "the pioneering spirit." His famous speech, which didn't become famous until long after it was given in 1893 in Chicago, gave rise as much as anything at the time – with one exception – to a measure of romanticism and penchant for optimism that are still, I think, central to the overall idea of American self, the sense that the meaning of the country was established by those trail-blazing people: the homesteaders, the trappers, the cowboys, the gold-rushers – an independent people, uniquely bold and self- reliant. A rough and violent people in many ways, honed by their confrontation with the Native Americans, with Mexicans, and by the frontier justice that their independence demanded.

As Teddy Roosevelt said of Turner once, "The frontier is what made the United States into a nation, and Turner brought many things together in a simple and straightforward way." In other words, you could argue – and feel indelibly proud, given your background – that the frontier made Americans into Americans. It is but a theory, I agree.

It is interesting that while Turner spoke on that particular day in Chicago, down the street and getting far more attention, Buffalo Bill's Wild West and Congress of Rough Riders Show was contributing to the myth of the west as a band of rough and tumble individuals who tamed the land singlehandedly. I note that many historians of the west describe Buffalo Bill as the "other great narrator of western history." As I said, he certainly got a lot more popular attention than Turner ever did.

Richard White, who is the western historian at Stanford, said that Buffalo Bill got such a hold on the American public because he played to what people already knew. These were, after all, 19th Century people who had grown up, much as we did, on stories of Indian attacks, Indian slaughter, and brave white men and women overcoming hardship to win the land. Buffalo Bill could claim to be part of that, and he re-enacted it all across the land and in many other lands in dramatic and predictable ways.

I do accept the notion, as many historians have written, that myths about the west seem to stand for America in ways that myths from other parts of the country do not. We talked a little bit today about the South. The west, I think, does still stand for America's future. The log cabin, for example, is about progress, starting low, and if it has meaning, as it did for Lincoln and for Henry Harrison, you end up high.

I am somewhat puzzled at the tendency here in the west to be anti-government and even to only reluctantly acknowledge that the federal government and western development are incontrovertibly together. Without the government, western development would have been so different. I made the short and obvious list. Without the Louisiana Purchase, without the Mexican War, without the railroads, and certainly without what the government established here during World War II – the western defense industries, the research institutions, the western military bases – surely the west would have been very different. An objective person would argue that it would have been a much poorer place without the federal government.

Now the program for this conference, as described by the Governor, says the west is the "region between Denver and San Francisco." I'm always struck by not always knowing exactly where the west is. But I do – and you're hearing the impressions of one editor – think much of the Pacific Coast has ceased to be "western." Moreover, I think that some coming to this conference might even have taken issue with the eastern boundary. Is the Panhandle in Walter Dean's home state of Nebraska no longer a part of the west? or the badlands of Wyoming? Andrew Jackson, as historians know, was the first western American president, and he came from Tennessee. Henry William Harrison, though he only lasted a month in the presidency, came from Indiana, which was certainly a frontier in the 19th Century. I thank you, Governor, for having given me a chance to get a fuller picture of the west.

In our search for America and in preparation for understanding the west better over the years, of course I have come to appreciate that Thomas Jefferson played a huge role because Jefferson believed that man and nature were inseparably linked, tied to the soil, and therefore integral parts of God's benevolent design. We're about to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, sent by Jefferson. I think when we do celebrate it, as the President unquestionably will in very full fashion because he has already said he will, it will be not only a fascinating experience for all of us in the country because Lewis and Clark have become so nationally interesting to people but also because we're already beginning to get some hints from scholars that while their journals have been celebrated as factual in their quality, we may yet discover – and I am eager to discover – whether in the fullest sense they do not add to the romantic elements of the national history.

For those of us in the press, I really do agree that treating this region responsibly demands responsibility. I was somewhat puzzled today by the emphasis on some issues that we discussed and the lack of emphasis on others. It strikes me, as a visitor to this beautiful part of the country, that there are promises and problems here that do not always match the popular legend. In some respects – and I'm not sure you'll all like to hear it – this vast landscape is not so different from many other parts of the country, despite what I do think are some persistent efforts at myth-making by many westerners.

Grumble, grumble, grumble. Even from New York City, we can see that this is a new place in many ways with startling features and dynamics that are bound to disappoint a popular culture if that culture is addicted to the rich and homey vaudeville that made Buffalo Bill a millionaire.

To create *In Search of America*, the book and the series of films, we traveled the country in search of contemporary stories that would help us shed light on the deeply-rooted attachment that I think all Americans have in some way or another to the founding fathers' concepts as they were embodied in the Constitution. We came to Idaho to focus on states' rights, knowing, as do you, that the 10th Amendment to the Constitution is as controversial as any because it has to do with the argument that you're always having out here: the relationship between the federal and state government. We chose to focus on the federal government's decision to reintroduce the grey wolf on these public lands, which so many Idaho ranchers believe are essential to their livelihood. I made some very good friends while I was here, and I'm glad to see that some of them have had the courage to come this evening.

Our broadcast turned out to be controversial for several reasons. Part of my education in the process of making it and writing the book was to learn that the rugged individual story of the west was actually inadequate. Without the federal government, we would not have the west as people understood it. After all, though we don't like to admit it in this neck of the woods, the federal government also took care of the Native American problem by relocating them, built the water supply, provided endless federal subsidies and programs that helped the west develop. In short, you could make an intellectual argument at least that the west is the overwhelming story of government. How could it not be when government owns or administers most of the land between the Pacific and the eastern slopes of the Rockies?

I know that there is widespread animus in the region toward the federal government, but I question whether we shouldn't think about whether perhaps that is rather hypocritical. The people of the American west are uniquely dependent on the aid and ministrations of the federal government, and it's worth considering at all times.

In the last several weeks, when Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana each voted to designate the wolf, so recently returned, as a trophy game animal in some forest areas and as a predator in the rest of the state, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service promptly told the states they had gone too far too fast. I was surprised that anyone was surprised because the widespread support in other parts of the country for the Endangered Species Act is not going to suddenly evaporate. Whether it is a threat to the coho salmon in the Klamath Valley, the spotted owl, the federal government's wildfire policy, which we talked about today, highway restrictions, or snowmobiling in the national parks, increasingly, I think, you should know that Americans in other parts of the

country take very seriously the idea that this land is their land, too.

As someone said in our earlier consultation today, the public land is out here, and all the people are out there. As a journalist and as an editor, for your benefit and for the country's, it would be a shame if we in the media were to become stuck in the historical phantasy and focus solely on the west as a museum piece from the 19th Century.

Besides which, it seems to me that the frontier is very much alive and a heck of a good story. Think about it in this line. Writing at the turn of the last century, Theodore Roosevelt wrote that Kentucky had become a state when that was the frontier in the 18th Century, and less than 1% of its residents lived in anything that could be called a city. Less than century later, Colorado was the newest state, the frontier revised for the 20th Century, and a third of its citizens lived in Denver. The city was growing just as fast as its counterparts in the east.

Somebody gave me a wonderful present this evening, which I shall treasure, Governor, a lariat, and I appreciate it. On it is a card that says, "Idaho is what everyone was and what everyone wants to be." Mark Steele, a good local journalist wrote that. At the same time, I noticed in Boise County, there on the front page of the paper today, that you're burning more wood than almost any other county in the state, up 21% when it's down everywhere else. I thought, "Is this what Idaho really wants to be?"

Your cities are now vitally important to the region. These are the fastest growing cities in the country, and they are straining for lack of water and schools and other public infrastructure. Some of these are problems that will never go away, and that, I have to tell you, for us in the media, is a very important story.

In business, you know so much better than I – I wish I were talking to a totally strange audience – Idaho's traditional economy of agriculture, mining, and timber is giving way to tourism and technology. Idaho and Wyoming are tied as the fastest-growing states for businesses owned by women. New ideas for business in general get started here. Can it be coincidence that Southwest Airlines, the innovative company that seems best poised to survive the industry's current catastrophe, began as a carrier in this region?

Intel is a great story about the inward migration in the west. Ironically, Intel is moving to the west by moving east from Santa Clara, California. In the last couple of years, Intel alone has put billions of dollars into chip-processing plants in Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. In part, Intel was attracted by low taxes. In time, given the budget deficits in virtually every state in the Union, I wonder whether you won't pay a price for that. Intel for us is also the story, as it should be for you, of an industry straining your water resources.

Internal immigration in the west, I think, is a huge story. In the past ten years, almost two million Californians moved east in your direction. In 1993 alone, more than 11,000 Californians changed their driver's licences to Idaho. Only six people did the reverse. Most of the new residents have moved to the cities, to Tucson, to Phoenix, to Las Vegas, and to Salt Lake City. A significant number have moved to the smaller cities of Boulder and Albuquerque. In the past ten years, I do not need to tell you, Meridian has more than tripled, and most of the people in Meridian and these others are new to the region.

We had a wonderful representative today on the panel from the Salt Lake City newspaper. Three months after September 11, on December 11, the U.S. attorney in Utah decided to prove that the airport was safe because the Winter Olympics were coming up. So he conducted a raid. They picked up 269 people, 69 of whom were illegal Mexicans, who had some totally minor access to secure zones. One of the women in question became one of our central figures in the book. She was the manager of the Ben & Jerry's at the Salt Lake City Airport, and she traveled a little way through a security zone every day to get supplies. Utah woke up the next morning to realize its dependence on the illegal and legal Latino population in Utah. Senator Simpson has worked profoundly on this and talked about it again today. Utah had to deal with the fact that, in America, in this nation of immigrants (I was one of them almost forty years ago.), it relies on new immigrants who will do what other Americans will not do. It is a crucial and central part of the national character and is how the country develops. When Utah woke up the next morning to realize how dependent they were on their immigrant population, they really were, I think, profoundly shocked.

It was nice to remind the editor today, as he talked about trekking across the west, that when the Mormons left, first New York and then Illinois, to go the Great Salt Lake, they were actually illegal immigrants. They arrived in 1847, and it was not until 1848 that the treaty to settle the Mexican War was actually signed. It's a story to remind us of who we are. Whether they move from California or the Midwest, Americans moving to the mountain west tend to be substantially wealthier than the people who are moving in the other direction.

This is going to change your region and be a story for us. As Wallace Stegner once said of California, "You in the west are getting to be almost like America, only more so." That is a story for us. And I haven't even touched on the native population.

It strikes me that the persistence of native peoples in the west would surprise a visitor from the 19th Century. Even the Indians' best friends at the time, I am told, never believed that they would survive the century. They believed that they would die culturally if not physically. Today, even as I see in this audience and certainly at this university, they are living proof that centuries of history here are still connected to the American West.

Finally, because the Governor told me I had to answer questions, which means to stand even more deliberately for what I've had to say, I do understand, as one of these guys from the east, that you cannot understand history without understanding the myths because people do not mold their lives to what actually happened. As Clyde Milner writes in the *Oxford History of the American West*, the west is often a dream and sometimes a metaphor. The west is an idea that has become a place. I'm sorry that it has been oversold and oversimplified. I for one will try to do better. Thank you for the education.

QUESTION FORUM

Cecil Andrus: Ladies and gentlemen, for ten or fifteen minutes, we – I said, "we" but I meant our guest will answer your questions.

Peter Jennings: That's OK, Governor, we can do it together. If it's a tough question, I'll say, "You answer it."

Cecil Andrus: We have Marc Johnson and John Freemuth in the audience with microphones. If you'll hold up your hand, they will approach you. I would ask them to hold the microphone so they can retrieve it if someone starts to make a lengthy speech. So be concise.

Peter Jennings: And if there is not a question, we'll all go and get some refreshments. By the way, I have to tell you that this is the first time in a week I haven't found myself talking about Iraq. Is that because it's a relief? I actually think we should talk a lot more about it than we actually have. When we left the hotel to come over here this evening, we noticed that there were some demonstrators on the corner. I thought, "That's what is great about America." You get to have your voice heard. That's not the case in many countries. I spent a lot of time in the course of my career in countries where that was not the case.

Audience: Mr. Jennings, first I want to thank you for the program you moderated about a month or two ago. It was excellent and very fair. When can we expect perhaps to see some of what you're saying tonight at the national level? Is that something you're thinking about?

Peter Jennings: Well, actually, I would have been thoroughly stupid not to make sure that some of what I talked about tonight has already been put in place by ABC. We already cover these stories. We have the Intel story, for example. We have the water story and the city story. As I pointed out to someone earlier today who thought we had all abandoned the west, ABC has a bureau in Denver, a bureau in Dallas, a bureau in Seattle, and a bureau in Los Angeles, which are stock full of people. One in particular, Judy Mueller, who works for us and for NPR, can hardly wait to come to Idaho. As I said in response to a question earlier today, my guess is that I'll get home, and Judy Mueller will probably be here twelve hours later.

Audience: Thanks for being here. I'd be interested in your thoughts on two totally separate topics. One is Roone Arledge. The other is that, in a large sense, we were talking about bias all day. I would be interested in knowing your thoughts on the other side of the environmental coin. We have inundated our young children with environmental issues. I'm wondering if we have also created an anti-business bias in that generation.

Peter Jennings: I couldn't answer the latter question with any accuracy because I simply don't know. I mention kids because kids who are not turned on to television certainly have an instinct and sensitivity about the environment. I can't answer whether we turn them on to be anti-business. I must say that WorldCom and Enron have not helped any of us this year in being sympathetic to business.

As for my boss, Roone Arledge, whom some of you may know, died yesterday afternoon. He was a great figure who changed American television for all of us. He was a man who said it wasn't enough that the owners of the sports teams should give the people in the stadiums the best seats. The viewers at home should have the best seats. So he created this astonishing technology that took us much closer to sports. When he became president of ABC News, some years ago, he did pretty much the same thing. He decided we would approach the world in a very vigorous, aggressive way. He got us the money we never had before. Ted Copple and I were two of his youngest correspondents. I think we're now his two oldest. We were both reminiscing on Nightline last night about what a great man he was. Yes, we did lose a great man in terms of his contribution to American communication.

Audience: I thought you did a masterful job in covering the aftermath of 9/11. Could you share with us what resources you drew on to get you through that terrible ordeal?

Peter Jennings: Thank you, sir. First of all I thought you were going to say, "Just do national disasters and leave the west alone." In some respects, in the early stages, I was insulated from the emotional experience that so many people in the country were having. I intellectualized the shock immediately because I was in the newsroom when it happened. Someone said, "Go and sit down." I sat down and didn't get up for the next 19 hours. It was the first time I had covered a long-running disaster. I also covered the Challenger disaster.

The journalist in some respects, at that particular moment, is protected by being so focused on trying to figure out what's happening. It wasn't until some time later that I really sat down and began to absorb in an emotional way, as so many other people had before me, what was actually happening.

I had one bad moment in the course of the day. I turned around and on the desk behind me was a message from my two kids. My son was at school out here in the west; my daughter was at school in Massachusetts, and they had just checked in. "Hi, Dad. We're OK; hope you're OK as well." I remember turning back to the camera and saying, "We must all call our children." That was the hardest moment for me in the entire day. But mostly I was protected, I think, by having so much work to do.

Audience: Because of your background and your early years of covering civil rights, I think there are many of us in the room who would be interested in your observations and perceptions of the area of civil rights, especially in the Intermountain West.

Peter Jennings: Let me make just one quick reference to my background. I pointed out that I am an immigrant, and someone kindly put up the Canadian flag today. I'm sometimes asked what I am, and I think I'm an American in my soul, but like millions of people, I came here for an adventure and actually went to cover civil rights in the South. I'd been in New York about 24 hours, and my new employers thought they needed fresh meat in the South so they said, "Get on a plane." I spent the next many many months living in a motel in Jackson, Mississippi in l964 and 65. It was an awesome story.

It would be presumptuous of me to think that I know in any depth about civil rights in the Intermountain West. Are you talking about Native Americans? or African Americans? or about the growing if not burgeoning Latino population? or, as I discovered when I got here, the Bosnian population you have in the Intermountain West? It would be simply presumptuous of me to comment except to say there are four quick examples of how you're changing. If you treat your minority populations badly here and you do not incorporate them into the American future, which sometimes happens in parts of the country, then we shall be out here. That will also be a story.

Audience: Peter, I'll be 55 for the next presidential inauguration day. I realize the way things went in November weren't good for my party —

Peter Jennings: Are you a Republican?

Audience: No, I'm a Democrat, but thanks for the joke. I was just curious about the fact that Colin Powell is not going to run because his wife won't let him. Do you honestly think we'll have a black president in the next 12 to 16 years? Or do you think a woman president will come first?

Peter Jennings: We toyed with that notion earlier today as well, and before long, we had a black woman president who was living with someone of the same sex. I was just journalist. I will tell you at the moment that I think the Democrats are in such disarray and performed so badly in the mid-term elections that if you had to base it on that, I would think George W. Bush will get a second term. As the Senator and the Governor know, a couple of months is a long, long time in politics.

I think the President is about to face a very testing moment, beginning this weekend. I don't mean to digress completely, but if Saddam Hussein says, as I suspect he will this weekend, that he doesn't have any weapons of mass destruction, I think a lot of the world will now think it is up to the Bush Administration to prove that he does. And the Administration may, to at least some constituency in the country, be able to establish that easily, but I think it will be more of a struggle in the international community. So when people ask me now what I think of the Bush legacy, given father and son and the son's election, I don't think we've even got into legacy period yet. I think judging will be tough for the next few months.

Audience: It's no secret that for the networks, just like for the rest of the media, it has been tough lately. I'm just wondering, with pressures like declining viewership, corporate ownership, fragmentation of the marketplace, what kind of effect you think that's had on the journalism you do now, and what do you see in the future?

Peter Jennings: I think you can probably see as readily as I can, as a consumer of television information, what has actually happened. The magazine shows, which occupy prime time and have to compete for prime time dollars and audience, are very different than they were ten years ago. I actually think, if it's not completely self-serving – well, it is completely self-serving – that, in some ways, the evening news programs are better because, with a fragmenting audience, with a declining audience – we're no longer, as someone pointed out – the gatekeepers. We can hardly find the gate because the fence is gone. We're actually having to look to our laurels and to our strengths in a more specific way. When my staff goes to work every day, almost the first word we use every morning is context. Sure, we still get carried away by outrageous stories, and we still do badly on stories, without question. Do we still follow others and get pushed around by the mass media in general? The answer is yes. But I think in some respects, we're doing as much context as we have done in the last ten or fifteen years. I take that as being a reasonably hopeful sign.

But I have no idea about the future. Anyone who predicts the future of the television business these days – except how long will Bill O'Reilly last – I don't know.

Audience: Can you speak to what you see as the implications of the corporate ownership of mass media? Does the fact that Michael Eisner writes your checks at some level or other have more, less, or no impact on the stories you cover? Specifically, if you want an example, the 1996 or 97 sale of the airwaves that basically was a massive, multi-billion dollar windfall for Disney, GE, and every other major media corporation. It didn't get any play. It got four media stories on the national news.

Peter Jennings: I tend to cover those stories. Last week, we did Disney's cruise ship. I've covered Disney on the problems it has had in the developing world for what it's paying people. We did deregulation because I think it's good for our audience to understand those. I think it's good for Disney to know that, although as you point out they do write the checks, we are an independent news organization. The truth of the matter is, however, that because they do write the checks, they have an enormous amount of power. You've got media experts here today. I'm not a media expert. I don't spend a lot of time on it. But it's reasonably automatic to think that the more media there is in fewer hands, the greater risk there may be. But there is a study out in the last week or so that shows that hasn't proved to be true. All I can really tell you is that, in my own case, it has not been true. It makes it harder to send people overseas. The simple answer is that if Disney wanted to put more money into ABC, they could put more money in. They could take it out of their theme parks. They don't. That is a measure of their authority in terms of the overall corporation, but have they ever meddled in my life? Never.

This sounds awfully arrogant, but I think they would do so at their peril, to some extent, if they came in and said to the newsroom, "You're going to this," or "You're going to do that." I can't imagine Michael Eisner doing that.

Audience: You spoke a bit about your aggravation or annoyance at people in the west resenting the federal government and the contradictions because of the benefits we have received. What about a couple of other contradictions? What's your perspective on the fact that we are a live- and-let-live state – or we like to say we are – and yet it's states like ours that are consistently not supportive of gay rights? What about the fact that we've had discrimination, at least in the early part of the century, against the LDS people? Yet now that they've achieved, at least under our constitution, equal rights, they tend to coerce others to adopt their religion through release-time programs in school districts and the like. How do you account for these contradictions?

Peter Jennings: Well, I'm going to just disappoint you because I simply wouldn't generalize. I don't know the LDS story well enough. I know the LDS story in Salt Lake City because we did it fairly specifically, and I do not know it here. If I'm not mistaken, you have a larger LDS population here than they have in Salt Lake City. But I've simply not examined it.

There was a great frou-frau today about gays. I thought Senator Simpson was particularly eloquent on the Matthew Shepard case in Wyoming, making the point that sometimes the media only gets part of the story. There was quite a hullaballoo made this morning about a cover that Time magazine had and whether or not the fence represented the west or the modern environment in which Matthew Shepard was killed.

I hope that what you believe about your media, for the most part, is that nothing is particularly off limits. If it reaches our newsroom that one religion or the other or one faith or the other – we do a lot about this in the book in the chapter called "God's Country," because there is a huge debate in some parts of the country about teaching evolution along side creation. That doesn't go unnoticed by the national media, but for me to generalize about the treatment of gays in the west would just be ill-informed, to say the least.

One more question, and then the Governor says we need to go and have a drink.

Audience: In World War I, we came in late. In World War II, we came in late. With the recent change in American foreign policy, everything seems pre-emptive. How do you feel the worldwide view of America has been changing?

Peter Jennings: We could have spent all evening on that question. It's true that America was late in World War I. America was late in World War II. In World Wars I and II, America made the difference. My mother used to always slam her first on the table because my grandfather was in World War I and was captured by the Germans before the Americans came. The truth of the matter is that in 1918 and 1919 and in 1945, what other country in the world did as much to save the world? I think it's not fair to compare that to the potentially pre-emptive notion of some members of this Administration. I think one of the reasons we need a debate at the moment is that many of us are simply not sure how the Administration will decide, if it decides – I'm not sure we're going to war – to move the furniture around in the Middle East.

I was very impressed by the President yesterday. The President has pretty good political antenna. At the beginning of his Administration, you will recall that he said very publicly that he wanted the United States to have a humble foreign policy, which suggested to me and to other people who cover foreign policy, a collective foreign policy, a policy of cooperation rather than domination. Then we got into 9/11, into Afghanistan, and now into Saddam Hussein, and it doesn't look quite like that.

But the President sensed this week that he has a problem in the Muslim world because he made a very, very public gesture of going yesterday to the Islamic Center in Washington and making the point about what contribution American Muslims had made to life here. But I think there is a huge debate going on in the Administration about what the country is going to do. I think that we do not make any progress in the Middle East, either with the Israeli-Palestinian struggle or with the Muslims by simply hiring people to make and run commercials on radio and television stations throughout the region. It is a very long haul. I wish we would all participate more profoundly in the debate.

Thank you kindly for having me.

Cecil Andrus: I have to be the bad guy and bring this to an end, but this man has given us his total day, starting at 9:00 AM this morning, and that was eleven hours ago. For a man of his position in the world, with his responsibilities, and with the travel schedule he's had, he's been very very generous. Peter, we thank you. We Westerners work long days...

One introduction. Some of you were not here for lunch today, so you did not have the opportunity to meet our luncheon speaker. He's an old friend of mine, a three-term United States Senator from Wyoming, a man who tells it the way it is. What you see with Al Simpson is what you get. There is no Mickey Mouse-ing around. He speaks in a language everyone can understand. Some of the words are quite short, only four letters. I want you to meet one of America's great contributors to the political process, a statesman in every sense of the word, Al Simpson.

Dateline: The West

Cecil D. Andrus: Chairman, Andrus Center for Public Policy; Governor of Idaho, 1987 to 1995; Secretary of Interior, 1977 to 1981; Governor of Idaho, 1971 to 1977. During his four terms as Governor of Idaho and his four years as Secretary of Interior, Cecil Andrus earned a national reputation as a "common-sense conservationist," one who could strike a wise balance between conflicting conservation and development positions. He played a pivotal role in the passage of the Alaska Lands Act and the National Surface Mining Act of 1977 and in the creation of the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness Area, the Snake River Birds of Prey Area, and the Hell's Canyon National Recreation Area. Governor Andrus elected not to run again in 1994 and subsequently established the Andrus Center for Public Policy to which he donates his service as chairman. His awards include seven honorary degrees, the William Penn Mott Park Leadership Award from the National Parks Conservation Association, Conservationist of the Year from the National Wildlife Federation, the Ansel Adams Award from the Wilderness Society, the Audubon Medal, and the Torch of Liberty award from B'Nai Brith. In 1998, he authored with Joel Connelly a book about his years in public service: Cecil Andrus: Politics Western Style. He and his wife, Carol, have three daughters and three grandchildren.

Bob Barbee: Senior National Park Service Manager (retired). Bob received both a BS and an MS from Colorado State University. Following service in the U.S. Army, he spent his entire 40-year career with the National Park Service, serving in a number of NPS units in various capacities from park ranger to park manager. He was the superintendent of several parks, including Cape Lookout and Cape Hatteras National Seashores, Hawaii Volcanoes NP, and Redwood NP. For 12 years, he was superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, years that included the 1988 Yellowstone wildfire. He finished his career as Director for Alaska National Park Units, comprising some 54 million acres in 15 parks, and he has maintained a lifetime interest in public policy as it relates to natural resources and wild lands. His honors include the U.S. Department of the Interior Meritorious and Distinguished Service Award, Meritorious Executive in the Senior Executive Service (Presidential Rank award), Honor Alum, Colorado State University College of Forestry, and Lifetime Achievement Award, Colorado State University Department of Natural Resources. Bob now lives in Bozeman, Montana with his wife, Carol. The Barbees have grown daughters and seven grandchildren.

Jacob Bendix, Ph.D.: Associate Professor of Geography in the Maxwell School at Syracuse University. He is also a Senior Research Associate in the Maxwell School's Center for Environmental Policy and Administration and an Adjunct Associate Professor of Earth Sciences. A native of the west coast, Dr. Bendix graduated from the University of California and worked as a Forest Service firefighter in California before earning graduate degrees at the Universities of Wisconsin and Georgia. Primarily an environmental scientist, he has published numerous scholarly articles about the impacts of wildfires and floods in California ecosystems. He has also conducted research on how news media cover environmental issues ranging from Amazonian deforestation to the controversy over protection of the northern spotted owl. As a scientist, he is interested in how the scientific aspects of these issues are portrayed. As a citizen, he is concerned about their impact on policy formulation. The research he will discuss regarding coverage of northwest forest issues was conducted jointly with Dr. Carol Liebler, Chair of the Department of Communication in the Newhouse School of Public Communications at Syracuse University.

Margaret E. Buchanan: Vice President of the Gannett Pacific Newspaper Group and President and Publisher of *The Idaho Statesman*. Ms. Buchanan graduated from the University of Cincinnati with a Bachelor's Degree in Marketing and an MBA in Finance. Upon graduating from college, she worked in sales for Cincinnati Bell and IBM. Since the joining the Gannett Company in 1986 as a general executive for the *Cincinnati Enquirer*, she has served as both Marketing Director and Advertising Director for the *Rockford Register Star* in Rockford, Illinois. Before her move to the Statesman, she served as President and Publisher of the *Star-Gazette* in Elmira, New York. She was named Vice President of the Pacific Newspaper Group in November 2001. Ms. Buchanan is married to Greg Buchanan, has two sons, and serves in the community as a board member for the Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce, Fundsy, the Idaho Shakespeare Festival, St. Alphonsus Regional Medical Center, the YMCA, and the Foothills Community Advisory Group.

Walter Dean: A 30-year broadcast news veteran who splits his time between NewsLab, the Project for Excellence in Journalism and the Committee of Concerned Journalists. He was a staff producer and news assignment manager at the Washington Bureau of CBS News for 14 years. Prior to that, he was a reporter, anchor, executive producer, and associate news director at WOWT-TV in Omaha. After leaving CBS in 1998, he served two years as associate director of the Pew Center for Civic Journalism where he produced A Journalist's Toolbox, a series of training videos now being used in more than 1500 newsrooms and classrooms across the country. More recently, he created the broadcast version of CCJ's Traveling Curriculum and, as part of a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Knight Foundation, is coordinating its teaching in broadcast newsrooms. Mr. Dean is a graduate of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln where he was a member of the Innocents Society, the senior men's honorary. He has taught broadcast news writing at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and Creighton University and is a past president of the Omaha Press Club.

Timothy Egan: National enterprise reporter, New York Times, Seattle. In 2001, he won the Pulitzer Prize as part of a team of reporters that did a series on how race is lived in America. He has done special projects on the West, the census, sprawl, endangered species, and the state of Indian country. He has also been a featured radio essayist for the British Broadcasting Corporation. Mr. Egan is the author of three books. His book on the Northwest, The Good Rain: Across Time and Terrain in the Pacific Northwest, has been a regional bestseller for ten years and was recently rated in a poll by Seattle's leading newspaper as one of ten essential books ever written about the region. His most recent book, Lasso the Wind, Away to the New West, won the 1999 Governor's Writing Award from Washington State, the Mountains and Plains Booksellers Award, and was named a Notable Book of the Year by the New York Times Sunday Book Review. Mr. Egan graduated from the University of Washington with a degree in journalism in 1980 and was awarded an honorary doctorate of humane letters by Whitman College in 2000 for his writings on the land.

Bob Ekey: Northern Rockies Regional Director, The Wilderness Society, Bozeman, Montana. Ekey is an established leader on conservation efforts in the Northern Rockies and often focuses efforts on building coalitions to achieve conservation goals. His work also focuses on building broader public support for protection of wild lands, including our national parks, Forest Service roadless lands, and wildlife refuges. He serves as chair of the Yellowstone to Yukon conservation initiative. Prior to joining the Wilderness Society in 1998, Ekey served as communications director for the Greater Yellowstone Coalition where he was a leader in the campaign to stop the proposed New World gold mine adjacent to Yellowstone Park. A former award-winning journalist in Montana, Ekey gained national recognition for his coverage of the 1988 Yellowstone fires. He wrote the book Yellowstone on Fire! and later a children's book on the fires. He is a graduate of the Ohio University School of Journalism.

Gloria E. Flora: Director, Sustainable Obtainable Solutions, Helena, Montana. For 22 years, Ms. Flora worked for the U.S. Forest Service, most recently as Forest Supervisor on the Lewis and Clark National Forest in Montana and on the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada and eastern California. Well-known for her leadership in ecosystem management and public involvement, she made a landmark decision to prohibit oil and gas leasing on the Rocky Mountain Front in Montana. She later resigned from the Forest Service to call national attention to persistent anti-federalist activities in Nevada, which included harassment of public land managers and their families and wanton ecological destruction of aquatic and range habitats. Ms. Flora earned a B.S. in Landscape Architecture from Pennsylvania State University, which recently gave her a Distinguished Alumnus Award. She is the recipient of many other regional and national awards, including the Murie Award for courageous stewardship of public lands (The Wilderness Society), the Environmental Quality Award for exemplary resource decision-making (Natural Resources Council of America), American Fisheries Society Individual Service Award, the Giraffe Award (Giraffe Foundation, honoring people who stick their necks out), and an outstanding performance award for her work in Nevada from the U.S. Forest Service. Her federal career has been highlighted in Public Integrity: Exemplar Series of the American Society of Public Administrators. Gloria is now working to ensure sustainability of public lands and the plant, animal, and human communities that depend on them through her non-profit organization, Sustainable Obtainable Solutions.

John C. Freemuth, Ph.D.: Senior Fellow, Andrus Center for Public Policy, and Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Boise State University. Dr. Freemuth's research and teaching emphasis is in natural resource and public land policy and administration. He is the author of an award-winning book, Islands Under Siege: National Parks and the Politics of External Threats (University of Kansas, 1991) as well as many

articles on aspects of natural resource policy in such publications as Society and Natural Resources, Denver Law Review, Landscape and Urban Planning, and the International Journal of Wilderness. He is the author of three Andrus Center white papers on public land policy, based on Center conferences in 1998, 1999, and 2000, and he has worked on numerous projects with federal and state land and resource agencies. He serves also as chairman of the National Science Advisory Board of the Bureau of Land Management. In earlier years, Dr. Freemuth was a high school teacher and a seasonal park ranger. He holds a B.A. degree from Pomona College and a Ph.D. from Colorado State University. He was named Idaho Professor of the Year for 2001.

Rod Gramer: Executive News Director, KGW Northwest News Channel 8, the NBC affiliate in Portland, Oregon. For ten years previously, he was the Executive News Director at KTVB-TV in Boise. While at KTVB, he also hosted Viewpoint, the longest running public affairs show in Idaho. From 1975 to 1988, Gramer worked for The Idaho Statesman in various reporting and management positions, including political editor, city editor, and editorial page editor. Gramer is also co-author of the award-winning biography of Senator Frank Church, Fighting the Odds.

Peter Jennings: Anchor and Senior Editor, World News Tonight. Peter Jennings has established a reputation for independence and excellence in broadcast journalism. He is the network's principal anchor for breaking news, election coverage, and special events. He has reported many of the pivotal events that have shaped our world. He was in Berlin in the 1960s when the Berlin Wall was going up, and he was there in the 1990s when it came down. He covered the civil rights movement in the southern United States during the 1960s and the struggle for equality in South Africa during the 1970s and 1980s. He was in Poland for the birth of the Solidarity movement, and he was one of the first reporters who went to Vietnam in the 1960s. He went back to the killing fields of Cambodia in the 1980s to remind Americans that unless they did something, the terror would return. He is the author, with Todd Brewster, of the acclaimed *New York Times* best seller, The Century. Their next collaboration, In Search of America, has just been published. Jennings led the network's coverage of the September 11th attack for more than 60 hours that week and provided a reassuring voice during the time of crisis. TV Guide called him "the center of gravity." Prior to his current appointment, Jennings served as chief foreign correspondent for ABC News and was the foreign desk anchor for World News Tonight from 1978 to 1983. He has been honored with many awards for news reporting, including 14 national Emmys, several Alfred I duPont Columbia University Awards, several Overseas Press Club Awards, and a George Foster Peabody Award. Jennings currently resides in Manhattan with his wife, Kayce Freed, a producer for 20/20. He has two children.

Marc C. Johnson: Boise partner of the Gallatin Group, a Pacific Northwest public affairs/issues management firm with offices in Boise, Seattle, Portland, Spokane, and Helena. He serves in a volunteer capacity as President of the Andrus Center. Mr. Johnson served on the staff of Governor Cecil D. Andrus from 1987 to 1995, first as press secretary and later as chief of staff. He has a varied mass communications background, including experience in radio, television, and newspaper journalism. He has written political columns and done extensive broadcast reporting and producing. Prior to joining Governor Andrus, Mr. Johnson served as managing editor for Idaho Public Television's award-winning program, Idaho Reports. He has produced numerous documentaries and hosted political debates. Several of his programs have been aired regionally and nationally on public television. He is a native of South Dakota and received a B.S. degree in journalism from South Dakota State University. His community involvement includes a past presidency of the Idaho Press Club and the Bishop Kelly High School Foundation, and he serves on the boards of the Idaho Humanities Councils, the Federation of State Humanities Councils, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and the Housing Company, a non-profit corporation devoted to developing low-income housing projects in Idaho.

Rick Johnson: Executive Director, the Idaho Conservation League, an organization devoted to protecting and restoring Idaho's water, wildlands, and wildlife through citizen action, public education and professional advocacy. It is widely recognized as one of the region's foremost conservation organizations. From 1986 until 1995, Johnson worked for the Sierra Club in Seattle. Much of that time was focused on protecting the region's ancient forests and the infamous spotted owl. This led him from the forests of the coast to the highest levels of government in Washington, D.C. where, as a lobbyist, he spent close to 100 days a year. This work included President Clinton's Forest Conference in 1993. Johnson has also provided staff support for several U.S. Senate and House campaigns in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho as well as in the 1976 and 1992 presidential races. He has degrees in history and political science, has owned a construction company, and has worked as a journalist.

Tom Kenworthy: Denver-based correspondent for USA Today. He has covered western public lands and natural resource issues for more than a decade, first for The Washington Post and, for the past three years, for USA Today. He has written extensively on forest management, endangered species, public lands grazing, water resources, energy development, wildfires, national parks, and the politics surrounding land use. Kenworthy began his newspaper career in Massachusetts with the Lowell Sun and has also been a reporter with the Washington Star and the Baltimore Evening Sun. A native of Washington, D.C., he is a 1970 graduate of Cornell University. Since 1995, he has lived in Golden, Colorado with his wife and two children. He is an avid hiker, mediocre skier, and lousy fisherman.

Scott Kraft: National Editor, Los Angeles Times. Since 1984, Scott Kraft has held a variety of positions with the Los Angeles Times, including deputy foreign editor and bureau chief in Paris, Johannesburg, and Nairobi. Previously, he was a New York-based national writer for Associated Press and worked also in Wichita and Kansas City. His many awards include the Los Angeles Times Editorial Award for the best article in the Times Magazine, the distinguished service award from Society of Professional Journalists, finalist for a Pulitzer Prize in 1985, and the Peter Lisagor Award from the Headline Club of Chicago. Mr. Kraft earned a B.S. degree in Journalism from Kansas State University in 1977.

Brad Little: Mr. Little operates a cattle ranch and farm in southwestern Idaho. Senator Little serves in the Idaho Legislature from District 11 and is a member of the Resources and Environment Committee and the Agricultural Affairs Committee. He was Council of State Governments Toll Fellow in 2002. He also serves on the boards of the Idaho Community Foundation, the High Country News (an regional environmental media foundation), the University of Idaho, and the Gem County School District Foundation. He is past chairman of the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry, Idaho Business Week, the American Sheep Association Public Lands Committee, and the Idaho Woolgrowers Association. Senator Little has spent considerable time meeting with national livestock, timber, political, and environmental leaders to resolve grazing and timber issues. He holds a B.S. in agri-business from the University of Idaho. Brad and his wife, Teresa, live in Emmett, and their two sons, Adam and David, attend the University of Idaho.

Robert Manne: President and Chief Executive Officer, The Pacific Lumber Company, Scotia, California. Robert Manne has over 30 years of experience as an executive officer and entrepreneur in the high technology, telecommunications, resources, and manufacturing industries. Prior to joining Pacific Lumber, Manne was President, CEO, and Director of Myrio Corporation, a software company focused on allowing telecommunications network operators to deliver fully interactive television over internet protocol. He spent 18 years with General Signal Corporation, and in 1986, Burlington Resources recruited Manne to join Plum Creek Timber Company where he ultimately served as Executive Vice President. He also served as President and CEO of Savia International, an international startup hardwood manufacturing organization. Manne holds a B.S. in Industrial Engineering and Management and an M.B.A. from Temple University.

Sandra F. Mitchell: Executive Director of the Hells Canyon Alliance and Public Lands Director for the Idaho State Snowmobile Association. Ms. Mitchell represents recreation interests on the South West Idaho Regional Advisory Council, South West Idaho Basin Advisory Group, North American Motorized Recreation Coalition, Hells Canyon Subgroup. She also serves on the Board of Directors of the Blue Ribbon Coalition. Mitchell attended the Universities of Idaho and Wyoming. For twelve years, she was a Staff Assistant in the Lewiston District Office for Representative/Senator Steve Symms. She is past president of the Northwest Children's Home and of the Lewiston Chamber of Commerce.

Mark Obenhaus: ABC Senior Producer for Peter Jennings Reporting. Mr. Obenhaus has been associated with ABC News since 1991. Among his achievements are the ABC prime-time magazine show, Day One; Dangerous World, The Kennedy Years; and the twelve-hour ABC series, The Century, with Peter Jennings. Recently, he produced two prime-time hours for the ABC series In Search of America. Prior to working with ABC, Obenhaus produced and directed documentaries and commercials for many clients, including the three major networks and Public Television. He produced six programs for the Public Television series, Frontline. In addition, he produced and directed films about music and performers: Miles Ahead: the Music of Miles Davis and Einstein On the Beach, both for Great Performances. His historical films include The World that Moses Built, Mr. Sears Catalog, and JFK: A Time Remembered for the PBS Series The American Experience. His work has been recognized by five national Emmys, the Columbia Dupont Journalism Award, two Robert Kennedy Journalism awards, the Gabriel Award, the Ohio State Award, the Writers Guild of America Award, four American Film Festival Awards, and numerous other honors.

Katy Roberts: National Editor, The *New York Times*. Roberts received a bachelor's degree in politics at UC Santa Cruz in 1974, studied Russian language at the University of Toronto, and received an M.A. degree in journalism and Russian area studies from Indiana University in 1977. Named National Editor of The *New York Times* in November 2000, Roberts had been the newspaper's Op-Ed Page editor since 1995, and had worked in several other positions at *The New York Times*.

Patrick A. Shea: Attorney, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, Salt Lake City, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land and Minerals Management. In that role, he oversaw the Bureau of Land Management, Minerals Management Services, and the Office of Surface Mining – agencies responsible for the management of over 270 million acres of land and for all offshore drilling for oil and gas production in the United States. Before entering government service, Mr. Shea was a lawyer, educator, and businessman in the Intermountain West. Along with practicing law in Salt Lake City and the District of Columbia, Shea was an Adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Utah and taught at the Brigham Young Law School. In September 1996, he was appointed by President Clinton to serve on the White House Commission on Aviation Safety and Security. Mr. Shea teaches seminars on Land Use Management and Biotechnology for Federal judges. Prior to his private law practice, he served as General Counsel and Assistant Secretary to a private communications company, operating television, radio, and newspapers. He also served as counsel to the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate. Shea is a native of Salt Lake City and received his undergraduate degree from Stanford University in 1970, a master's degree from Oxford University in 1972, and a law degree from Harvard University in 1975.

Jay Shelledy: Editor, *Salt Lake Tribune* since 1991. Jay Shelledy received his B.A. in journalism from Gonzaga University and attended law school at the University of Idaho. He is the former editor and publisher of the *Moscow Pullman Daily News* and the editor of the *Lewiston Morning Tribune*. Mr. Shelledy worked as a reporter for both the LMT and the Associated Press and as a high school teacher and coach in the late sixties. Among his more colorful employments was a brief stint in 1966 as a railway brakeman. When Governor Andrus looked for Idahoans of impeccable integrity to serve on the Lottery Commission, Jay Shelledy was one of the people he chose. He has lent his time and talents to many civic causes, including the boards of the YWCA Community Advisory Board, the Rose Park Library Project in Salt Lake City, Investigative Reporters and Editors, the Washington-Idaho Symphony, and the Idaho Governor's Task Force on Education. His after-hours activities include sailing, golf, public speaking, and tutoring in at-risk schools. He is married to Susan E. Thomas and has one child, Ian Whitaker Shelledy.

Alan K. Simpson: U.S. Senator from Wyoming from 1978 to 1994. Senator Simpson is a significant part of the Simpson family's legal tradition in Wyoming, one that began two generations earlier with the first Simpson attorney, William L. Simpson. Milward Simpson, his son, carried on the tradition and passed it on to his son, Alan K., who practiced law in Cody for 18 years. His two sons currently practice law in Cody. Following college, Senator Simpson joined the Army and served overseas in the 5th Infantry Division and in the 2nd Armored Division in the final months of the Army of Occupation in Germany. In 1964, he was elected to the Wyoming State Legislature where he served for the next 13 years, holding the offices of Majority Whip, Minority Floor Leader, and Speaker Pro Tem. In 1978, he was elected to the U.S. Senate and was re-elected in 1984 with 78% of the vote and again in 1990. His distinguished career includes chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Immigration and creation of the Subcommittee on Social Security and Family Policy. Senator Simpson did not seek re-election in 1996, and he and his wife Ann, moved to Boston where he taught at Harvard University.

Mike Simpson: U.S. Representative from Idaho's Second District, Congressman Simpson has just been re-elected to his third term in the House of Representatives where he serves on the Agriculture, Resources, Transportation, and Veterans Affairs Committees and on six subcommittees. Prior to his election to Congress, he served fourteen years in the Idaho Legislature and three terms as Speaker of the Idaho House of Representatives. During that time, he was appointed Vice Chair of the Legislative Effectiveness Committee for the National Conference of State Legislatures. He also received the Boyd A. Martin Award from the Association of Idaho Cities for exceptional contributions benefiting Idaho city governments because of his diligent work to pass legislation stopping unfunded state mandates. Congressman Simpson favors small government by transferring certain federal responsibilities back to the states. He believes in lowering taxes on married couples, eliminating the death tax, and encouraging economic growth for small businesses. Simpson has become of the House's leading advocates for a new energy policy and a renewed commitment to research and development of improved nuclear energy technologies. He is a member

of the House Nuclear Clean-up Caucus and also of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus. He is an advocate of a strong national defense and of the establishment of a stable agriculture economy. Mike Simpson attended Utah State University and graduated from Washington University School of Dental Medicine in St. Louis. He began practicing dentistry in Blackfoot in 1978 and has recently received the Idaho State Dental Association President's Award in recognition of outstanding service to ISDA and to the people of Idaho.

Conrad Smith: Professor of Journalism at the University of Wyoming, author of Media and Apocalypse, a study of how news organizations reported on the 1988 Yellowstone wildfires, the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska, and the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake near San Francisco (Greenwood, 1992). He taught journalism at Idaho State, Colorado State, and Ohio State Universities before assuming his present position. His 1974 documentary, Against the Flow of Time, regarding efforts to establish a national recreation area in Idaho's Hell's Canyon, included interviews with Governor Cecil Andrus and Senators Church, Hatfield, and McClure and was broadcast by 17 commercial and public TV stations in the Pacific Northwest. He serves on the faculty of the Forest Service's National Advanced Resource Technology Center in Arizona where he teaches federal land managers how to interact with journalists.

Mark Steele: Editor/Publisher, *Caribou County Sun*. Mark Steele grew up on the family ranch in Soda Springs, Idaho. Following high school, he enlisted in the Army Security Agency and served in the highly classified unit. His education includes a B.S. in journalism from Utah State University and a full fellowship from the National Institute of Mental Health, which allowed him to complete his master's degree. While working as the editor of the Solomon Valley Post in Beloit, Kansas in 1976, he and his wife, Wendy, had the opportunity to purchase their old hometown paper and returned to Soda Springs. The rest is pretty much old news with no regrets. Work experience has mostly been with community newspapers in rural settings although he was the script writer for a weekly half-hour agriculture TV program at Utah State University where Steele said he learned more about turkeys than he ever wanted to know. Other work includes stringing for the Associated Press, a weekly mental health column for newspapers in Kansas, reporter and editor positions on rural weekly papers, and mostly as editor/publisher for the *Caribou County Sun* for the past 25 years. Community service includes SSPD police reserve captain for 25 years, service on several Fish and Game committees, Chamber of Commerce board, local education foundation board, past Idaho Newspaper Association board, deputy coroner, and other small-town duties. Related professional experience includes environmental reporting in a series on issues including selenium leaching from southeast Idaho phosphate mines and its impact on livestock, fisheries, and mining; Superfunding of phosphorus production plants, radioactivity of slag and the impact on the community and industry, and southeast Idaho wildlife issues. Personal dislikes are computers, emails, voice mail, cell phones, some (maybe most) politicians, free trade, corporate mergers, greed disguised as either deregulation or the free market place, rude people, and narrow minds. Things that make Steele happy are a manual typewriter, a rotary dial phone, old John Wayne movies, trucks with clutches, horses with spirit, deals sealed with a handshake, and the thought that a little humor or an occasional fist fight can resolve most issues.

Jim Strauss: Executive Editor, Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Montana. A native of Minnesota, Strauss is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin-River Falls with degrees in economics and journalism. He received his master's degree in business from the University of Notre Dame. Strauss worked in regional business magazines in Wisconsin and Minnesota for three years after college before taking his first job in newspapers at the Billings Gazette in 1983. He was with Knight Ridder from 1986 to 1995, where he was business editor and later assistant managing editor of the News Sentinel in Fort Wayne, Indiana. In 1995, he was named to his present position in Great Falls, Montana. Strauss and his wife, Dee, have five children.

Pat Williams: Senior Fellow, O'Connor Center for the Rocky Mountain West in Missoula, Montana. Pat Williams is an educator who served in the United States Congress for nine terms from 1979 to 1997, immediately following two terms in the Montana Legislature. In the Congress, Williams was Deputy Whip of the U.S. House and member of the following committees: Budget, Education and Labor, Interior, and Agriculture. Congressman Williams was elected to the U.S. House for more consecutive terms than anyone in Montana history. He returned to Montana after leaving the Congress in 1997, teaches at the University of Montana, and serves as senior fellow at the O'Connor Center. Williams also writes a regular newspaper column, which is carried by many newspapers in the Rocky Mountain West. He hosts a region-wide program on public radio and also provides a monthly commentary on Montana Public Radio.

SPONSORS

APME National Credibility Roundtables Project

The Brainerd Foundation

The Bullitt Foundation

Gannett Co. Pacific Group

The Idaho Statesman

The Key Foundation

The Lazar Foundation

Richard King Mellon Foundation

The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation

Boise State University
P.O. Box 852, Boise, Idaho 83701
(208) 426-4218 Fax (208) 426-4208
www.andruscenter.org