Alaska elected officials

Mike Gravel: Democratic senator for Alaska from 1969 to 1981.
Don Young: Alaska’s lone representative in the US House from 1973 to the present.

Washington state elected officials

Henry ‘Scoop’ Jackson: Democratic senator for Washington from 1952 until his death in 1983, and a Congressman before that beginning in 1941. Originally from Everett, WA.
Lloyd Meeds: Democratic representative for Washington state’s 2nd legislative district (from Everett north to the Canadian border, between the coast and the crest of the Cascades) in the US House of Representatives from 1965 to 1979.

Other elected officials

John Seiberling: Democratic representative from Ohio in the US House from 1971 to 1987. Chair of the special subcommittee on Alaska lands created by Udall.
John Durkin: Democratic senator from New Hampshire chosen by Udall and Seiberling the champion the Alaska Lands bill in the Senate.
Cecil Andrus: President Carter’s Secretary of the Interior. Not elected, but appointed by the president, as are all cabinet secretaries.

Organizations:

Alaska Coalition: Partnership of several conservation advocacy organizations, including the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Audubon Society, the Friends of the Earth, and the Alaska Conservation Society.
ACS (Alaska Conservation Society): Alaska-based conservation group originally formed in 1960 to advocate for the creation of ANWR and against Project Chariot.
SEACC (Southeast Alaska Conservation Council): the primary conservation organization in SE Alaska; works almost entirely on Tongass National Forest issues.
CMAL (Citizens for the Management of Alaskan Lands): organization formed by Alaska’s industrialists and boosters to oppose environmentalists in the Alaska Lands debate.
US Forest Service: the agency of the US Dept. of Agriculture that administers national forests (including Alaska’s Tongass). The FS has historically held timber harvest as its highest priority in Alaska, with little regard for environmental protection or conservation.
Other people:

Celia Hunter: President of ACS and leader within The Wilderness Society, based in DC.

Robert Weeden: Another prominent figure within ACS.

Doug Scott: Lobbyist for the Sierra Club in DC. He will be visiting our class on May 7.

A few terms:

d(2): Refers to the ambiguous section 17d(2) of ANCSA, which seemed to authorize the secretary of the Interior to set aside various lands for federal protection to be decided by Congress at a later date, including 80 million acres of potential parks and wildlife refuges. This section carried an expiration date of 1978 for Congress to resolve the status of these 80 million acres. It is worth clicking on the link above to read the actual text of the section, which is pretty short. Section 17d(2) is the reason that the Alaska Lands act came into being in the first place.

H.R. 39, or the Udall bill: The first manifestation of what became the Alaska Lands act.

“Fifth system”: An idea for a way to manage federal lands in Alaska favored by the state of Alaska and others. The “fifth” system would have been a joint state-federal partnership to manage such lands, in addition to the existing four systems within the federal government: the national parks, wildlife refuges, national forests, and wild and scenic rivers.

“Multiple use” agencies: The US Forest Service and BLM (Bureau of Land Management). “Multiple use” is a term that came to mean favoring all forms of economic development (timber harvest, mining, oil and gas development, etc.) on federal lands. When land falls under the unlimited jurisdiction of a “multiple use” agency, this is the lowest level of federal conservation protection (many conservationist would argue that lands in this category have no protection).

Ideas to consider as you read:

• When reading about the actions of a particular person, particularly an elected official, consider what motivates this person to take such actions. Elected officials have both personal beliefs and constituents (voters), and some officials are more accountable to voters than others, depending on how popular they are. For individuals who are not elected officials, consider whether they might be motivated primarily by personal beliefs, financial interests, religious beliefs, or anything else you think of.

• Watch for what you think are the most important and decisive moments in this multiyear debate and indentify these. For each of these turning points, consider how strongly this turning point was influenced by specific elements of our system of government, or by the actions of particular individuals. How much was the course of this history affected by individuals versus institutions? If we went back and replayed the tape with different people but the same institutions, would we get a similar result? This concept is sometimes called historical contingency.