

Sue Nash

Judith: Today is Monday, December 19th, 2011. I'm Judith Auth and I'm interviewing Sue Nash. Also in the room is Cherstin Lyon and Tom Lyon.

We want to begin with your biography, your background. Please share with us any early childhood and family experiences that may have shaped your environmental involvement.

Sue: Ahhh, well, I grew up ... my dad was in the Air Force and I grew up living in through junior high school in Arizona ... not in Arizona. Let me back up. I was born in Northern Illinois in Rockford, and we lived in Michigan from like first grade, second grade through seventh grade. And at the time we lived on the edge of Lake Saint Clair, which had flooded and there was a dike in back of our apartments on the base housing. And of course we were forbidden to go there.

I was a tomboy and I just spent all my life outside on the islands (laughing) climbing trees, riding my bicycle and sleds back and forth. Complete tomboy. We did a lot of camping and just outdoors.

Judith: Your father was in the military?

Sue: Yeah. My dad was in the Air Force so we traveled around a lot. And then after that we went back to near O'Hare, and then we went to Okinawa when I was in high school. And again I was outside all the time, going to the beach, working as a lifeguard, so I was just always outdoors. And we always did a lot of camping. That was our main family vacation, to go camping.

Judith: Is there anything in your family history, your family tradition that shaped your involvement in the environmental effort?

Sue: Uhmm, I think only that I got lucky enough to be a lawyer. I mean, I was involved in the environment and always, you know, interested in protecting it. And then when I went to law school late, when I was in my mid-thirties. I graduated and got out of law school when I was forty at UCLA. And that's really the only way you can impact the environment now is by filing lawsuits.

Judith: The question is: Do you see a relationship between your political values and your views on the environment?

Sue: Well, actually it's more my view of the world and I don't know which came first, but basically I've identified now as a Buddhist even though I grew up with Protestant non-denominational military Sunday School kind of thing. But when you start looking at biology, and when you start looking at the world, you know, the universe is just one organism. And what I've noticed is when I talk about people's politics, like people who say all these really conservative things, as opposed to people who say what we think of as more liberal or progressive things, when you start talking to them it comes down not what they think their politics are but where on the spectrum they are as thinking that we're separate, independent individuals, or we're one organism. So I would label it a worldview. My worldview is we're one organism and so everything else follows from that.

Judith: Do you have any favorite stories or works of literature that you think shaped your views?

Sue: Uhmm, I was an English major and an English teacher and I read a lot of environmental stuff, but that really hasn't shaped my views as much as the Buddhist reading that I'm doing now. And the more I get to and understand and really, you know, in my bones understand that it's one organism. So the more biology books I read the more (chuckle) my worldview is strengthened and confirmed.

Judith: How were you introduced to Buddhism?

Sue: Uhmm, I think some friends of mine ... I'd always read a lot and I got cancer in like '98 ... breast cancer in '98, and about the same time and about a year later I bought a house ... now at the same time I got my diagnosis. Almost the same day I got my diagnosis I closed on the house that Bev sold me in Riverside.

Judith: Beverly Wingate.

Sue: Yes. And so I'm living in downtown Riverside by myself at the time, and I started getting involved in 2003, 2002, 2001 with the whole peace movement. I started going back to the Quaker Meeting, and some of the women I met who created this group called "Women Creating Peace Collective" in downtown Riverside, which is still going, and they started talking about this different Buddhist stuff. So I started reading. I started going to retreats and it's just grown and grown from there.

Judith: Do you have any favorite hobbies or leisure activities?

Sue: Uhmm, I was doing a lot of bird watching. I started bird watching in the '80s, but mostly now I just like hiking. You know, walking. I take walks. I do yoga. I have a daily meditation practice. I go to someplace in town and meditate for 45 minutes every morning with some meditation room that's been set up, and I read a lot.

Judith: What influences personal, cultural or social would you say has shaped your outlook?

Sue: Uhmm, personally having cancer was a profound shift in just everything. And the Buddhism and everything grew out of that. Uhmm, growing up in a very ... my father was very knee-jerk conservative and was a mean drunk. (Chuckle) My mother was sort of a-political so I would say rebelling against that. Not so rebelling but like thinking, well, that's not right! That's just not right, you know, thinking about that. So that shaped me.

I wasn't shaped that much by the '60s. It was just ... Oh! This is what I need. This is what needs to happen. This is the right thing to do. There was a big shift in the '60s as far as understanding about war or not war. I grew up in a military family. I was, you know, moved to San Francisco, was involved with Peace Demonstrations, and just sort of, you know, this is wrong and dah-ta,dah-ta. Dah. And actually in my first year in college I read somebody's doctoral thesis on how we shouldn't be involved in Vietnam because it was just a civil war going on, and the roots of it and everything.

And then I ended up ... my first husband was in the Air Force and he was somebody I'd grown up with in Michigan, and actually I had known him my whole school career because they were stationed with us in Michigan, and then at O'Hare, and then at Okinawa. And he had just joined the Air

Force, and then he was stationed in Sacramento, so he came to San Francisco 'cause our mothers were best friends. So I ended up going from living in San Francisco to being a Peace activist, and then married to somebody who then went to Vietnam, and was in the back seat of an F-4 and dropping bombs on people, and then came back. And then I was married to him for ten years.

And then while I was married to him and came back, I got really ... you know, that was when Ms. Magazine first came out, 1971-'72. My daughter was born in '71. My son was born in '73 so that whole feminist thing probably had more influence and, okay, you're going to go out and do something, so the environment is something you want to do.

But I would say the feminist revolution had more to do with shaping me than Earth Day.

Cherstin: Can we back up a little bit ?

Sue: Yeah.

Cherstin: ... about how you solved your feelings as a Peace activist being married to somebody so ...

Sue: It was just schizophrenic.

Cherstin: Can you explain that?

Sue: Uhhh, well the usual thing about schizophrenia (laughing) It's just schizophrenic in a way is ... this was the time in my life ... it's only been the last few years where my life isn't compartmentalized.

Judith: Is *not* compartmentalized.

Sue: Yeah. So before, you know you grew up thinking, before you became a Buddhist and you started meditating and you started realizing everything's all connected, you thought that you could just compartmentalize your life. This is a human being that I love and care about and this is just what he does when he's not with me. And it wasn't so unusual. It wasn't like I first came from that ... came from one kind of growing up. I'd lived on military bases for years, so this was not something foreign. So it didn't seem as compartmentalized as it really was.

Cherstin: And then what impact did the beginnings of the feminist movement have on that perception of your compartmentalization of your life and views?

Sue: Uh, I never have really thought about it. I just, you know ... feminism is just a concept that women are also human beings.

Judith: What influenced your decision to go to law school?

Sue: Ohhh, my grandfather was an attorney. My uncle was an attorney. My cousin's an attorney. States attorneys. Judges. And I was an English major and there were all these attorneys in my family. The whole feminist movement. All these women were going to law school! (Laughing) A friend of my husband's wife was going to law school. So I took the L-Sat, and I did okay. So I said, "Well, let's

do this!”

Judith: This was in ...

Sue: Because it was something, you know, being a teacher I was a high school English teacher and then I was a Special Ed teacher, and you know, you weren't getting much respect.

Judith: This was about the end of the '70's?

Sue: I went to law school ... I started in '82.

Judith: Who were your role models?

Sue: Going to law school?

Judith: Or all together.

Sue: Uhhh, I remember thinking of Gloria Steinham was cool. Uhhh, so no ... I can't remember any particular role models. But even then I didn't think ... sort of early on I was thinking, “Okay, women are going to bring a better perspective” and when I was in law school I actually did research for this professor. There was this book that came out by this male law professor, or psychologist or something, about the Web. Have you ever heard of that book? The Web of Life or something? The Psychology ... women's psychology versus men's psychology. No, it was a woman who wrote it. Yes, it was a woman who wrote it. The Web of Life. She'd done all these studies about how men are hierarchical thinkers. Women are web thinkers that know that everything is interconnected, and so in classical psychology you actually rate people as being more ethical if they rise to the highest level on the ethical scale, which is a hierarchical thing. And so if you say that this person has only reached the point where they're thinking that everything is interconnected they're on a lower level of ethics.

And what happened was with this book and things that got done later, that got all blown away. So that was sort of an inspiration. So actually I worked doing research for Law Review articles by Carrie Menkel-Meadow, who I think is still a professor at UCLA. She did a Law Review article on Women in the Law, and I did a lot of research for her.

Judith: Can you spell her name?

Sue: M-e-n-k-e-l (hyphen) -Meadow. And it's C-a-r-r-i-e.

Judith: Thank you.

Sue: So she did a lot of Review articles talking about ... and so this in like ...I graduated in '85 so this is the early '80's there where she was thinking, and even I was thinking, even though we saw examples to the contrary, what difference are women going to make in the law? How are they going to approach it differently? How has it changed? How do we think it's going to change? And it has made a big difference because unlike other professions, over 50% of law school graduates are women. And it hasn't translated into like ... my daughter's an attorney and there's I don't know how many partners in her law firm now that they merged. Before they merged she was the only woman partner. And I don't

even know if she's still the only woman now that they've merged. And I've discovered in the law ... I mean, there's that whole other thing that you could have a hundred hours of discussion on women in the law and hierarchical thinking, and web thinking, and what changes have been made.

But what makes it difficult in working with environmental law, which is what I'm doing right now, is that you're working with the environment, so that's biology, and the biological fact is that we're a web and we're all connected. But the law is set up so you have to follow. It has nothing to do with reality! It has to do with this hierarchical thing that's set up to protect the status quo. The Constitution is based on personal property. That's the highest value in the Constitution. Human beings are irrelevant. When I was in law school it dawned on me that the purpose of the law was so that the white boys could keep their toys. That's it. That's the law in a nutshell.

Judith: What prompted you to see the law...

Sue: I don't know.

Judith: ... as a tool to aid in the preservation and protection of the environment?

Sue: Just 'cause I was an attorney and there's the California Environmental Quality Act and I started getting involved with Audubon. I was President at the Audubon for four years. And we were hiring attorneys to do things, and so I began to get involved with other attorneys.

Judith: Was there any specific situation or event, or moment that provided the impetus for your involvement?

Sue: Uhhh, No. We were just ... there was a ... you know, there was a ... Well, let's back up a little bit. So I came out here ... let's see. So I was in Orange County and I was married to the guy in the Air Force and he was working up there, and then I met a teacher and I got divorced from my husband and I married this teacher and we moved to Moreno Valley. And then I went from Moreno Valley to law school at UCLA and I came back to Moreno Valley and after law school I got a job working for the Court of Appeal in San Bernardino. It was stationed in San Bernardino at the time. And I decided I wanted to get involved with something, so I got involved with the Sierra Club. I joined the Sierra Club and I joined Audubon to go on the hikes and stuff. I decided as a single person 'cause I was divorced from Number 2 at that time. So I got involved with him and then I got involved with people who were bird watchers in Audubon.

And that's when I started getting involved with those groups who were then filing lawsuits, and then, since I was an attorney, we started that's basically what happened.

And then I married Tom Pollack, who's upstairs, in '91 and he was the manager of the San Jacinto Wildlife Area, which is right down the ... have you ever been there or seen it? So it's 10,000...

Judith: Mystic Lake?

Sue: Yeah. Ten thousand acre wildlife area. So we lived there for fifteen years. So, of course now that we're living on the Wildlife Area, and there's threats from Moreno Valley, from the Moreno

Highlands Project going on, we hired an attorney, and I got really heavily involved with that, outside of my work. I was working for the County of San Bernardino. By that time I had worked for the Court of Appeal for two years and then in '87 I was working for the County of San Bernardino. So I couldn't actually do this work and get paid for it. So I was working with an attorney named Kate Nislander who still does environmental stuff in Ventura. She lived in Ojai. So getting involved with her, writing comments, drafting complaints, that's when I really became active with the environmental law.

Judith: What was the biggest obstacle you encountered working in environmental law?

Sue: Uh, because the law means nothing. The whole judicial system is completely corrupt.

Cherstin: Can you explain that?

Sue: Ummm, it's all political. Look what the Supreme Court ... I mean, every judicial system is political. What you do ... the first thing you learn in law school ... I had wonderful contacts. Professor Rosen who just passed away, and he would show us ... we would spend a lot of time looking at cases and dissents. And he would talk a lot about what was going on behind the curtain. And that was my first semester of law school when I really realized that the judge has made up his mind ... almost always has ... how they want to rule and then they take the facts and the law and twist it. I just read the Citizens United case and the dissent to that case. The dissent was 90 pages and the thing was about 50 pages because I wanted to look at it, and what they did is they pulled something out of thin air.

Judith: And this was the decision about the corporations, right?

Sue: Right. Now Corporations had been persons ... artificial persons under the law since 1872, and it's gone through all these steps. But this was the first time they just went whole-hog and said they're not only human beings, but they're super-human beings. Because of course they don't die and, you know, they've got even more power. But decision after decision. I was just in a case where I went to the Court of Appeals ... I had a Trial Court case and it simply said you have to do ... the law says you have to do CEQA review. You have to comply with the Environmental Quality Act. You have to identify any significant impacts and then you have to mitigate them or say there's no mitigation possible before you approve them. You have to go through these steps. Cross your T's and dot your I's.

And the Department of Fish and Game that we sued did a project out at the Wildlife Area with no CEQA document. The Wildlife Conservation Board who hands out, you know, millions ... tens of millions of dollars every year said, "We'll do it later." So they did some bogus thing later and said "There's no environmental impacts even though it's a core MSHCP area that has three endangered plants on it. But they said, "No impacts."

Judith: Fish and Wildlife multiple species, habitat ...

Sue: Conservation Plan. The Fish and Wildlife Service went out there and said, "Oh, nothing here." So ...

Cherstin: What year was this?

Sue: This was like three years ago. So, we went to the Trial Court. The Trial Court said “This is not a problem. We do this all the time.”

Went to the Court of Appeals and the Court of Appeals says, “You have to prepare a CEQA Document. You have to vacate the approval and prepare a CEQA Document before you do any more work on this project.” They just essentially finished it and they didn't give us everything that we wanted, but we got the principle.

So I go back to the Trial Court for the Return on the Writ, and the Return on the Writ is when they're supposed to tell the Trial Court how they have complied with the Writ, which is to vacate the project and not do any further work on the project until you have completed your obligations under CEQA. So they said “Oh, the Court of Appeals didn't really mean that.”

And the Trial Court said, “Okay. Writ's approved. All you had to do was vacate it. You didn't have to do anything else.”

So I went running back up to the Court of Appeals thinking, “Of course they meant it!” The Court of Appeals said, “No, we didn't really mean it.”

The AG, the California Attorney General who's representing, you know, is supposed to be the people's attorney, protecting the environment and enforcing CEQA gets up there and says, “We don't want ... we're going to do CEQA on the project eventually. In fact we're preparing a manageable plan and it's going to be part of the Act. We just don't want Friends to retain jurisdiction ... we don't want the Court to retain jurisdiction over the case to enforce the judgment.” So black and white .. what this means is ... if they had done things properly, when they come up with the CEQA document to comply with finishing the project, they review the Environmental Impacts. If the Court had retained jurisdiction, then if they do a terrible job on this CEQA document, I can go back to the Court and say they haven't complied with the Writ.

Now when they do a terrible job I'm going to have to file another lawsuit and the Judge stands up there at Oral Argument and says to me: “Gee, I guess all this work you did just went for naught, didn't it?”

That's my greatest frustration! So what ... we're working with the system. We filed another lawsuit against the Wildlife Conservation Board. We will continue to work on more lawsuits and on this I have to give ... I'm actually not doing as much of the work anymore at all because my husband who was studying for the L-Sat when we met in '91, has gone to law school and was taking the Bar, but hasn't passed it yet, now he's writing all the briefs. So all I have to do is look 'em over (laughing) Because of this frustration I was getting completely burned out and I said, “I can't do this anymore. I just can't do this.” So he's doing a lot of the work. I help with a lot of the work. I still do a lot of the stuff, but I couldn't carry the whole load by myself. So if it weren't for him, I wouldn't be doing any of this stuff right now. That would be it.

Judith: Do you have any triumphant moments?

Sue: Oh, yeah. When we won at the Court of Appeal and we got some attorney's fees, and the

Friends were able to use those attorney's fees to hire Shute, Mihaly & Weinberg who's doing the Villages of Lakeview lawsuit, which is a lawsuit that's going to trial in January, which is at the southern end of the Wildlife Area. It's a big lawsuit. So it's triumphant in the sense that I see that people's hearts and minds have to change. People have to come to realize that we're all one organism. But in the meantime we can slow things down a little bit and maybe in filing these lawsuits and writing letters, and talking to people, and trying to educate children, that we can slow things down before they're irrevocably (laughing) destroyed.

Judith: Irrevocably.

Sue: Irrevocably destroyed. So I started out thinking, "Oh, we could file this lawsuit and we can win, and then ...". So I had to completely change my thinking. But that's where Buddhism comes in. Impermanence, impermanence, impermanence is all that it's about.

Judith: What's the bravest thing you ever did?

Sue: Hmmmm I don't know if I've done anything particularly brave. One of the funnest "bravest" things I ever did is I've taken my kids on lots of cross-country trips by myself, and we went camping. We went all the way to Washington, D.C. And went camping by ourselves.

Judith: How old were the kids?

Sue: Hmmmm., like nine, ten, eleven?

Judith: That's great.

Sue: Yeah! And all these women in the campgrounds came up to me and said, "Your husband lets you take your kids and go camping by yourself?"

And I go, "Uh, I just told him I was going." (Laughing)

Judith: You described this process of filing lawsuits and then having to appeal the decisions. Could you elaborate on the strategies, the tactics that have not worked and those that have?

Sue: Well, I was asked once to present ... after I worked at the Court of Appeal for a couple of years and then went to work for the county, they asked me to give this little presentation for the other attorneys who were writing appeals. So I actually called over and talked to some of my friends over there, and the Judge and stuff, and they go, "Uh, duh! The facts in the law!" So that is the only strategy. You present the facts. You present really, really good comments that point out all the significant impacts and how the significant impacts weren't mitigated. And then you know the law really well and the procedures and you put them together, and that's really the only strategy. And what we've tried to do ... sometimes Ann and I have gone many times ...

Judith: This is Ann McKibben?

Sue: Ann McKibben. We would go to the Supervisors and meet with them. We had tours of the Wildlife Area for the Supervisors who were making decisions. City Council people who were making

decisions toured the Wildlife Area. Let's see ... made no difference whatsoever that we could ever see. So the only thing is ... is to back them up against the wall with good facts, have lots of biologists who are friends of yours, write really good comments and then put it together in a way that the Court has no choice but at least to rule in your favor on some things because it's so strong. And then hope that the Legislature doesn't change the law, which they do all the time. They keep weakening and weakening CEQA.

Judith: What do you see is the present concerns right now?

Sue: Global Warming.

Judith: Global ...

Sue: Warming. That's it. I've been involved ... I started to say that I did *Women in Black*. I did that up here. Now we've started an *Occupy Idyllwild* group. We're working on the Corporate Personhood. *The Move to Amend* thing. We're working on that a lot. But the thing is Global Warming. Oh, you asked me who inspired me! Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine* is the most blowing-away-the-curtain-and-seeing-how-the-world-works book. You'll have to read it.

Judith: Shock

Sue: Shock Doctrine. Naomi Klein.

Judith: K-l-e-i-n?

Sue: Yeah. She's from Canada. And she's on Amy Goodman and I watch Amy Goodman every day.

Judith: Who is Amy Goodman?

Sue: Ohhhh! Amy Goodman is a woman in her fifties, who's a reporter and she has a show Democracy Now. It's been on for about ten years and she has people on her show for extended interviews, three or four every day, for an hour, and she just came back from Copenhagen and she has Noam Chomsky, my favorite male author, on. And just everybody, you know. She is the most radical reporter around. And she's on PBS. She's on other stations. I just stream her now and she's on the radio at 6, 9 and maybe again at 4 in the afternoon on KPFK.

Anyway, so let's back up. So Global Warming is the most important issue because we are doing nothing. Nobody is doing anything. Forget about the 1% temperature rise by the end of the century. It's probably going to be 5 to 7. And it's going to make everything else irrelevant. Everything else irrelevant. The world is ... I just can't imagine ... and so it's only my daily meditation that has allowed me to not shoot myself. Really. I mean I was just ... I was ... when I realized how bad things were ... not just the minor frustrations, oh, they're going to destroy the Wildlife Area, but what's going on in the world and how many people already died because of Global Warming. I mean, there were just floods over the weekend in the Philippines. We went through the Middle West last summer just after the Joplin hurricane. So, the only thing I'm thinking ... so my perspective right now is ... I learned in grade school that the sun is going to blow up or die, or whatever the sun does, in about 5 billion years, so I knew the human race wasn't going to be there forever, so I've just come to the

conclusion now that well, it might be a little sooner than 5 billions years before the human race is no longer on the earth. I always thought that the human race would be here until the sun died. But now I'm saying, well, impermanence and it's just going to come a little quicker than we planned, and maybe like Noam Chomsky says, the human race is really an evolutionary *cul de sac*.

So in the meantime I'm just working on acting as compassionately as possible, relieving as much suffering as possible. That's it.

Judith: When you work with other women, how do you see the young women that you work with? Are they concerned about these same issues?

Sue: I'm not really working with any younger women, but I'll tell you what ... the kids ... what I call kids at 66, the people I've seen in the *Occupy Movement* have just blown me away! I was seeing some of them, starting in Seattle in '99 with the WTO stuff, and everything else, but the people I've seen and the stuff I've been reading, but mostly the stuff that I've been seeing at all the *Occupy* encampments, and what's coming. It's just like "Ohhhh! I've been waiting 50 years! I didn't think you guys were paying attention! You guys are paying attention, and it's like I feel I can sit back and relax now." It's the first time I had any hope. It's like, Okay, Sue. You do not need to save the world! All these little lawsuits, go through the motions, slow things down, but they've got your *back*! Men, women ...they all know what's going on. It's going to be fine! It's going to get really warm. They understand we're all connected. They care whether those billions of people die. They think war is stupid. It's going to be fine!

Judith: The question asked is what should we be focusing on? You have given us the broad issue of Global Warming. Is there anything local in particular?

Sue: I think that ... and everybody who's thinking agrees the same thing ... unless we take back humanity from corporations, we won't be able to stop Global Warming. We won't be able to do anything ... unless people ... you know, there's this phrase I'm sure you've heard ... Slavery was the myth that human beings are property, corporate personhood is the myth that property are human beings. And it comes back to changing people's hearts and minds, and changing people's worldview. Unless we start thinking of human beings as all human beings that are all the same as us, and that nothing else is a human being. That's what I think we need to focus on ... changing our hearts and minds. If we don't change our hearts and minds then there really will not be the human species anything like we know it, and we'll just destroy ... I mean, we're destroying our home. We're destroying each other and we really will exterminate between the contamination, the heat, the lack of food, clothing, shelter, water, medicine. The earth is going to survive fine.

Judith: You mentioned several groups and individuals that inspired you and practices that keep you going each day, what would you say motivates you to keep engaged, instead of just stepping back?

Sue: Uhmm, I think it was just my mid-western up-bringing. I mean I just think I was engaged. You know, my mother was PTA and went to work ... you know, I was ... everybody ... I knew that I'd grew up in this sort of mid-western, middle-class environment where you just ... you got up and you went to work and you were engaged, and you had friends. You know, you just ... it was a very simple way of doing things. I didn't really have any traumas or difficulties to overcome. It was just what you did. And I stay engaged just because I can't not. And I don't know exactly why I can't not.

Judith: Do you feel that you've made a difference?

Sue: Ummm, I hope that I've changed some people's hearts and minds. I hope in what I'm doing. I don't think that winning a lawsuit makes any difference, but I hope that saying that something is important and maybe having people look at things from a different perspective makes a difference. I hope that I've changed their hearts and minds and saying, Oh! well, ... or in the way that Penny has ...

Judith: Penny?

Sue: Penny Newman .. in the way of ... well, if she can do that. I can do it too! That I've inspired people to do it. And so I was a single parent. I was a teacher. And then I've got ... (Choking up ... weeping sounds) I didn't know I was going to choke up over this one. My son's a doctor. But it was by example. So I hope my example of going out and doing things, like standing out there for five years, now I have people with me.

Judith: This is the *Women in Black*?

Sue: Yeah. So now we're *Occupy Idyllwild*. But if I hadn't done that for five years and just started standing, I don't think anybody would have joined me. Now people that I know who have been saying, "Oh, yeah! I really admire you for doing that, but I just can't bother to get up. (Laughing) I can't ... you know ... I don't wanna do that."

But now that I've been doing it, that's how I hope I've made a difference ... "Well, Sue can do it. I can certainly do it."

Judith: So your daughter is an attorney and your son is a doctor. Do you have any other stories you'd like to share with us?

Sue: Ummm, well, I think my husband's a real inspiration. Being a biologist. Doing all this work, trying to pass the Bar. But then keeping on doing it. If he weren't coming in to me ... many of the lawsuits I've filed or gotten involved in because he comes in and says: "You have to read this EIR! You have to make comments on it! We have to file a lawsuit! We have to do this! We have to do this!" If it weren't for him bringing the stuff to me, and doing the biology part of it, so that I could start to make good biological comments, and educating me about that, then I wouldn't be able to. I couldn't do this by myself. Nobody could do anything by yourself. You've got the whole ... yeah. That's just a man.

Judith: You made an incredible journey from a tomboy to an attorney filing lawsuits to protect the environment. Have you received any recognition for your efforts?

Sue: Ummm, you know, I have, but I think at the time I did, I think Audubon gave me a little award for being their President, and Sierra Club gave us, Tom and I, a little award for working the environment, but back then I was thinking that I deserved the award. Or was ...I said, Oh, I did something. But now I have a completely different perspective. It was like ... okay, I just happen to be the one who had a Bar card, who could sign the signature, and could know where to go on the Internet to get the formats, and had the books to do the research, but nobody can do ... you can't recognize one person. You have to recognize, you know, from the time they were born, the whole environment they

grew up with, all the people that they've encountered. It's just impossible to ... so that would ... yeah ... so recognition ... But my biggest thing ... you know, but personally it would be really special to me if my grand-kids recognized me. My kids, you know ... Oh, it's just mom! (Laughing) But if my grand-kids ... if I live long enough, my grand-kids say thank you. That'll be great! (Laughing)

Judith: They're beautiful human beings. It's been a pleasure talking to you.

Sue: Thank you.

Judith; Cherstin, do you have any questions? Then that concludes our recorded session, and you will have an opportunity to look at the transcript and we can adjust it any way that makes you more comfortable.

Sue: Okay!

Judith: Thank you so much.

Sue: Oh, thank you!

Judith: It's a very powerful story you tell.