

SALMON IS EVERYTHING: THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF ECO-
DRAMA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE KLAMATH SALMON CRISIS AND AN
EXAMINATION OF ITS ROLE AS A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL

By

Adriana R. Guzman

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Social Sciences: Environment and Community

Committee Membership

Dr. Betsy Watson, Committee Chair

Margaret Kelso, Committee Member

Dr. Llyn Smith, Committee Member

Dr. Mark Baker, Graduate Coordinator

December 2012

ABSTRACT

SALMON IS EVERYTHING: THE EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF ECO- DRAMA IN THE CONTEXT OF THE KLAMATH SALMON CRISIS AND AN EXAMINATION OF ITS ROLE AS A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL

Adriana R. Guzman

The deaths of thousands of salmon have been a large part of the Klamath Watershed Conflict. Salmon were once abundant in the Klamath, and its various tributaries, but populations are now far below historic levels. The intersections of people's lives which are affected by or dependent on the salmon are just as complex as the watershed itself. All along the Klamath River, are many narratives and perspectives struggling to be heard. In response to the Klamath Salmon Crisis the Klamath Theatre Project was developed, which created a community-based theatre work called *Salmon is Everything*. Based on interviews from various parties and input from the local community, this theatre work, often termed an eco-drama, is a unique project that warrants an in-depth look.

Salmon is Everything displays some characteristics of theatre forms with a transformative nature. A great deal of literature has explored forms of theatre that raises awareness and creates dialogue about pressing social issues, working towards individual or social change. These forms have the ability to educate, transform, and heal and strengthen communities. Drawing from these uses of theatre, I explore what function the *Salmon is Everything* production has within the context of the Klamath Watershed

Conflict. Using data from in-depth qualitative interviews and primary document/archival research I investigate if and how the play has changed perspectives about the Klamath Salmon Crisis and the parties involved. I also analyze how the development process of *Salmon is Everything* has contributed to community outreach, education and activism.

By researching the origins and continued development of *Salmon is Everything* this study examines the play's role in representing and forging community and its implications for community-building across difference from within the Klamath Salmon Crisis conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the people who allowed me to document their journey with *Salmon is Everything* and who allowed me to interview them. Special thanks to Jean O'Hara and the cast, who welcomed me as part of the crew and helped me greatly with this project. I am especially grateful to Dr. Theresa May for letting me interview her and allowing me to do this project based on her work.

Thank you to Dr. Betsy Watson for her great advice and motivation to complete this long-overdue thesis. I don't think I would have made it through without your help! Thank you to Margaret Kelso and Dr. Llyn Smith for their guidance and patience as my committee members. Thank you for all your time and effort and valuable feedback. Thank you to Marlon Sherman for his assistance and contributions to this project.

Thanks to my mother, Betty Guzman, for her endless love, sacrifices, support and encouragement. I could not have made it this far without her. I love you, Mom! Thank you to my fellow Environment and Community cohort members for their friendship, advice, and encouragement through this long process. You are amazing men and women and I wish you all the best.

My love and gratitude goes out to my husband, John Fintel. Thank you for your patience and support. You gave me the love, motivation and energy to finish this project when I needed it most. I love you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF APPENDICIES	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
The Pathway to Theatre	1
The Origins of <i>Salmon is Everything</i>	3
The growth of the Klamath Theatre Project	5
Continued collaboration through public readings.....	6
From readings to stage performance.....	7
BACKGROUND: THE KLAMATH BASIN	8
Fish and Wildlife in the Klamath.....	9
Fish Species	9
Wildlife	11
People and Place	11
Different Connections to the Klamath	13
Federal and State Government Agencies.....	13
Tribes	17
Irrigators (farmers & ranchers).....	19
Fishing and recreation interests	20
Environmental interests	22

Conflict Along the Klamath.....	23
The 2001 water crisis	24
Fish kill of 2002	25
Portrayal of a local community: The <i>Salmon is Everything</i> story	26
LITERATURE REVIEW	28
Alternative Theatre: Beyond the Mainstream.....	28
The foundations of alternative theatre	29
Contemporary forms and purposes	31
Exploring Transformation and Empowerment	32
Awareness, healing, dialogue, and strength.....	32
Socio-Political uses of theatre.....	40
Eco-theatre	42
Social Capital: Building Community.....	42
Reflecting on Alternative Theatre.....	44
METHODS	46
Surveys: Questionnaires and Interviews.....	47
Analysis of Audience Interviews	49
Analysis of Actor/Creator Interviews	49
Analysis of Audience Questionnaires.....	50
Literature and Archival Research	51
RESULTS	52
Audience Interviews	52
Actor/Creator Interviews	57

Audience Questionnaires	65
I feel very connected to the Klamath River.	65
Was there any change in a certain thought, attitude, or perception you had?	68
What is the overall message of the play?	69
DISCUSSION.....	71
Process--The Methodology.....	72
Praxis: A catalyst for change	73
Participation and representing community	74
Research & development stage.....	75
Collecting stories and memories.....	75
How hearing the “other side” led to transformative action.....	79
Lauren’s story: how process and social change collide	80
The process: casting and rehearsals.....	83
Community casting brought community knowledge.....	84
Community casting brought emotion and passion.....	85
The process: public presentation.....	88
The process: post-performance discussions.....	90
The Product of Performance: What the Results Reveal.....	94
The performance process: what the actor/creator interviews revealed	94
Affecting audiences: Comparing audience survey results	106
Audience questionnaires: a closer examination.....	111
CONCLUSION.....	115
Representing & Building Community	116

The impact of education & awareness	117
The impact of dialogue	118
Impact of healing & compassion	119
Activism and advocacy	120
Wider Implications: Theatre's Role in Environmental Conflicts.	122
Concluding Thoughts.....	124
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127

LIST OF APPENDICIES

Appendix	Page
A INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR AUDIENCE MEMBERS	132
B AUDIENCE MEMBERS CODED THEMES AND MEANINGS	133
C INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ACTORS/CONTRIBUTORS	143
D ACTOR/CREATOR CODED THEMES AND MEANINGS	145
E SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS	160

INTRODUCTION

The Pathway to Theatre

I was intrigued with the intersection of theatre and environmental issues when I saw a performance of *Salmon is Everything* in 2006 at Humboldt State University. At that time, I had lived in Humboldt County for about 6 years. I knew that the Klamath River had its share of environmental problems and was a subject of debate in the local area. However, my knowledge was very general, so I thought maybe this eco-drama (as it was called) could teach me a few more things.

I learned about *Salmon is Everything* through my former professor, Dr. Theresa May, who was the playwright. Besides my curiosity, I wanted to support my friend and fellow graduate student, Kathy McCovey, who was acting in the eco-drama. A performance like this was very new to me. It was a theatrical production that wasn't simply for entertainment purposes, but instead was meaningful to me. *Salmon is Everything* was about issues affecting where I lived and the people around me. I found this to be more than a story about one side versus the other. It was about many peoples' lives, relationships to the land and to each other, and stories that often went unheard. I didn't expect such a powerful performance and I didn't expect that this would be my future thesis project.

I am far from being an expert in theatre. In fact, I knew very little about theatre besides my experiences as an audience member. My primary interests involved wildlife, environmental conflicts, environmental justice and other ecological issues, so the idea of

a thesis project involving theatre was far from my mind. As I learned more about the impact the arts have on our environmental reality it expanded my thoughts on what it means to have a holistic view. I felt that this intersection between theatre and ecology was worth exploring. *Salmon is Everything* grew out of a concern about what was happening along the Klamath River. The river has been plagued with environmental problems and long-standing conflicts between tribes, farmers, government agencies, environmentalists and many other stakeholders. Many of the Klamath issues reached a tipping point when thousands of salmon died and people realized the magnitude of the crisis.

This thesis provides an in-depth view of the origins of *Salmon is Everything* and its continuing development. It explores the issues and motivation behind the creation of (and participation within) *Salmon is Everything* as well as its role in our environmental reality. By examining the views of actors, creators, and audience members I will assess how involvement and exposure to this eco-drama affects people on a personal level and make a case for its potential as a tool for social change.

Analyzing *Salmon is Everything* will allow me to explore theatre's potential to encourage the transformation of perspectives on the Klamath salmon crisis. Whether on a personal or social level, the play's potential to be a transformative agent is something that may affect our future ecological culture. An individual's behavior and willingness to communicate in a conflict situation is often shaped by the attitudes and belief systems they hold to be true. Educating and informing others through theatre may have the potential to create change through shifting perspectives and beliefs. If these perspectives

are well informed ones, then they may contribute to development of common ground within a contentious issue. The viewpoints and characteristics of the eco-drama may point toward its ability to be used as a tool of community building, activism, and understanding within the Klamath conflict.

The following sections of this chapter will explain the background of *Salmon is Everything*, the background of the Klamath salmon crisis, and how I will begin to examine *Salmon is Everything's* potential role as a transformative agent.

The Origins of *Salmon is Everything*

By initiating the Klamath Theatre Project, Dr. Theresa May, hoped to “tap theatre’s power to touch the human heart by developing a performance in collaboration with the people who have been directly affected by the salmon crisis” (May, 2004). At the time, Dr. May was assistant professor in Theatre, Film and Dance at Humboldt State University. By the time the salmon crisis occurred Dr. May had already been involved in using theatre to do environmental education as well as exploring the theory behind how theatre can become a place where we can uncover our sense of connection to the ecological community. Through a personal interview with Dr. May I learned that after the 2002 fish kill happened (where over 60,000 salmon suddenly died on the Klamath River) she was invited by the President of Humboldt State, Rollin Richmond, to a Klamath River summit. This summit brought together many federal and state agencies as well as tribal fisheries departments to discuss the problem on the Klamath. There were many presentations and talks from the scientific community, however, Dr. May soon realized

she and her partner were the only arts & humanities people there. As she listened to more presentations, one in particular struck her. She remembers a man from the Fish & Wildlife service getting up and talking about taking his six year old son fishing and being appalled at the sight of seeing lots of dead salmon along the river. As he talked about his experience tears came to his eyes and he choked up. At that moment, Dr. Theresa May had a realization:

“...if we could collectively grieve and collectively share our stories about our connection with the river and with the salmon, that then the kinds of changes at the level of policy (to take the dams down or not take the dams down, and how much water, and whose science it is and all of that) we would be in a better place to answer those, to have those discussions, but until we can share our humanity, our experience, we’re not really in a place where we have common ground to make those other assessments (personal communication, March 28, 2008) .

She decided to examine what she could do as a theatre artist to help a community make those connections between the Klamath crisis and the stories we share. Dr. May knew that what theatre does well is tell human stories. Therefore she proposed to do an interview-based or community-based performance. She describes this as a tradition of theatre where the playwright/director works with the community to draw out the stories, then construct a play and have the community perform that play (p.c., March 28, 2008). After getting positive feedback and interest in collaboration from the faculty and staff within the Native American Studies department, the Indian Teacher Education & Personnel Program (ITEPP), and the university President, she decided it would be possible to facilitate her proposal.

The growth of the Klamath Theatre Project

The Klamath Theatre Project was initiated by Theresa May, Marlon Sherman of the Native American Studies Department, Phil Zastrow of ITEPP, and Sue Burcell, ITEPP Director. From there the Klamath Theatre Project grew into a group of concerned students and community members looking to bring awareness to ecological and cultural impacts of the Klamath salmon crisis. A special class at Humboldt State University was created called the Klamath Theatre Project. Those from the class, or in independent study with Theresa May, gathered together to begin the process of creating a performance piece based on the Klamath salmon crisis. The concerned students and community members believed in the power of theatre and wanted to create something that would promote awareness and action for the health of the salmon of the Klamath watershed. In order to create such a performance piece the Klamath Theatre Project felt that the people who know the salmon and the river the best should be able to tell their own story. Therefore a great deal of collaboration occurred as they got the community involved and sought out their input and counsel. Even before the project commenced collaboration began with an initial community meeting where the group could listen to tribal community concerns and ideas about the project. About 20 people attended this meeting and several of them continued to be involved in the project on a regular basis.

Throughout the semester long class, the students of the Klamath Theatre Project made an effort to better inform themselves about the issue at hand through the study of the history, culture and personal accounts of life along the Klamath. The students studied the natural and cultural history of the Klamath, learned the spiritual and cultural

significance of the salmon, and ways contemporary tribal people participate in salmon ecology. They also gathered first person stories from people who live and depend on the Klamath River (May, 2007). Students conducted informal interviews with community members (both tribal and non-tribal) and visited the mouth of the Klamath River and sacred sites (May, 2007). The students were also involved in creative writing assignments that allowed them to express their own connection with place, community, and traditions (May, 2007). This process went on for about 2 years with three different groups of students.

Dr. Theresa May was able to combine the interview material, experiences, stories, and the creative writings gathered from the Klamath Theatre Project, to create a work-in-progress script called *Salmon is Everything*.

Continued collaboration through public readings

Further collaboration from the community was a critical part of the project. The community was able to engage in the process of the ecodrama's development through public readings. These readings were important to make sure the final product represented their interests, concerns and aesthetics. One key component was the discussion periods that followed the public readings. The results of these discussions helped shape the final script. The chance for public readings and discussions occurred during local public events. In 2004, public readings occurred during events such as the Earth Matters On Stage: Ecodrama Playwrights Festival, the Education Summit at HSU, the California Indian Conference and during HSU's Dialogue on Race week. The readings aided in script development as members of the community helped to draw out

new aspects of the story and even provided their visual and theatrical ideas for what they wanted to see onstage.

From readings to stage performance

Theresa's skills as a playwright together with community ideas and input helped form a script that was ready for its first performance on May 5th, 2006. As local groups and individuals helped with set design, lighting, film footage and visual landscapes¹, *Salmon is Everything* was finally ready for the stage. During its three day run, *Salmon is Everything* had its first staged production in HSU's Studio Theatre where students, faculty, staff and community members performed the play. There were 12 Native and 5 non-Native cast members (most of whom had never acted before). Discussions followed each of these performances as people in the cast conversed with the audience. These debriefings and discussions were facilitated by Ron Reed, Karuk tribal member and Fisheries Program Director as well as Dr. Theresa May herself. The community was able to voice their thoughts, opinions, questions or stories and often brought forth comments about people's reactions to the play as well as ecological, cultural and environmental justice issues associated with the Klamath watershed.

This was just the initial process of *Salmon is Everything* as things have evolved and more performances have occurred. I began documenting *Salmon is Everything* in 2007 so this thesis will explain its development during that time as well as my analysis of the creation and performance process.

¹ Media such as film footage was used to make this a multi-media performance. Footage of swimming salmon, landscape views, Klamath River views, footage of dead salmon, etc was displayed in the background during certain parts of the play.

BACKGROUND: THE KLAMATH BASIN

It is important to be familiar with the context of this theatre project to better understand the issues that surround *Salmon is Everything*. This section will describe the geography and history of conflict along the Klamath River.

There is a long history of natural landscape use from mining, forestry practices, fishing, ranching and farming throughout Klamath country (Most, 2006). It also has great biological riches, including the forms of life that exist nowhere else (Most, 2006). Few Californians are familiar with the Klamath Basin due to its isolated geography. Even to those who live there the Klamath is still a mystery due in part to its size (Most, 2006). The Basin extends over ten and a half million acres---equivalent to the size of Connecticut, Rhode Island and New Hampshire put together (Most, 2006). The lack of navigability due to its rapids also adds to its mystery. Until the placement of dams, only the salmon have traveled the entire length of the river (Most, 2006).

The Klamath River is 254 miles long flowing from its headwaters in Oregon through California to the Pacific Ocean (Most, 2006). The Klamath has a reverse watercourse compared to most rivers. One can find its marshes and wetlands near the headwaters, rather than the mouth, and its water quality improves as it moves downstream (Most, 2006). Although few Californians know the river exists, the Klamath can be described as one of the major rivers of the American West (Most, 2006). It is fourth in volume after the Columbia, Sacramento, and Colorado (Most, 2006).

Besides the Klamath River, the Klamath Basin consists of many springs, lakes, marshes, wetlands, dams, reservoirs, and tributary rivers. The basin drains approximately 16,000 square miles with 35% of the watershed in Oregon and 65% in California (USDA, 2011a). For discussion and management purposes, the Klamath is divided into upper and lower basins (National Research Council, 2008). The Iron Gate Dam (the first of many mainstem dams) on the Klamath River is the generally accepted boundary between the two as the upper Klamath basin is comprised of all lands upstream of the dam (area: 8,060 mi²), and the lower Klamath Basin includes lands below the dam (area: 7,628 mi²) (National Research Council 2008).

The Klamath Basin is further divided into sub-basins. Six hydrological sub-basins (Williamson, Sprague, Upper Klamath Lake, Lost River, Butte and Upper Klamath (East)) make up the Upper Klamath Basin and cover 5.6 million acres (USDA, 2011a). It is located in three counties in Oregon: Jackson, Lake and Klamath, and two counties in California: Siskiyou and Modoc. Six hydrological sub-basins also make up the Lower Klamath Basin (Shasta, Scott, Lower Klamath, Salmon, Trinity, South Fork Trinity, and the Upper Klamath (West) sub-basins) with the basin flowing through the California counties of Trinity, Humboldt and Del Norte (USDA, 2011a).

Fish and Wildlife in the Klamath

Fish Species

Many native species of fish call the Klamath watershed home, several of which are threatened or endangered. The Upper Basin of the Klamath River is home to 18

species of native fish. Two native fish, the Shortnose sucker (*Chasmistes brevirostris*) and the Lost River sucker (*Deltistis luxatus*), inhabit Upper Klamath Lake and are listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA) (US Congressional Research Council [USCRS], 2005; National Research Council, 2008). One widespread species, the bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*), is listed as threatened and the redband trout is listed as a species of concern by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (National Research Council, 2008).

The lower Klamath basin contains 19 native fish species. Most of the fish in the lower basin are anadromous species and the Klamath River provides important spawning and rearing habitat. The Klamath River was once the third-largest salmon-producing stream on the West Coast behind the Sacramento and Columbia Rivers (National Research Council, 2008). Before development of the Klamath basin, anadromous species had a wider range and were more abundant than they are today (National Research Council, 2008). For example, the Coho salmon historically existed throughout the Klamath Basin but are now extinct above the Iron Gate Dam (which blocks fish passage) (USCRS, 2005). The three most well-known salmonids, the native Coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), the Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) and steelhead (the anadromous form of rainbow trout; *O. mykiss*) are either threatened or listed as species of special concern (National Research Council, 2008).

Wildlife

The Klamath River watershed is also important for many terrestrial species. Over 430 wildlife species, including 263 bird species, have been observed in the basin (Oregon Wild, 2010). Six National Wildlife Refuges were established in the Upper Basin between 1908 and 1958 (USCRS, 2005). These refuges contain wetlands that are major stopping points for over 85 percent of ducks, geese and other birds that migrate through the Pacific Flyway (USCRS, 2005). The Klamath Basin is also home to mule deer, elk, pronghorn antelope, cougar, black bear, and river otters (Oregon Wild, 2011).

People and Place

The basin consists of not only landscapes and water bodies but also people with different ways of living on the Earth. From the Native American communities to the farmers, ranchers, and numerous other parties, the people along the Klamath depend on the river and its provisions for their own mode of living. Each party may also have different forms of knowledge and beliefs with regard to nature (Most, 2006).

The Klamath Basin is largely a rural area with its largest town, Klamath Falls, Oregon, having a total metropolitan population of about 42,000 people (City of Klamath Falls, 2007) The next largest towns include Yreka, CA with over 7,000 people (City Data, 2007) and Weaverville, CA with a population of 3,807 (City Data, 2009). The economies of the upper and lower Klamath basins are similar in size and output, but their products are very different (National Research Council, 2008). The upper basin is home to approximately 120,000 people and its economy is heavily dependent upon agriculture,

the forest-products industry, tourism, and public employment (National Research Council, 2008). The lower Klamath basin, home to 167,000 people, has an economy more dependent on the retail trade, educational services, and health care and social assistance industries (National Research Council, 2008).

The Klamath basin is a very complex area as landscapes, cultures, economic practices, perceptions of people who live there, and administrative and political lines divide the region (Most, 2006). The upper basin of the Klamath River in southcentral Oregon and northeastern California is predominately ranch and forest country (Most, 2006). Farmers and power users depend on the Upper Basin as pumps, canals, dams and reservoirs, move most of the upper drainage waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power. Most of the land that the river runs through is national forest, creating great opportunities for recreationists. White water rafters love the twenty-two-mile stretch of the Klamath River that rushes through a deep canyon near the states' border. While fishermen frequent the Klamath below the Iron Gate Dam and its hatchery (Most, 2006). For the Karuk people, Ishi Pishi Falls, near the confluence of the Salmon River, is now the only place where Karuk fishermen are allowed to fish for salmon using traditional dip nets (Bell, 1991).

Further downriver, Simpson Timber Company manages the forested and logged out areas the company owns and the Yurok people own a one mile deep stretch of reservation land on either side of the Klamath.

The many landscapes, jurisdictions, and ways of living along the river created disconnections between different perceptions of time and space. As Most (2006)

describes, you feel time differently if you live by the life cycles of fish than if you live by the seasons of planting and harvesting. Those who depend on fishing and farming also perceive time differently than the region's government employees who are governed by the fiscal year's appropriations (Most, 2006). "For generations people living in different parts of the Basin or doing different kinds of work there have seen little connection between their own existence and the lives of their culturally distant neighbors" (Most, 2006).

Different Connections to the Klamath

There are various people, agencies and groups who all have a different stake in the Klamath River. The following section includes a description of the many stakeholders and will provide a context for my evaluation of divergent perspectives, interests and controversies that have developed around water and fish in the Klamath.

Federal and State Government Agencies

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBOR) is one of the primary decision makers as the federal agency controls the dams and irrigation systems. Their mission is to "assist in meeting the increasing water demands of the West while protecting the environment and the public's investment in these structures" (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, [USBOR] 2008b). The USBOR is the largest wholesaler of water in the country bringing water to 31 million people and irrigation water to 140,000 farmers (USBOR, 2008a). With 58 power plants, the Bureau of Reclamation is the second largest producer of hydroelectric

power in the Western United States (USBOR, 2008a). Created in 1902, USBOR constructed dams, power plants and canals in the 17 Western states (USBOR, 2008a). The water projects promoted homesteading and economic development in the West (USBOR, 2008a).

The USBOR manages major water supply projects in the Klamath Basin. In 1905, Congress authorized the BOR to develop and construct the Klamath Reclamation Project.² The project plan includes construction of facilities to divert and distribute water for irrigation of basin lands (USBOR, 2008c). The facilities include many dams, diversion channels and reservoirs³ The Project converted many lakes and marshes into agricultural lands and wildlife refuges (Braunworth, Welch, & Hathaway, 2003). The BOR entered into contracts with irrigation districts under the authority of the 1902 Reclamation Act. Districts charged irrigators annual operation and maintenance charges as repayment of Project costs. Contracts also provide the granting of rights to use project water and the delivery of water (Braunworth et al., 2003).

The USBOR describes itself as a water management agency planning numerous programs, initiatives and activities “that will help the Western states, Native American Tribes, and others meet new water needs and balance the multitude of competing uses of water in the West” (USBOR, 2008a). The USBOR is obligated to follow federal and state

² The Secretary of the Interior authorized development of the project on May 15, 1905, under provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902 (32 Stat. 388). The irrigable lands of the Klamath Project are in south-central Oregon (62 percent) and north-central California (38 percent) (Bureau of Reclamation, 2008).

³ Clear Lake Dam, Gerber Dam, and the Lost River Diversion Dam are operated by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Link River Dam is operated by the Pacific Power and Light Company. The Anderson-Rose Diversion Dam is operated by the Tulelake Irrigation District, and the Langell Valley Irrigation District operates the Malone and Miller Diversion Dams. The canals and pumping plants are operated by the various irrigation districts (Bureau of Reclamation, 2008)

laws as well as its contracts to irrigators. The majority of water rights are un-quantified creating difficulties as the USBOR tries to balance a variety of interests. The interests include accommodating instream flow needs, needs of the tribes, needs of the endangered and threatened fish, and needs of irrigators (Braunworth et al., 2004).

Fish and wildlife agencies.

With a mission as resource managers, state and federal agencies, have a great interest in the Klamath River. They must depend on scientific data and analysis to determine what requirements are needed to manage the fish and wildlife habitat within the Klamath. Examples of interested agencies include: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

The USFWS focuses on analyzing environmental information, setting requirements for protection of fish and then issuing their analysis as Biological Opinions (National Research Council, 2004). For example, the USFWS is responsible for issuing biological opinions related to the endangered suckers of the Klamath River basin (National Research Council, 2004). They also have authority to create “reasonable and prudent alternatives” (RPA’s)” that call for “...changes in Klamath Project operations as it believes necessary to reduce risk to the endangered suckers” (National Research Council, 2004, p. 31). Under the Endangered Species Act, the USFWS is responsible for the management of all freshwater and other fish species while the NMFS is responsible for marine species. Under the National Oceanographic & Atmospheric Association (NOAA) and the Department of Commerce, the NMFS is “responsible for the

management, conservation and protection of living marine resources within the United States' Exclusive Economic Zone (water 3 to 200 mile offshore)” (NOAA Fisheries Service, 2011). The USFWS and the NMFS (“the listing agencies”)⁴ have the last word in judging the requirements of the endangered and threatened fishes and can reject a part or all of BOR’s biological assessment proposals (National Research Council, 2004).

The USFWS also plays another role as manager of wildlife refuges in the Klamath Basin. Many of these refuges were created to replace habitat that was lost to the Klamath Project. The six National Wildlife Refuges that were established include the Lower Klamath, Tule Lake, and Clear Lake Refuges in California, and Bear Valley, Upper Klamath, and Klamath Marsh Refuges in southern Oregon (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], 2011). Water allocation for refuges is required to support the migrating waterfowl and other wildlife populations and their habitats. Although required, water delivery to refuges has a lower priority than agricultural use of water. Lower Klamath Lake and Tule Lake refuges receive drainage water from the Klamath Project (National Research Council, 2004). This water is used to manage the refuges depending on constraints set by water availability and requirements for agricultural use in or around the refuges (National Research Council, 2004). USFWS cannot demand specific amounts of water or timing for delivery of water, but rather must negotiate with BOR and with agricultural interests for water to manage the refuges.

⁴ The Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of the Interior and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)-Fisheries in the Department of Commerce, share responsibility for administration of the 1973 Endangered Species Act. These agencies are primarily responsible for listing or de-listing a species considered endangered or threatened.

Their governing statutes are reflected in agency perceptions about water allocation (Soden & Steel, 1999). Agencies provide information about the needs of the ecosystem indicating that some change in water allocation is important to preserve endangered species and a healthy environment (Soden & Steel, 1999).

Tribes

The Indian communities have greatly depended on the Klamath River for many years and desire to see changes in the use of Klamath River water (Soden & Steel, 1999). Sustainable water use is of great interest to the tribes because change in water allocation affects water quality and fish populations. When these are negatively affected, tribal health, culture, and economic stability are compromised.

The river and its health are of central importance to the tribes as they have extensively used the fish of the Klamath River for food and cultural traditions (National Research Council, 2004). The basin tribes include the Klamath (Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin) tribes, the Yurok, Karuk, Shasta and Hoopa Valley tribes. The river and its health are of central importance to the tribes. Historically the Klamath tribes lived along the shores of Upper Klamath Lake and along the streams and rivers of the upper basin (Soden & Steel, 1999). The two endangered species of suckers, Lost River and Shortnose sucker, in Upper Klamath Lake have religious, subsistence and economic significance to the tribe. The Yurok, Hupa and Karuk historically lived along the lower 40 miles of the Klamath River. These lower basin tribes depend on anadromous fish for their subsistence, spiritual health and tribal economies (National Research Council, 2004). Spring and fall-run Chinook salmon, Coho salmon, steelhead, lamprey, and sturgeon continue to sustain

a living culture to this day. The endangered and threatened fish, as well as numerous other fish, are tribal trust species; the U.S. government has an acknowledged obligation to preserve and promote these fish for use by the tribes (National Research Council, 2004).

Preserving fish for tribal use implies given water rights, and in the seniority system, tribal water rights would be senior to all others (National Research Council, 2004). However, the issues of how to translate the protection of fish into specific amounts of water in the basin (and the degree to which any such commitment would curtail other uses of water), have yet to be resolved (National Research Council, 2004). Water allocation is critical to the livelihoods of all the basin tribes. The tribes therefore desire to see changes in the use of Klamath River water that will sustain both traditional ways and modern livelihoods (Soden & Steel, 1999).

Not only is the amount of water important to Indians in the basin but the quality of the water as well. Fish survival is negatively impacted when human activities affect nutrient loads and increased water temperature (USCRS, 2005)⁵ According to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (2002), federally listed salmon “are highly sensitive to warm stream temperatures.” Low water quality has been known to cause disease and mortality of fish populations and also pose a risk to human health (California Department of Fish & Game, 2003). One main symptom of low water quality in the basin has been the emergence of toxic algae (*Microcystis aeruginosa*). A 2005 study by Jacob

⁵ Human activities such as land use changes, increased water use, erosion and agricultural runoff have been shown to decrease water flows, increase water temperatures and increase nutrient loads. Low water flows, high temperatures and run-off causes conditions that affect fish survival due to low oxygen levels, increased stress levels in fish that leave them vulnerable to disease, and algae blooms (USCRS, 2005; Martin, 2003; Oregon Wild, 2011).

Kann (2006) found microcystin levels 4000x the World Health Organizations standard for moderate risk in some places in the reservoirs near Klamath River dams. Not only does the algae provide habitat for parasites that cause gill rot in fish but also secretes a potent liver toxin that can cause necrosis of the liver in humans (Chorus & Bartram, 1999)⁶. Polluted water poses health risks to tribes as many ceremonial practices call for tribal leaders to bathe numerous times in the river (Klamath Basin Tribal Water Quality Working Group, 2011).

Many Indian tribes feel that the health of fish populations and water quality will improve once the first four hydroelectric dams of the Klamath River are removed. They feel dam removal will increase fish passage and survival as well as reduce or eliminate algae blooms. Different tribes may not all agree that this approach will fully solve the problem. However, all can agree that sustainable water use and improving the health of the river and the fisheries is of dire importance.

Irrigators (farmers & ranchers)

Irrigated agriculture has been practiced on the upper Klamath for over 140 years. Farmers and ranchers depend on appropriate water allocation to support their livelihoods. An increasing number of irrigators used water within and outside of the Klamath Project. (National Research Council, 2004). Forty-three percent of consumptive use in the upper basin occurs outside of the basin project while 57% is within the project, irrigating about 220,000 acres (National Research Council, 2004). There is also a considerable amount of

⁶ Many acute effects range from diarrhea, nausea, cramps, fainting, numbness, dizziness, tingling, and paralysis to skin rashes (Chorus & Bartram 1999).

irrigation along tributaries in the lower basin beyond the boundaries of the Klamath Project (National Research Council, 2004). Agricultural uses of irrigation water are numerous and include water used in the broad flat valleys of the upper basin mainly for flood irrigating pastures and alfalfa crops (Soden & Steel, 1999). Principal irrigated crops are barley, alfalfa hay and other hay, oats, potatoes, and wheat (USBOR, 2008c).

The non-project irrigators and the Bureau of Reclamation irrigators in Oregon and California have similar views about changes in water use in the Klamath. Irrigators strongly oppose any change in water use and view changes as a challenge to property rights and livelihoods (Soden & Steel, 1999). The Klamath Project irrigators receive as much water as can be put to beneficial use (Soden & Steel 1999). Most irrigators believe that the federal government should not intervene in the water allocation system (Soden & Steel, 1999).

Fishing and recreation interests

There are also fishing and recreation interests along the Klamath River. Many parties are involved as their livelihoods depend on enough water flow in the Klamath to support fishing and white water rafting. These groups include, but are not limited to, white water guide services, ocean fishers, and sport fishing groups (Soden & Steel, 1999). “They are concerned about the condition of the streambed, fish spawning, salmon populations, and fish health as well as water quality and the timing and magnitude of flows” (Soden & Steel, 1999).

Healthy salmon populations in the Klamath are particularly important to commercial fishermen. Unsuitable water conditions and low populations of anadromous

fish in the river mean low ocean populations and therefore create greater government-imposed fishing restrictions. Fishermen desire to see changes in Klamath water use that will sustain the long term health of the fisheries and therefore their livelihood. Fish and water declines in years past, pitted fishermen against Indian tribes as the reallocation of salmon harvest to tribes were once blamed for declining populations for fishermen. After long battles, fishermen (specifically ocean fishers) finally realized that tribal harvests were not the cause for declines and soon found a common cause with many tribes. With similar interests to sustain livelihoods these two parties are allies in the fight for clean, adequate water flows and healthy salmon populations in the Klamath River.

One of the most vocal parties representing the ocean fishers are the Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association (PCFFA). PCFFA is made up of many different port and fishermen's marketing associations, spanning from San Diego to Alaska (PCFFA, 2011). Their goal is to assure the rights of individual fishermen and fight for the long-term survival of commercial fishing as a productive livelihood and way of life (PCFFA, 2011). Fisherman have been hit with restricted fishing access over the years but the most widespread closure occurred in 2006 when over 700 miles of coastline were closed to the salmon industry due to the Klamath crisis (PCFFA, 2011). Fisherman could not fish any salmon in the ocean for fear of jeopardizing Klamath stocks (PCFFA, 2011). Currently, many ocean fishers believe that the decline in salmon fisheries and salmon-produced jobs are due to habitat destruction and mismanagement of federal hydropower and irrigation dams (PCFFA, 2011). The PCFFA has worked hard to endorse the removal

of several dams along the Klamath because they see this as a necessary measure for restoring west coast salmon (PCFFA, 2011).

Environmental interests

Due to the important and remarkable environmental resources in the basin, there are strong environmental interests in the Klamath River. Some of the environmental groups often involved in Klamath issues include: American Rivers, World Wildlife Fund, and California Coastal Conservancy, Friends of the River, Klamath Forest Alliance, and Ecotrust. Their major concerns are improving the water quality of the river, species recovery, ecological restoration, controlling algae blooms, and providing safe recreation. Many groups have worked toward reducing consumptive use, protecting fish and other wildlife habitats, and the reversing of environmental damage, among other goals. For example, The Nature Conservancy has purchased a large tract of land near Upper Klamath Lake, where it is restoring wetlands (National Research Council, 2004). The goals of many environmental organizations are similar to some of the goals of agencies, tribes, and fishermen however the goals are based on different interests.

Environmentalists might work to protect environmental resources because of their intrinsic value. The governing statutes of agencies often drive their environmental protection interests, while interests in spirituality, health and sustaining one's way of life may drive many tribes to protect resources. Interests in a productive livelihood may drive fishermen's interests in resource protection. Although interests are different they all work

toward a common resource protection goal and often ally with each other when entering the political fight for policy change along the Klamath.

PacificCorp

PacificCorp is another entity worth mentioning because of its stake in numerous hydroelectric dams along the Klamath River. PacificCorp is an energy company that owns and operates the Klamath Hydroelectric Project (KHP), located on the upper Klamath River in Klamath County (south-central Oregon) and Siskiyou County (north-central California) (PacificCorp, 2011b). There are 5 distinct developments that generate about 169 megawatts of energy: Iron Gate, Copco No.1, Copco No.2, J.C. Boyle and Fall Creek (PacificCorp, 2011a). These dams were constructed between 1902 and 1962. Dams have been known to block anadromous fish passage along the Klamath River and therefore many stakeholders have concluded that dam removal will help restore endangered fish populations. On February 25th, 2004, PacificCorp filed an application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to renew their 50-year license for the KHP. This has caused disputes over the various benefits and costs of re-licensing versus removing the dams. Diverse stakeholders such as the environmental groups, the tribes and fisherman, have petitioned against PacificCorp's license renewal in favor of decommissioning the dams.

Conflict Along the Klamath

The disconnections and competition for resources along the Klamath River have led to a variety of conflicts and legal battles over the years. The Basin's deep-seeded past,

turbulent present and murky future more than qualifies it as a long standing conflict (Lewicki, Gray, & Elliot, 2003). For the past 150 years there have been controversies in the Klamath River basin. Competing demands for fish, power, and water have plagued the Klamath since the early 1900's (Most, 2006). The Klamath River was once America's third greatest salmon producing river, but today, dams, diversions, mining, and poor logging practices have left salmon runs at less than 8% of historic levels. For the most part, disputes have revolved around fish and water rights. Conflict after conflict has ensued between Native Americans, fishermen, farmers, ranchers, miners, local residents, government agencies, energy companies, environmental organizations and whoever else has a stake in the future of the Klamath River.

The 2001 water crisis

Many issues were brought to the forefront when the 2001 "water crisis" occurred. The conflicting claims for water between Klamath Project irrigators and Indian tribes, environmental organizations, and federal wildlife managers (paired with extremely dry conditions that year) set off a firestorm of debate (USCRS, 2005; Meiners & Kosnik, 2003). Conflict was sparked when BOR notified farmers (who had contracts for delivery of water), that they would not be receiving water for irrigation that season (USCRS, 2005; Meiners & Kosnik, 2003). The USFWS, NMFS and tribal scientists released a biological opinion that called for increased flows of water into the Klamath. They determined that the limited water in the Klamath river was needed to prevent jeopardizing the survival of fish species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (USCRS, 2005; Meiners & Kosnik 2003). The studies

concerning coho and suckers pressured the BOR to comply or face lawsuits based on tribal fishing rights and the Endangered Species Act (Most, 2006). Farmers felt the denial of water was an attack on their livelihood and feared economic hardship so they responded with fury. There were occasions of angry protests and times where “they faced down federal marshals in order to open the canals and – symbolically - release water to their lands” (Meiners & Kosnik, 2003, pp. 2-3). They also made statements by forming a “bucket brigade” and pouring Klamath River water bucket by bucket into an irrigation canal (Most, 2006). The intense pressure led to Interior Secretary Gale Norton announcing the release of 70,000 to 75,000 acre feet of water from Upper Klamath Lake to assist farmers in need (Most, 2006). Before this release, irrigators already estimated the economic losses for the 2001 crop year at around 160 million (USCRS, 2005). Later that year the Department of Interior appointed the National Research Council to review the scientific studies on which the Biological Opinion was based (Most, 2006). Their report determined that there was no scientific basis for cutting off water to farmers in order to protect fish habitat (National Research Council, 2002; Meiners & Kosnik, 2003).

Fish kill of 2002

Despite the report that there was no scientific justification for diverting water flows, environmental and tribal biologists still feared that low flows would result in a fish kill. In September 2002, thousands of Chinook salmon in the Klamath River suddenly died resulting in one of the country’s largest fish kills (Anderson, 2002). The sight of thousands of salmon dead on the Klamath River was shocking to many people. Although the Chinook were not an endangered species, it revitalized concern about “how to keep

sufficient water in the river to protect wildlife, especially endangered fish” (Meiners & Kosnik, 2003, p. 4). Warm water temperatures and low flows contributed to the death of the salmon and made them vulnerable to diseases that ultimately killed them (USCRS, 2005; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 2003; Martin, 2003; Meiners & Kosnik, 2003). The die-off damaged fish stocks and hurt tribes, commercial fisherman, and recreational anglers that catch Klamath fish.

Conflicting goals and missions, along with inflexible policies and procedures, leads to further intractability in this conflict. The conflicts that came before and after the 2001 and 2002 crisis have lead to negative attitudes and perceptions often pitting one group against another. When groups are at odds, mistrust and fear can arise creating a boundary to understanding each other’s point of view. Throughout this thesis I will describe how the *Salmon is Everything* theatre performance may help to break down that boundary and create greater understanding among the many conflicting groups.

Portrayal of a local community: The *Salmon is Everything* story

On the road to understanding different viewpoints, the perspectives must be brought to the forefront. *Salmon is Everything* does this as it uses the stories and relationships between characters to illustrate the many different viewpoints that exist along the Klamath. The fictional characters ranged from Upper and Lower Klamath folks, tribal families, farmers, ranchers, biologists, tourists, and recreationists. Many of these stories were drawn from actual interviews from the local community. The main thread delves into the lives of a Yurok/Karuk family and reveals what the salmon mean to them and how the fish kill affects them. It also follows an Upper Klamath ranching and

farming family and their story. The interweaving of the stories and insights of the various players illustrates how all are connected and affected by the Klamath crisis. One of the main characters, Julie (a young Yurok-Karuk woman), has an influence in many different social worlds. Her family has a long history with the spiritual and cultural uses of salmon as her gram, Rose, describes throughout the story. They also greatly depend on the salmon physically and economically as Julie's husband, Will, is a Yurok-Karuk native fisherman. As a student in tribal fisheries she brings new perspectives and knowledge with her in her interactions with Kate, a fellow biology student. Julie also attends a town hall meeting to make her voice heard and strikes up a unique relationship with Tim, the Upper Klamath rancher. Towards the end there is a hopeful scenario where Tim and Julie begin to understand each other better. Tim eventually desires to make an effort to do what he can to work with his Indian neighbors to take care of the land.

By illuminating these stories on stage and envisioning the possibilities towards positive change I believe this play has the potential to alter perspectives. As I will describe in the following section, many types of community based theatre works, like *Salmon is Everything*, has been shown to be powerful transformative agents.

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many forms of theatre, created for different reasons or purposes, yet I think all would agree that theatre, somehow affects all who participate in it. Whether participation simply gratifies the desire for aesthetic pleasure and entertainment or transforms and empowers people, theatre leaves an impression. Participation can include performing in a theatrical work, helping to create it, or watching the performance. The interplay of these aspects of theatre depends on which form, and for what reason and purpose a theatre work was created. Theatre forms can range from “formal theatre” to performance of literature; and “alternative theatre”, such as political theatre, applied theatre, community theatre and so on.

For purposes of this paper I will explore some of the literature describing these theatre forms to better understand the ways they are used to create individual or social change.

Alternative Theatre: Beyond the Mainstream

Mainstream, or institutionalized, performance is bound by specific practices in which there is an obvious distinction between performer and audience member. From the performing arts buildings, to the opera houses and theatre stages, many types of dance, theatre, or other visual art, are familiar to us and can often be clearly categorized. We clearly know our role as an audience member as we sit back enjoy the show and prepare to be entertained. Alternative performances on the other hand, cannot be easily

categorized as they often incorporate many elements and disciplines into their practices and the boundary between performer and audience is blurred. “Alternative theatre” is generally described as an alternative to the dominant form of theatre or in opposition to the conventional, mainstream or establishment theatre (Holderness, 1991; Kershaw, 1992). Community participation throughout the many stages of performance is one of many contrasts between the alternative from the mainstream form. Alternative, or community theatre performances, use a variety of unconventional spaces and practices to contribute to and learn from the community in which it performs.

The foundations of alternative theatre

While researching alternative forms of theatre, a common base between them emerged. The literature on alternative theatre frequently reflected and referenced Augusto Boal’s work. A logical place to start in this literature review is with the foundational piece most often mentioned called *Theatre of the Oppressed* (Boal, 1979). Augusto Boal, a native Brazilian, presents a different view of theatre that has influenced a variety of alternative practices. First of all, Boal expresses his view about theatre and politics by attempting to show in his book “...that all theatre is necessarily political, because all the activities of man are political and theatre is one of them.” Boal does not believe there can be a separation between theatre and politics and any such effort is a political attitude leading us into error (Boal, 1979). This idea of politics and theatre will be revisited when I discuss more about political theatre.

A very influential part of Boal’s *Theatre of the Oppressed* is his discussion about the different forms of theatre and the fundamental changes that theatre has undergone.

Boal (1979) believes that “theatre is a weapon” that can be used as a tool for domination or liberation depending on how it is used and in what form. As Boal (1979) states, “change is imperative.” In a critique of the traditions of early European theatre, Augusto Boal (1979) attempts to illustrate major changes in theatre that moved it from an activity in which “all could participate freely” to a form that created divisions such as spectators and actors. Boal argues that this type of theatre emerged from “Aristotle’s coercive system of tragedy”; even though Aristotle believed there was a dependence between poetry and politics, Aristotle’s poetics “constructed the first, extremely powerful poetic political system for intimidation of spectator...” (Boal, 1979). “Theatre” was once “the people singing freely in the open air; the theatrical performance was created by and for the people...” (Boal, 1979). According to Boal (1979), the aristocracy emerged and created divisions; “...some persons will go on stage and only they will be able to act; the rest will remain seated, receptive, passive—these will be the spectators, the masses, the people.” He also states that to further reflect the dominant ideology, the aristocracy also made divisions among the actors; “...some actors will be protagonists (aristocrats) and the rest will be the chorus—symbolizing, in one way or another, the mass” (Boal, 1979).

Boal argues that the ideological theatre system described is still utilized today in conventional theatre and feels it must be brought back to its original form—a more participatory form. Boal (1979) notes Bertolt Brecht’s contribution to a type of Marxist poetics that differs from Idealist poetics and implies that social being determines thought and not vice versa. From this, Boal takes theatre a step further and illustrates ways to create the participatory theatre he describes by laying out a plan and using examples of

People's Theatre in Peru. Overall, Boal has worked to create a variety of participatory forms of theatre which have been taken up by community theatre practitioners around the world.

Contemporary forms and purposes

Theory vs practice.

Discussions and applications of Augusto Boal's works in other practices has centered around the transition from theory to practice and the use of critical pedagogy. Leigh Anne Howard (2004) discusses the idea of critical pedagogy and the tension between ideology and praxis. In her article *Speaking Theatre/ Doing Pedagogy: Re-visiting Theatre of the Oppressed*, she argues that one avenue for "making the transition from theory to practice" is to combine "critical pedagogy with interactive performance" (Howard, 2004). Howard (2004) informs the reader that under the critical pedagogy paradigm "...education should encourage students to think critically, to analyze social conditions, and to evaluate information---particularly information related to power, identity and representation." Howard situates her argument within the ideas and methods of Augusto Boal's *Theatre of the Oppressed* because she sees Boal's work as one of the early works that values "performance as a pedagogical tool" (Howard, 2004). Using Boal's techniques, a project entitled Beauty and the Feast was created, stemming from various interviews, in which student performers "created an interactive drama that explored issues of body image and related social pressures" (Howard, 2004). Through this process, participants learned about their "personal behaviors related to eating and

body image,” critically analyzed cultural norms and expectations, and “developed a richer understanding of the performance process” (Howard, 2004).

Again, looking at the tension between ideology and practice, I believe Howard’s combination of critical pedagogy and interactive performance serves to address the other discussion on critical pedagogy described in “Story-telling for social change” by Sharene Razack. Razack (1993) stresses that critical pedagogy must be careful to pay attention to “our ways of knowing” and therefore the context in which we tell and hear stories. Razack (1993) states that “Unless we want to fall into the trap of demanding that the oppressed speak in a unified voice before we will believe them, we are still left with the difficult task of negotiating our way through various ways of knowing and towards political action.” Pairing critical pedagogy with participatory forms of theatre allows the participants to critically reflect; it gives them the authority and power to choose what issues to explore; and gives them the authority to choose how to give voice to their stories, if they choose to do it at all.

Exploring Transformation and Empowerment

Awareness, healing, dialogue, and strength

Opportunities for transformation are present when theatre taps into the need a community has to better understand critical issues, to heal wounds or to empower themselves. This section illustrates the array of literature that addresses the transformative nature of theatre. To get a deeper understanding of the implications of alternative theatre forms I will begin with Philip Taylor’s (2003) book *Applied Theatre:*

creating transformative encounters in the community. In his book Taylor describes a critical, participatory, community-based and personally and socially transformative theatre (Taylor, 2003). Taylor writes of theatre “that is a catalyst for reflection and inquiry, one that poses problems rather than closing down interpretive options, one that seeks incompleteness [and]...demonstrates possible narratives.”

Taylor (2003) mostly describes applied theatre as a way to pose alternatives. In most of the theatre projects that Taylor describes, characters and scenarios are generated and opportunities are created for the community to respond to their pain. The audience (or participants) are encouraged to participate in this form of theatre, reconstruct the narrative and come up with possible solutions to the dilemmas posed. These dilemmas are ones reflective of what the community is dealing with at the time. This type of theatre is very similar to one of Augusto Boal’s forms of theatre, called Forum Theatre (Boal, 1979). This form is currently different from the *Salmon is Everything* play I am analyzing however, applied theatre described in Taylor’s book illuminates the role of theatre as a way to educate, transform, raise awareness, create dialogue, and heal or strengthen communities, all of which *Salmon is Everything* may serve to do. Applied theatre is participatory in that it is driven by the needs and desires of the community. Applied theatre is described as almost a combination of therapy and collaborative decision-making in regard to a pressing issue.

Taylor (2003) illustrates the elements essential in applied theatre (people, passion, platform), praxis and the challenges, and subsequent compromises, of implementing applied theatre. Concepts of applied theatre that can be useful in describing the *Salmon is*

Everything performance are how theatre helps communities process issues, heightens awareness, and therefore may be seen as a transformative agent. Describing how applied theatre helps communities process issues Taylor (2003) states: “This is a theatre that is taken out into non-theatrical settings...and other locations for the purpose of helping the audience, or the participants, grapple with an issue, event or question of immediate public or personal concern.”

Taylor (2003) gives a good brief descriptions of various ways theatre (applied or not) can be used to create change. Taylor (2003) describes applied theatre as being powered by a need to change: “a community is hurting and theatre can enable people to process their hurt...”

First of all, theatre can raise awareness by troupes engaging in theatre as the principal way of understanding issues (Taylor uses the examples of HIV, AIDS and safe sex awareness) and “drawing on the traditions of storytelling and narrative discourses (Taylor, 2003). Also performances can be “important events for calling attention to unjust political policies such as those that actively promote exclusion of certain cultural groups...” Refer back to how Leigh Anne Howard’s, “Beauty and the Feast” allowed for the group of young women to become more aware of their personal (as well as others’) eating habits and perspectives on their bodies. This awareness allowed individuals or communities to make changes if necessary. “Applied theatre is committed to the power of the aesthetic form for raising awareness about how we are situated in this world and what we as individuals and as communities might do to make the world a better place” (Taylor, 2003). There is a chance that *Salmon is Everything* incorporates these characteristics.

Another purpose of theatre can be to heal psychological wounds or barriers. Stories and thoughts are put in dramatic form and act as a healing process for audiences to observe the work and share their stories. This work has a therapeutic quality, “which aims to rebuild a fracture, a scarring” (Taylor, 2003). Taylor argues that “..theatre can be applied in the “rebuilding” and healing of those in need” (Taylor, 2003). Howard (2004) acknowledges the psychosocial functions of performance. This function is possible because “performance provides individuals with an experiential, communicative tool to express what might otherwise be inexpressible” (Howard, 2004). Theatre can be a tool for therapy (Moreno, 1946) because it can have therapeutic benefits “that help individuals recognize problems and identify emotional responses to heal” (Howard, 2004; Meillo, 1991; Meldrum, 1994; Roloff, 1983; Williams, 1983). Theatre can be a method of “self-understanding or a tool for personal change” (Howard, 2004).

Theatre can also be used to challenge contemporary discourses. Theatre in this form is applied to “...critique contemporary mainstream discourses, discourses often powered by oppression of minorities and those who live in the margins” (Taylor, 2003). “Applied theatre provides a significant public service by enabling communities to talk freely about their own, and others’, perceptions and values” (Taylor, 2003). Again, referring to Howard’s example of *Beauty and the Feast*, the women participating in the project were able to discuss their views about body image more openly and able to analyze and critique norms about these issues (Howard, 2004).

Finally, Taylor (2003) describes an example of a theatre project dealing with domestic violence and illustrates theatre’s use for voicing the views of the silent and

marginalized. Theatre can be an important tool to enable victims/survivors to voice their views (Taylor, 2003).

Two quotations from Taylor (2003) that eloquently summarize the implications of these various uses of theatre follow:

“...it’s the application of the theatrical art form that is being harnessed to help communities determine some aspect of who they are and what they aspire to become. Whether these applications are aimed at facilitating a dialogue, healing a pain, or processing a specific issue of significant importance within a community, theatre is a platform that empowers a transformation.”

And further:

“The theatre is applied because it is taken out from the conventional theatre house into various settings in communities where many members have no real experience in theatre form. The theatre becomes a medium for action, for reflection but, most important, for transformation—a theatre in which new modes of being can be encountered and new possibilities for humankind can be imagined.” (Taylor, 2003).

Looking at more illustrative examples in which the forms mentioned above are used, Boon and Plastow (Eds) (2004) present a collection of essays that describe a variety of community-based art forms used to empower various communities. The accounts are from individuals who were involved in the creation or production of these plays. They are academics, professors, and authors as well as community artists and playwrights. These examples illustrate the positive political and social interventions that theatre has made in a range of developing cultures across the world. Boon and Plastow (2004) make the claim that theatre matters in its “...power to bring together divided communities of different kinds...and engage creatively, productively and meaningfully with a wide range

of issues from extreme poverty to AIDS, violence, human rights, sexual, racial and political intolerance and the power of the state.”

The first example by Gerri Moriarty (2004) describes the process of bringing two community theatre groups together in Ireland from conflicting religious groups (a Protestant and a Catholic theatre group) to create a “collaborative project with the major community theatre groups in Belfast to produce a play that would take as its central point a marriage between a young Protestant and a young Catholic” (Moriarty, 2004, p. 15). This project was called “The Wedding Community Play Project” and was initiated in Northern Ireland (Moriarty, 2004). The aims of the project were to:

“...create a safe space in which the participants of different backgrounds could explore difficult issues, and emotions, differences and similarities through drama, create a powerful piece that raised questions about mixed marriage encouraging insight and debate, to raise awareness of the quality of community theatre practice in Belfast and give it a higher profile, and create opportunities for participants to develop their theatre skills” (Moriarty, 2004, p. 15)

The goal of this project was to “provide opportunities for individual development of political and social discourse and cultural growth” (Moriarty, 2004, p.16). Here we see the goals of this project incorporating some purposes of theatre such as raising awareness, exploring emotionally difficult issues to try to promote healing, and to possibly challenge a contemporary discourse.

An interesting concept that may help me to distinguish between what kind of community theatre *Salmon is Everything* might be is Moriarty’s discussion of the two models of community theatre.

“One model sees community theatre as collaborative creative process, owned by all those who agree to participate in it, striving to give voice to different perspectives (sometimes colliding, sometimes contradictory). The second model is predicated more on creating theatre about communities, using material such as testimony and research, it is in some senses rather like a television documentary” (Moriarty, 2004, p. 21).

The Wedding Play Project was a success in some ways, but failed to accomplish its goals in others. The project created good opportunities for discussion and dialogue but due to lack of time, energy and money at various stages, this theatre work fell short of the “community cultural production” that was hoped for (Moriarty, 2004). This brings up some important issues that need to be taken into account when analyzing the goals of *Salmon is Everything*. External forces may thwart the efforts to reach its potential.

Another example described as community theatre is the emergence of a community play, Teatro Povero, in Monticchiello, Italy (Andrews, 2004). With this project we see the purpose of “voicing the views of the silent and marginalized” (Taylor, 2003) because this theatre work emerged to give voice to the oppressed, ignored and subordinate peasant culture that once existed in Tuscany (Andrews, 2004). “The cultural strategies which peasants built up to cope with their predicament, and the worldview created by their oral culture, were systematically despised by the rest of Italian society...” (Andrews, 2004, p. 38). Through the medium of theatre the Monticchiello village initiated a project to “recount and analyze both the peasant experience as such and the way it came to an end” (Andrews, 2004, p. 40). The motivation for this show was “a desire to tell one’s story to a larger audience” (Andrews, 2004). The transformative aspect of this project comes from the empowerment “...of knowing that one has acquired

an image, and therefore more of a presence, in other people's minds (Andrews 2004, p. 40).

In Michael Etherton's (2004) article, *South Asia's Child Rights Theatre for Development: the empowerment of children who are marginalized, disadvantaged and excluded*, he described theatre for development (TfD) workshops in Bangladesh to empower young people. Asia's children, women and poor "constitute the disadvantaged and powerless in society" (Etherton, 2004 p. 192). Etherton (2004), with Save the Children, were concerned with strengthening children's "right to be heard, the right to express their views in the media of their choosing, and their right to assembly" (p.190). One insight of the empowerment of this project was "...when the poor and powerless young people can be heard, they usually want to decide for themselves what they want changed. Once they are given a voice, they alter the agenda for action and change" (Etherton, 2004 p. 192).

Although this was an effort to give voice to the oppressed and marginalized as well this project also illustrates the opportunities that theatre can create for negotiation and conflict resolution, which is another aspect I may want to explore for my thesis. Etherton (2004) argues that: "TfD itself is a method and a process that the young people say enables them to deal with those in authority" (Etherton, 2004 p. 215). The method is improvisation and the process "is contained in a set of tools and exercises that leads children and young people into negotiation with adults in positions of power. One purpose of the TfD was to "enable adults, and young people together to learn negotiation skills and conflict resolution" (Etherton, 2004 p. 190). TfD, then, is itself a process of

empowerment of socially excluded children and young people” (Etherton, 2004 p. 216)

The techniques of the Tfd mostly mimic the theatre forms of Augusto Boal’s *Theatre of the Oppressed*, because it was activist theatre that emphasized collective improvisation, encouraged audience involvement and creativity; no author or written script, or memorized lines (Etherton, 2004). There was a positive reaction to the Tfd project and Etherton (2004) notes that there was “...a growing sense of change in the relations between the powerful adult world and marginalized children and young people.”

Socio-Political uses of theatre

Most of the alternative forms and examples I have already described in this thesis exemplifies how theatre has changed the participants on an individual level but fails to explain further how this change may be connected to social change. I wanted to visit this idea of socio-political uses of theatre because I think that the relationship between politics and theatre speaks more to the social change aspect that theatre may play a part in.

The characteristics of the alternative theatre forms can be considered political in some way but is not necessarily considered “political theatre.” A theatre work may not intend to have socio-political influences but a connection may be present through content that challenges mainstream discourses and unfair policies informed by those discourses. Theatre can merely represent the political as an aspect of life or be theatre that is fundamentally shaped by political commitment and conviction (Barker, 1992).

Leigh Anne Howard acknowledges the sociopolitical uses of theatre in her article, *Speaking Theatre/ Doing Pedagogy: Re-visiting Theatre of the Oppressed* (2004).

Howard (2004) states that “performance is a social-political process because it serves as an indicator of social change as it illuminates problems, encourages awareness or dissent, and serves as a forum for civic discourse.”

I feel that the argument that best explores the socio-political functions of theatre is Kay Ellen Capo’s, *From Academic to Social-Political Uses of Performance*. Capo (1983) describes that there have been few people who “...have considered whether the performance of verbal art can establish a “public,” a community of culture and values that makes social practice and social change possible.” She discusses several examples that have been influential as socio-political projects involving the elderly, ethnic minorities, women, the handicapped, small farmers, the imprisoned, and local communities (Capo, 1983). For example, in the project involving disabled participants, planners conducted interviews with disabled persons of the area, condensed the material into a reader’s theatre script, and taught disabled participants to perform their own stories for public audiences of diverse types (Capo, 1983). The audience was reminded that “it is not enough to feel sympathy for the disabled individuals, nor is it enough to criticize or bemoan existing conditions. They are confronted with the question: What are you willing and able to do to improve conditions for disabled people?” (Fritsche, 1978).

Capo (1983) states:

“Audience members were challenged to imagine how they could put pressure on schools, public institutions, and advocacy groups of which they were a part in order to see that facilities and services for the disabled could be made available.”

The aim of the drama was “to move large numbers of people to urge reconsideration of public policies which have a negative impact upon the disabled” (Fritsche, 1978). Capo (1983) states that “oral interpretation surely showed its usefulness in this political context.”

Eco-theatre

As ecological crises are coming to the forefront in our society, theatre has begun to take up these issues and explore the connections between art, culture and nature. Eco-theatre can be described as community-based theatre with an environmental theme. It is theatre that illuminates ecological issues on stage as well as gives voice to the natural world (May, 2004; Davis, 1997). Eco-theatre often seeks to address human disconnections from the natural world that can be seen as a base of many environmental problems (May, 2004; Davis, 1997). In eco-theatre projects, local theatre artists are often responding to environmental issues that affect the community. May (2004) describes that “community-based environmental issues – including environmental justice concerns – have found theater a viable tool through which to promote social change, open dialogue, or protest the status quo” Eco-theatre desires to rebuild the connections between the human and non-human world and be used as a tool to help address the environmental problems we face.

Social Capital: Building Community

Within this review I have illustrated many examples of how theatre can be used to repair disconnections between individuals, groups, and even between people and nature. Fostering connections is important if theatre proves to educate, increase dialogue, heal or

empower communities. Bridging connections between people establishes trust and allows relationships and networks to form. This “building of community” has the potential to create a stronger and more extensive level of social change.

The act of people coming together, engaging with one another, and creating a work of art through people’s experiences and stories, is at the heart of community based theatre. Many of these undertakings involve “making connections among people, establishing bonds of trust and understanding, building community” (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). In other words, they are creating social capital. Social capital is defined as “developing networks of relationships that weave individuals into groups and communities” (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). The positive effects of social capital involve ways people in relationship can reach goals that would have been far out of reach for isolated individuals (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). Some networks link people who are similar in most respects (“bonding social capital”) while others encompass different types of people (“bridging social capital”) (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003). It is obviously much more challenging to foster social networks that bridge splits in communities than it is to foster the networks that reinforce “bonding social capital”. Community based theatre has the ability to meet those challenges by creating social capital through people sharing stories about their experiences. Putnam & Feldstein (2003) put it well when they describe how “the rich mixture of events, values, feelings and ideas that stories communicate has long made storytelling an important mechanism of social connection. Stories help us to relate to one another.” People like to tell their own stories and most like to also listen to others’ as well. The act of telling and listening to stories creates empathy and helps

people find things they have in common. Finding common ground in turn eases the formation of enduring groups and networks (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

Building community by forming relationships and networks does not happen overnight. Bridging social capital and crafting lasting relationships and mutual trust, takes a great deal of time and effort. Putnam and Feldstein (2003) describe a performing arts project that aimed to bridge a shipyard and town that were divided by social class and ideology. The performing arts project brought the two communities together by establishing intimacy and trust through its participatory process. Bridging social capital was built over the two long years of development and rehearsal rather than within the performance itself. “People working together over a period of time is what built connections and understanding. It took time to let the stories come out, to shape stories and gestures into art, to establish trust and understanding” (Putnam & Feldstein, 2003).

Community theatre, with its emphasis on story-telling and its often time-intensive process, may provide the key ingredients to building trust, forming relationships and strengthening communities. This creation of social capital may leave those communities better equipped for creating the positive change they need and desire.

Reflecting on Alternative Theatre

This literature review explored the various forms of theatre and what motivations and purposes guide the direction of performance. It is clear that Augusto Boal’s ideas reoccur throughout each kind of practice. The practices are diverse and serve various functions but I feel they share characteristics in their process. The process of these art

works described “pushes people to think and analyze” (Boon & Plastow, 2004). All the practices in the book are “profoundly subversive of established power” (Boon & Plastow, 2004), because they are unconventional and alternative in nature. Most people involved in these works did not have a background in community-based theatre and the practices developed reflect, and are closely tailored to, the cultures and needs of the communities they serve.

The various issues raised throughout the different pieces of literature including transformation and empowerment, personal and social change, and politics and resistance will help to inform my analysis of the origins, development, goals and role of the *Salmon is Everything* play within the context of the Klamath Salmon Crisis.

METHODS

A variety of methods were employed to meet the various goals of this study. One goal was to record and follow the progression of *Salmon is Everything* as the project struggles to continue its work. In 2007, I had the opportunity to interact and learn more about some of the people in the Klamath Theatre Project. I attended every rehearsal and performance of *Salmon is Everything* to video record the process that *Salmon is Everything* went through to continue their performances that year. Rehearsals occurred almost every night throughout the month of February culminating in 4 performances in March and April. One performance occurred at Humboldt State University during the Education Encounter conference on March 3rd, 2007. The next performance was in Hoopa, CA on March 10th, 2007 held at the Hoopa High School Gymnasium. The next performance was March 18th, 2007 in Klamath, CA with the last performance held in Orleans, CA.

Besides documenting the process and performances, my second goal was to find out what people's opinions were about *Salmon is Everything* and how it informed their thoughts or emotions. Along with documenting the progression of *Salmon is Everything* I was interested in the stories and opinions of the cast, the audience, and any key players in the emergence of *Salmon is Everything* (i.e. the playwright, the director, those involved in the Klamath Theatre Project class, etc.).

Surveys: Questionnaires and Interviews

Multiple data collection methods were used to illustrate the goals of this study. One of the methods includes surveys. Most surveys focus on attitudes, opinions, pieces of information about the conditions of life, and the categories that define and differentiate individuals (Baker 1994, p.11). The attitudes and opinions of audience members and cast members was the main focus of surveys in this study. Baker (1994) indicates two primary modes of doing a survey: questionnaires and interviews. This thesis utilized both types of surveys. Questionnaires were created and used at performance locations to gauge audience reaction to *Salmon is Everything*. Face to face and telephone interviews were used to ask more in-depth questions to audience and cast members involved.

The questionnaires contained general socio-demographic information as well as open-ended questions related to the performance. The number and type of questions added to the questionnaire allowed flexibility in examining different research questions and analyzing numerous variables. Originally created for a class project, the questionnaires also met the needs of data collection for this study.⁷ The open ended questions (not providing multiple choice categories) presented to audience members were important for gathering information about people's immediate reaction to the eco-drama, how the eco-drama may have informed them and if any of their perspectives changed

⁷ The questionnaire created served dual purposes. Demographic data were used for a class project titled, *Audience Surveys and GIS: Looking at Patterns of Connection to the Klamath River through Spatial Analysis*. I explored if distance of residence from the Klamath River or socio-demographics had any effect on how connected one feels to the Klamath River. The remaining questions about the Klamath River and about *Salmon is Everything* were used for this thesis research.

after seeing the eco-drama. Questionnaires were placed on seats at the performance and audience members were asked to fill them out and turn them in after the show.

Questionnaires were used to collect opinion data from audience members and gather contact information from audience members interested in being interviewed further. From contact information given on the surveys, certain audience members were later contacted to schedule a more in-depth interview.

In order to gather further in-depth data on audience opinion and reaction to *Salmon is Everything* I conducted interviews with audience members, cast members, and key players involved in the emergence of KTP and/or *Salmon is Everything*. The sample group of audience members that were interviewed were drawn from individuals that saw the eco-drama in 2007 and who indicated on their survey that they were willing to be interviewed further. Cast members interviewed were from the 2007 cast of *Salmon is Everything* (which differed slightly from the previous cast). Other influential people that played a role in the emergence of *Salmon is Everything* or the Klamath Theatre Project were referred to me by other people I interviewed. A digital recorder was used to record interviews. Additionally, for most cast members, interviews were also video recorded with a digital video camera.

Choosing to use two types of surveys allowed me to try to corroborate the findings from the questionnaires with the evidence from the qualitative interviews. The collection and analysis of the qualitative data enriched the evidence found in the survey analysis.

Analysis of Audience Interviews

I interviewed a total of 8 audience members and asked a series of 15 questions (See Appendix A). The subsequent analysis identified various themes or patterns that emerged from my interviews. Appendix B illustrates the different themes that I identified for each question and what types of responses I included under each theme. When analyzing each response I placed answers under the most appropriate theme. If answers contained multiple themes each theme was only coded once per answer. Likewise, if the interviewee mentioned the same theme multiple times in his or her answer, I only coded it once.

To quantitatively analyze the interview data, each theme became a numbered variable. I then counted how many responses fell under that variable and calculated the percentage. Since one answer can contain multiple themes, the total responses given for each question will not always reflect the total number of people interviewed.

Analysis of Actor/Creator Interviews

I interviewed a total of 4 actors and 4 creative contributors (including the playwright) for a total of 8 people interviewed. A few of my initial questions were created to gather more information about how the actors/creators became involved in the KTP or *Salmon is Everything* while the remainder of the questions were the same ones I asked audience members. I created a total of 21 questions to ask this interview group (Appendix C), however, four of the questions were specifically created (and specifically addressed to) the main creative contributors (e.g. the playwright, advisor, director).

The interview data for the actor group was handled the same way as the interview data for the audience group. Answers to each question were placed under the most appropriate theme. Appendix D illustrates what types of responses I included under each theme. I coded each theme with a numbered variable, counted how many responses fell under that variable and calculated the percentage. Since one answer can contain multiple themes, the total responses given for each question will not always reflect the total number of people interviewed.

Analysis of Audience Questionnaires

Questionnaires were given to audience members at three performance locations—Humboldt State University, in Arcata, Ca, Hoopa High School, in Hoopa, Ca and the Klamath at the Yurok Tribal Office in Klamath, Ca (Appendix E). I combined all three performance location questionnaires into one analysis for a total of 75 questionnaires. (31 surveys for HSU, 19 surveys for Hoopa, and 25 surveys for Klamath). There were three major questions that were studied from these questionnaires. One question had people describe how connected they felt to the Klamath River and why, the second question had people explain if there were any changes in their perceptions after watching the eco-drama, and the last question had them explain what their idea of the eco-drama's overall message was. Answers that audience members gave were broken up into themes (Appendix F). I analyzed the themes to determine what people's overall feelings or opinions were. If answers contained multiple themes each theme was only coded once per answer. Likewise, if the interviewee mentioned the same theme multiple times in his or

her answer, I only coded it once. Since one answer can contain multiple themes, the total responses (N) given for each question will not always reflect the total number of people surveyed.

Literature and Archival Research

Research involved reviewing relevant literature or articles on the Klamath Basin and salmon health, reviews about the previous *Salmon is Everything* performances and literature on alternative theatre and social change. This type of research allowed me to keep up to date on the Klamath crisis and understand the context behind *Salmon is Everything*. It also allowed me to understand the various concepts and theories regarding alternative theatre's role in social change projects.

RESULTS

Audience Interviews

For Question 1, two themes emerged and a total of 8 answers were given. Question 1 revealed that 75% of the people interviewed had never heard of or seen *Salmon is Everything* before. Twenty-five percent of the people interviewed had either seen a previous production of *Salmon is Everything* or had seen a reading of it. For Question 2, there were four themes that emerged and a total of 11 answers given (interviewees gave multiple answers that fell under more than one theme). The top reason people were attracted to the theatre production was that they were “*Interested in local salmon issues*” (45%). The second reason they attended the theatre production was that they were “*Supporting a family member/friend*” (27%). Other reasons were that they “*Wanted to learn more about issues*” (18%) or “*Someone suggested they see it.*” (9%). For Question 3, there were 8 themes that emerged and a total of 12 answers given. This question revealed the many opinions people had on what *Salmon is Everything* is about. The majority of opinions were that *Salmon is Everything* is about “*Different points of view/interests*” (25%), while the second most stated answers were that it is about “*People’s reaction to the fish kill*” (17%) and “*How the river relates to everyone*” (17%). The remainder of interviewees responded that *Salmon is Everything* is about “*Conflicts between groups/ways of living*” (8%), “*People trying to solve an issue*” (8%), *Expressing opinions of the unheard voices* (8%), *Cultural identity* (8%), and *Loss of culture* (8%).

For Question 4, three themes emerged and 8 answers were given. This question revealed if audience members had any expectations about *Salmon is Everything*. Most people had no expectations (63%) while others expected *Salmon is Everything* to be geared toward a specific viewpoint (25%), while the rest expected that there would be multiple viewpoints represented (13%). For Question 5, there were 8 themes that emerged and 13 answers were given. This question revealed the many opinions interviewees had about what issues were raised in *Salmon is Everything*. Many thought that *Native American culture/history* (31%) was one of the important issues raised in *Salmon is Everything*. The second most important issues interviewees mentioned are *Social and cultural issues* (15%) and *Conflicting goals/competing for same limited resource* (15%). The remainder of issues interviewees mentioned were *Environmental issues* (8%), *Farmers/Ranchers history* (8%), *Efforts to work together* (8%), *Water rights* (8%), and *Examining our priorities* (8%). For Question 6, there were 3 themes and 4 subthemes with a total of 8 answers given. This question revealed if there was an increase in dialogue between the interviewee and others around them about the issues raised in *Salmon is Everything*. Most of the people answered yes and stated that dialogue increased in some way (63%), while none of the interviewees reported a lack of increase in dialogue (0%). The subthemes revealed what kind of dialogue or other interactions occurred. Fifty-percent of those interviewed stated that watching *Salmon is Everything* did generate a greater dialogue between them and friends or family (50%). Twenty-five percent informed others to see *Salmon is Everything*. Thirteen-percent stated that *Salmon*

is Everything better informed their discussion with others and that networking opportunities arose in relation to *Salmon is Everything*.

For Question 7, there were two main themes and 5 subthemes with 12 total answers given. This question revealed if interviewees thought that *Salmon is Everything* is an important production and their reasons why. All of those interviewed agreed that *Salmon is Everything* is important (100%) and none answered that they thought it was unimportant (0%). The subthemes referred to people's reasons why they thought *Salmon is Everything* is important. Most thought that *Salmon is Everything* is important because it "*Raises awareness, increases education and understanding*" (42%). Others thought that *Salmon is Everything* is important because "*Theatre is an important medium*" (33%). The remainder of interviewees thought that *Salmon is Everything* is important because it "*Creates dialogue*" (8%), "*Presents all sides of the issue*" (8%), or simply stated that it was important without a clear reason why (8%).

Questions 8 and 9 were very similar so I combined these questions for my analysis. Question 8 determined interviewees knowledge base and Question 9 asked them to describe in more detail their perspective on the crisis. There were three main themes and 8 subthemes with a total of 26 answers given. The three main themes revealed how much interviewee's felt they knew about the Klamath Salmon Crisis. Most interviewees *felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problem* (88%) and provide their perspective about it, while some interviewees felt that they were not knowledgeable enough and did not have an opinion about it (4%). Lastly, others discussed how they learned about the crisis from *Salmon is Everything* & were inspired to learn more (8%). Where an

interviewee felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problem within the Klamath Salmon Crisis, I divided their responses into 8 subthemes. The subthemes described more about what each interviewee thought was the main problem behind the Klamath Salmon Crisis. Most of the responses fell under the subtheme that the problem causing conflict is the *Many divergent interests* (19%) involved. The second most popular response was that the main issue within the KSC was the *Dams* (15%). Others responded that the real issue involves *Environmental degradation* (12%), *Changes in water conditions* (12%), and/or *Low salmon numbers* (12%). Some responded that the problem stemmed from our *Limited resources* (8%), while others thought that the crisis simply *Reflects our impact on the Earth* (8%).

Question 10 revealed if an interviewee's perspective about the KSC differed after watching *Salmon is Everything*. There were six main themes and three subthemes with a total of 11 answers given. Of the main themes, most people mentioned that they became *More educated or aware of another's perspective/culture* (36%) after watching *Salmon is Everything*. Others stated that they *Gained a more positive outlook* (27%) about the crisis or about the possibility of people resolving their issues after watching the docu-drama. Some interviewees stated that *Salmon is Everything* caused them to *Realize the more human side of the issue* (18%). There was also mention of becoming *More aware of the size or depth of the issue* (9%) after watching *Salmon is Everything*, while on the flip side, 9% gained *No new information or perspectives*. Of those who responded that they learned more about another's perspective or culture, there was a split between those

Educated about native culture (18%) and those *Educated about farmer/rancher culture* (18%).

For Question 11, there were seven themes that emerged and a total of 14 answers given. When asked what role they see *Salmon is Everything* playing in the overall Klamath Basin conflict, the overwhelming response was that it *Raises awareness* (36%); It makes people more aware of the issues, what is happening, & how much others are affected. The second most popular response was that *Salmon is Everything Creates dialogue* (21%). Others thought that *Salmon is Everything Needs more distribution to be able to play a role* (14%) such as performing in other places outside of the local area. The remainder of answers were the *Salmon is Everything Educates* (7%), *Allows people's voices to be heard* (7%), acts as *A form of activism* (7%), and *Creates a deeper level of connection* (7%) such as that it has a profound, emotional effect on people. For Question 12, three themes emerged and 7 answers were given. Question 12 revealed if those interviewed thought that the voices in *Salmon is Everything* were well represented. Many thought that the characters in *Salmon is Everything* were clearly portrayed and well represented (71%). A few interviewees *Wished for more character elaboration* (29%). None of the interviewees mentioned that a voice was missing or suggested any voices to be included in *Salmon is Everything*.

Question 13 was a question I often skipped during my interviews to focus on more important questions and therefore it provided little data that would be useful to this analysis.

For Question 14, seven themes emerged and a total of 9 answers were given.

When interviewees were asked if something struck or surprised them about *Salmon is Everything*, most were surprised by the *Emotional impact* (44%). Interviewees believed it had a powerful impact and were surprised at how emotional they felt when watching it. Secondly, interviewees were surprised by the *Passion of the actors* (22%). Interviewees were also surprised by the *Unique style of theatre* (11%) *Salmon is Everything* presented, surprised about *Gaining in-depth knowledge about an issue or viewpoint* (11%), as well as being surprised by *People's reaction to Salmon is Everything* (11%). None of the interviewees answered that the *Content/Information presented* surprised them or that the *Perspective of a character* surprised them. For Question 15, there were five themes that emerged and 7 total answers. I asked interviewees to share a story or experience they had related to *Salmon is Everything*. Many responses fell under the theme of *Related issues to personal experiences* (29%); People's stories were either connected to someone they know, their line of work, or related to something they did or experienced. Many also had *No answer* (29%) to this question. The remainder told a *Story regarding telling others about Salmon is Everything* (14%), *Made a connection between Salmon is Everything and other informational sources* (14%) or mentioned that it was *Not advertised enough* (14%).

Actor/Creator Interviews

For Question 1, there were a total of 5 themes that emerged and a total of 11 answers given. For this question I asked the interviewee how they were involved with

Salmon is Everything to get a good idea of what subgroup they represented. A majority of the interviewees responded that they were *Involved as a cast member* (36%) and/or they were *A part of the creative stages* (36%). The other subgroups represented were *Playwright* (9%), *Director* (9%), and *Cultural advisor* (9%).

For Question 2, there were two themes and a total of 8 answers given. With this question I wanted to find out at what point the actors/creative contributors were involved with *Salmon is Everything*. Most were *Involved from the beginning* (63%), meaning they were involved in the creative phase before the eco-drama reached the stage. Others were *Involved during the first performances* (38%), meaning they became involved once the script was created and the eco-drama needed help with the stage performances. For Question 3, three themes emerged and a total of 8 answers were given. This question revealed how many interviewees had previous experience with community-based theatre. A majority of interviewees stated that they had *No previous experience* (63%) in community-based theatre. Only a few stated that they have *Had a lot of experience in community theatre* (25%). Lastly, a very small percentage stated that they had *Some general acting experience* (13%).

For Question 4, two themes emerged and a total of 10 answers were given. This question revealed what initially attracted the interviewees to get involved with *Salmon is Everything*. Most interviewees were attracted to this eco-drama because they *Felt it carried an important message* (60%). The rest were simply *Intrigued by the use of theatre to express issues* (30%).

Questions 5 through 8, were special case questions only asked to those involved in the creation of *Salmon is Everything*, such as the playwright, advisor, or director. These questions revealed more information about the eco-drama's goals and its creative emergence however the questions did not produce enough themes to quantitatively analyze them. The answers to these questions will be discussed qualitatively in the discussion section. Question 7 is the only one of these questions that produced enough themes to be analyzed. For Question 7, five themes emerged and a total of 10 answers were given. For this question I wanted to find out more about the initial goals of the eco-drama. Of those interviewed, the majority answered that the initial goal of the docu-drama was to *Inform others about the issue* (30%). Others stated that the initial goals of the docu-drama were to *Express often ignored views and perspectives* (20%), *Create awareness* (20%), and *Motivate people to take action* (20%). The other goal mentioned was one of *Reconciliation, healing and acknowledgement of the crisis* (10%).

For Question 9, there were 7 themes that emerged and a total of 14 answers given. For this question actors and creative contributors were asked what they thought *Salmon is Everything* is about. Many thought *Salmon is Everything* is about *Connection* (20%), meaning a connection to one another or a connection to the natural world (Appendix D). Many also thought that *Salmon is Everything* is about *Promoting better relationships* (20%), in other words, promoting understanding and the healing of relationships among conflicting communities (Appendix D). Some interviewees stated that *Salmon is Everything* is about *Communities that depend on the river* (14%), about *Respect for life* (14%), and/or is a *Metaphor for how we treat the planet/ environment* (14%). The

remainder of interviewees stated that *Salmon is Everything* is about *The impact of the salmon kill* (7%) or *Injustice* (7%).

For Question 10, two themes emerged and 6 answers were given. This question revealed if actors/creators had any thoughts or expectations about *Salmon is Everything*. Most people came *open minded and had no expectations* (83%), while others *Didn't expect how powerful it was* (17%).

For Question 11, there were 9 themes that emerged and 17 answers were given. This question revealed the many opinions interviewees had about what issues were raised in *Salmon is Everything*. Most thought that *Salmon is Everything* raised *Issues of sustaining communities & natural resources* (18%). The second most important issues interviewees mentioned are *Water Allocation* (12%), *Understanding Each Other* (12%), *Building Relationships* (12%), *Power Struggles/Relations* (12%), *Racism* (12%), *Different Perspectives/Concerns* (12%). Other issues interviewees mentioned were *Resource Dependence* (6%) and *Threatened Livelihoods* (6%).

For Question 12, there were 3 themes that emerged and a total of 8 answers given. This question revealed if there was an increase in dialogue between the interviewee and others around them about the issues raised in *Salmon is Everything*. A majority of interviewees stated that being involved with *Salmon is Everything* generated a greater dialogue between them and *friends or family who saw Salmon is Everything* (38%). Others stated that it created greater dialogue among them with people *Outside of the production* (38%), meaning that they had more discussions about salmon or river issues with people they met outside of the *Salmon is Everything* audience/actor community.

The remainder of interviewees stated that being involved in *Salmon is Everything* generated a greater dialogue between them and the people around them *In a unique way* (25%). By this, most people meant that the nature of their dialogue changed or the richness of their dialogues increased (Appendix D).

For Question 13, five themes emerged with 13 total answers given. This question revealed if interviewees thought that *Salmon is Everything* is an important production and their reasons why. Most thought that *Salmon is Everything* is important because it “*Raises awareness, increases education and understanding*” (31%). Others simply stated that *Salmon is Everything* is *Important and a way to make a difference* (31%). Some interviewees stated that *Salmon is Everything* is important because it is *A vehicle to vent feeling/frustrations* (15%) and/or *Its transformative/reaches beyond our intellect* (15%). It was also stated that *Salmon is Everything* is valuable because *It’s important to get the word out* (8%).

For Question 14, there were 4 themes that emerged and 5 total answers given. For this question I wanted to know how much interviewees knew about the fish kill and the overall crisis before being involved in *Salmon is Everything*. Most interviewees stated that they *Knew about the fish kill* (33%) or they *Knew general information about the Klamath Salmon Crisis but learned a lot more from being involved with Salmon is Everything* (33%). Other interviewees stated that they actually *Witnessed the aftermath of the fish kill* (17%) or *Did not know anything about the issue before being involved in the eco-drama* (17%).

Question 15 revealed two main themes and eleven subthemes with a total of 20 answers given. When I asked interviewees what the Klamath Salmon Crisis and conflict was about I broke the two main themes up into *Felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problem*, or *Could not describe problem/did not feel knowledgeable*. All interviewees *felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problem* (100%) and provide their perspective about it. Where an interviewee felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problem within the Klamath Salmon Crisis, I divided their responses into 11 subthemes. Most of the responses fell under the subtheme that the problem causing conflict is the *Many divergent interests* (20%) involved. The second most popular responses were that the main issue within the KSC was *Environmental Degradation* (15%), that the crisis *Reflects our impact on the environment* (15%), or that the problem is *Corporate interests/Money* (15%). Others responded that the real conflict involves *Water rights* (10%) and/or *Limited Resources* (10%). Some interviewees responded that the source of the problem comes from the *Dams* (5%), while others thought that problem stemmed from *Power and control* (5%), or *Lack of Understanding* (5%). None of the interviewee's answers fell under the theme of *Change in water conditions* or *Low salmon numbers*.

Question 16 revealed if an interviewee's perspective about the KSC differed after being involved with *Salmon is Everything*. There were eight main themes and three subthemes with a total of 10 answers given. Most people mentioned that they became *More educated or aware of another's perspective/culture* (36%) after being involved in *Salmon is Everything*. Of those who responded that they learned more about another's perspective or culture, most were more Educated about rancher/farmer culture (18%),

while others were either Educated about Native culture (9%), or educated about other perspectives in general (9%).

Others interviewees stated that *No new information or perspectives were gained* (20%). Some interviewees stated that they *Gained a more positive outlook* (10%), while others stated that they *Gained general information* (10%) from being involved in *Salmon is Everything*. Interviewees also mentioned the *Impact of many voices* (10%) in other words, they realized how the diversity of voices is important for reaching many people. While some stated that *Salmon is Everything* made them *Aware of or challenged their worldview* (10%). None of the interviewees responses fell under the theme of *Realized more human side of the issue* or *More aware of size or depth of issue*.

For Question 17, there were eight themes that emerged and a total of 13 answers given. When asked what role they see *Salmon is Everything* playing in the overall Klamath Basin conflict, the overwhelming response was that it *Raises awareness* (31%); It makes people more aware of the issues, what is happening, & how much others are affected. The second most popular response was that *Salmon is Everything Educates* (23%) and helps people understand the issues. Others thought that *Salmon is Everything Needs more distribution to be able to play a role* (15%) while others thought that *Salmon is Everything is a Form of Activism* (15%). The remainder of answers were the *Salmon is Everything Creates dialogue* (8%) and *Allows people's voices to be heard* (8%). None of the answers given fell under the themes of *Creates a deeper level of connection* or *Promotes healing*.

For Question 18, five themes emerged and 6 answers were given. Question 18 revealed if those interviewed thought that the voices in *Salmon is Everything* were well represented. Many thought that the characters in *Salmon is Everything* were clearly portrayed and well represented (33%) or *Suggested a voice to include* (33%). A few interviewees either answered *I don't know* (17%) or stated that they *Didn't understand the need for certain voices/felt some voices were not needed* (17%). None of the interviewees responded that they *Wished for more character elaboration*.

Question 19 was a question I often skipped during my interviews to focus on more important questions and therefore provided little data that would be useful to this analysis.

For Question 20, six themes emerged and a total of 10 answers were given. When interviewees were asked if something struck or surprised them about *Salmon is Everything*, most were surprised by the *Acting potential* (40%) regarding either their own abilities or someone else's. Some interviewee's responses fell under the *Other* (20%) category which included mention of being surprised by something someone said or telling a personal story. The remainder of responses included being surprised by the *Emotional impact* (10%), the *Audience response* (10%), the *Growth of relationships with the cast* (10%), or *Being aware of how real this is for the community/people* (10%).

For Question 21, there were four themes that emerged and 13 total answers. I asked interviewees to share a story or experience related to *Salmon is Everything*. Many of the interviewees *Described how Salmon is Everything affected them* (38%). Some interviewees *Gave a performance-related story* (31%), while others *Presented a*

historical perspective (23%) where they talked about the problems of the past and how they relate to present of future problems. Other interviewees mentioned that they had *Nothing else to add* (8%).

Audience Questionnaires

I feel very connected to the Klamath River.

I asked audience members to rate how strongly they felt connected to the Klamath River based on a Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree range. They circled the appropriate choice that described how they felt about the statement: “I feel a strong connection to the Klamath River.” The statement was followed by a question asking them to explain why they feel that degree of connection. The question produced a total of 81 answers.

Strongly agree.

There were a total of 34 responses given under those that answered “strongly agree.” Of those who strongly agreed that they felt a strong connection to the Klamath River, 29% stated that their connection was due to their *Native Heritage*. Twenty-one percent stated that they have a strong connection because the *river is an important resource for them* (e.g. provides them with food, salmon, water, spiritual needs, cultural needs). Twelve-percent of people provided *no answer* for why they felt so strongly connected to the Klamath River. Some people responded that their connection is related to their *sense of place and/or use of the river* (14.7%), in other words they feel a strong connection because they have lived in the area all their life (or for a very long time) and have used the Klamath for recreation. A few respondents described how they feel a

connection *simply because it's a river and/or they feel connected to all waterways* (8.8%). Others stated that their connection stemmed from their *dislike of the destructive effects of corporations, political decisions/dams* (5.9%). A small percentage of people responded that they felt a very strong connection because they either, *lived on an associated/adjacent river* (2.9%), *considered the Klamath their favorite river* (2.9%), or *felt a connection due to their occupation* (2.9%) (e.g. fisheries, fisherman, restoration work). See Appendix F for a summary of these results as well as the following results.

Agree.

There were a total of 30 responses given under those that answered “agree.” Of those who agreed that they have a strong connection to the Klamath River, 33% responded that they felt this way because *the river is part of the environment/ecosystem* and therefore is valuable and part of the connection to everything. Twenty-percent stated that they felt this connection because *rivers are an important resource for them or to support life/fish*. Resource could have been defined as something cultural, spiritual, physical, or mental. A little over thirteen percent of people provided *no answer* for why they felt so strongly connected to the Klamath River (13.3%). Others stated that they felt a strong connection because *they love the salmon/Klamath River* (6.7%) or they feel a connection *simply because it's a river and/or they feel connected to all waterways* (6.7%). The same percentage felt a strong connection *due to their occupation* (6.7%), and/or *due to their Native Heritage* (6.7%). A very small percentage felt their strong connection was due to their *sense of place/use of the river* (3.3%) or because they *lived on an associated/adjacent river* (3.3%).

Undecided.

There were a total of 11 responses given under those that answered “undecided.” These responses indicate that people were undecided about their connection to the Klamath River. Of those who answered “undecided,” 36.4% responded that they *feel a connection to rivers, just not specifically the Klamath River*. Twenty-seven percent of people provided *no answer* for why they were undecided about their connection to the Klamath. Eighteen percent of those who selected “undecided” stated that it was because they have *never been to the Klamath River before*. A very small percentage stated that they were undecided because they *know very little about the Klamath* (9.1%) or because they *just moved to the area* (9.1%).

Disagree.

There were a total of 4 responses given under those that answered “disagree.” These responses indicate that people did not feel a strong connection to the Klamath River. Twenty-five percent stated that they disagreed because they *know very little about the Klamath*, while another 25% stated that they did not have a connection because they *did not grow up near the Klamath River*. The remainder of people answered that they were *new to the area and the river was unfamiliar* (25%) or they provided *no answer* (25%).

Strongly Disagree.

There were a total of only 2 responses given under the strongly disagree category. These responses indicate that people did not feel at all connected to the Klamath River. Their reasons were similar to the disagree group. Fifty percent felt that they were not

connected to the Klamath River because they *know very little about the Klamath* while the other half felt that they were not connected because they *have never been to the Klamath before* (50%).

Was there any change in a certain thought, attitude, or perception you had?

With this open-ended question, I wanted to determine if there were any changes in people's perceptions after they watched *Salmon is Everything*. I divided the responses to this question into four major categories, each with their own set of themes. The four themes are Yes, No, Greatly Affected and Other.

If there was a clear explanation by the survey taker that no thoughts or perspectives changed for them, then their answer was categorized under No. Under this category, there were a total of 14 answers given and a total of two themes that emerged. Of those who answered No, 50% stated that they were *already aware of the Klamath issues but it did deepen their understanding/emotions*. The other 50% simply answered *No*, without an accompanying explanation.

If there was a clear explanation by the survey taker that something changed for them then I categorized under Yes. Under the Yes category, there were a total of 8 answers given and a total of two themes that emerged. Of those that answered Yes, 75% stated that after watching *Salmon is Everything* they *understand another's perspective much better than before*. Twenty-five percent of people answered that *Salmon is Everything changed an opinion about possible resolution or cooperation within the Klamath crisis*.

If someone answered neither yes or no but stated that *Salmon is Everything* affected them in some way I categorized their answer under Greatly Affected. There were a total of 20 answers given and a total of 4 themes that emerged. The majority of people stated that they were *educated by the play* (45%). They often stated that it increased their awareness and understanding about the issue and about the many connections between people and place. Twenty-percent of people stated that after watching *Salmon is Everything* they were *inspired to be part of the solution*, while others stated that they were very *emotionally moved by the eco-drama* (20%). The remainder of people responded that *Salmon is Everything made the issue more real and personal for them* (15%).

Answers in which survey takers stated an expectation or opinion or did not answer the question were categorized under the Other section. A total of 33 responses fell under this category. Twenty-seven percent of responses in this section were expectations or opinions about the eco-drama, while 73% in this section were left blank with *no answer*. See Appendix F for a summary of results.

What is the overall message of the play?

This is the last open-ended question asked to audience members who took the survey. I wanted to find out what audience members thought was the overall message of the eco-drama. There were a total of 73 answers given and this question produced a total of 15 themes. A majority of people did not provide an answer to this question (23.3%) or they stated an *expectation or opinion* about the eco-drama (16.4%). Of those who described an actual theme, 13.7% responded that the overall message is that the *Klamath*

River/salmon can be saved if we all work together. About eight-percent of people stated that the message was *salmon are valuable; save/protect the salmon.* Others stated that *Salmon is Everything* 's message is *to educate others about this issue* (6.8%), or provides the message that *we need to be more responsible stewards of our water/environment because of its value to people's lives* (6.8%). There were a few who believed that the overall message was that *we need to preserve/conservate the balance of nature/the environment* (5.5%). About four-percent of people believed that the message was *communication can facilitate change* (4.1%), while others stated the message as *Salmon is Everything* (4.1%). Over two-percent thought that the overall message of the eco-drama is that *dams have a negative impact on salmon* (2.7%) or that this was a *tragic/unjust event that needs urgent attention or lives/ecosystems will be lost* (2.7%). A small percentage of responses described the overall message as one *to inspire change* (1.4%), or to *understand everyone's perspective* (1.4%). Other responses included: *farmers' needs have a negative impact on salmon and tribes* (1.4%) and *we are all connected* (1.4%). See Appendix F for a summary of results.

DISCUSSION

By looking at the various aspects of the play (from the background, content, methodology, public presentation, and reactions from the community) I demonstrated the ways in which *Salmon is Everything* creates connections, communication, and transformational awareness. The history of the environmental crisis (the Klamath conflicts and the Klamath Salmon crisis) sets the stage for a complex situation involving many community groups and many different views, opinions and values. These communities are hurting in many ways and are struggling to find solutions to a problem that affects them all. The origins of the play illustrate the use of theatre to express environmentally rooted problems and giving voice to both the “human and more-than-human worlds” (Davis, 1997). The content of the play focuses on our disconnection to each other as well as the environment and the possible glimmer of hope to rebuild that connection. It emphasizes the community stories and their associated passion and emotions that often get lost in communication, scientific data or media coverage. The methodology, or process of *Salmon is Everything*, focused heavily on consultation and participation throughout the various stages. Community participation occurred through the research, the public readings and discussions about the play’s direction, script development, and post-performance discussions. The public presentations acted as the avenue for the transaction of information, awareness, healing and dialogue. Feedback through the post performance discussions encouraged reflection and dialogue among

community_members (and with the performance group). It also brought forth emerging questions about what can be done to solve the problem.

Here I examine the stages of development and bring it back to what I have explored in the literature and what my results suggest. I explain each stage of the process and describe the moments where this play displays transformative characteristics. I also analyze the results of my interviews and surveys and look at what people said about how this play affected them. The characteristics of the play and people's reaction to it illustrates the power of *Salmon is Everything*. At almost every stage there is some sort of transformational component or significant contribution made towards personal or social change.

Process--The Methodology

As described in the *Origins of Salmon is Everything*, the play's methods began with research into the history and scope of the Klamath issues and research into the associated stories and human experiences. A presentation of the research and communal discussions about the content and direction of the script quickly followed. The final steps included the theatrical production as well as the follow-up discussions. This methodology created opportunity for consultation at each stage. These methods are comparable to many of the theatre for development approaches that strive to empower communities dealing with pressing issues (Boon & Plastow, 2004; Nda, 2007). The stages of consultation described in Nda's (2007) methods include "research, discussion/agreement on the play's story line and scenario, rehearsals through usage of improvisational

techniques, production/discussions and follow-up.” The *Salmon is Everything* stages of consultation were very similar and participation occurred throughout the research process, the public readings/discussions during script development, during the rehearsals, and during the post-performance discussions.

I will analyze each stage more closely to illustrate the important and transformational aspects of the play.

Praxis: A catalyst for change

It began with the knowledge of the 2002 fish kill, a hurting community, and the desire of a playwright to use her skills to help make the connections between an ecological crisis and the human stories behind it. I contend that Dr. Theresa May’s desire and steps towards finding a way to help a community heal, was a catalyst for transformation. Once Dr. May put these ideas into action she became the external change agent who facilitated this project towards a transformational learning process. Then the community took it from there. It was a transformational learning process for all involved-actors, creators, audience members.

As I will illustrate, *Salmon is Everything* demonstrates a process which represents community (through participation) and creates awareness around multiple ways of knowing (through education and outreach). This representation and awareness has further implications for community building across difference through promoting healing and compassion. These outcomes may also serve as a catalyst for community activism towards resolving a pressing environmental & social issue. This can be seen through the

characteristics *Salmon is Everything* holds as well as through the stories and thoughts of the people who I interviewed.

Participation and representing community

This theatre project involved input from the local community from beginning to end and was essentially molded by the community. The participation aspect contributes greatly towards *Salmon is Everything*'s role as a transformational and pedagogical tool.

Participatory theatre brings theatre back to its historical roots in which many practitioners have been described as ordinary people, singing, dancing, and telling stories freely (Davis, 1997; Boal, 1979). It was a way in which "...individuals in the community expressed their fears, hopes and desires" (as cited in Davis, 1997). Remembering back to Augusto Boal's (1997) description, "the theatrical performance was created by and for the people." *Salmon is Everything* first began with Theresa May's desire to "help give voice to the Native communities that depended on the river for survival but had been marginalized.." (May, 2007). Even though the main goal underwent changes, this process began as a forum for stories and grieving voices to be heard. May's efforts to enlist the help of community members, Native American staff, faculty and students established this project as a collaborative effort from the start. She realized that "it was not my story that needed to be told it was the story of the Native people who were grieving....who they considered to be their friends and relatives, the salmon" (personal communication, March 28, 2008). Providing a space for voices to be heard and facilitating a participatory process has a whole host of implications which allows a theatre project to be driven by the desires and needs of the community (an important goal in applied theatre). As you will see from

the rest of the development process, *Salmon is Everything* was first created *for* the people then it was created *by* the people.

Research & development stage

Looking back at *Salmon is Everything*'s research process; it began with the collaboration between Dr. Theresa May and Native American faculty and staff to initiate the Klamath Theatre Project at Humboldt State. Through the Klamath Theatre Project class they brought together theatre students, Native students with no theatre training, and community members "to talk about the fish kill and how theatre might be used to tell stories surrounding the event" (May, 2007). The initial purpose was to bring to light the stories of the Native communities who were directly affected by the salmon crisis.

Collecting stories and memories.

The process of student creative writings, discussions, field trips, and interviews had a significant impact on the initial creation of the play. Dr. Theresa May and her students interviewed a variety of community members to obtain the stories that surrounded the Klamath salmon crisis. They interviewed individuals and groups in the Lower Klamath watershed (May, 2007). "Native students interviewed parents, grandparents or boyfriends who worked as subsistence fisherman or for the tribal hatchery. Non-Native students interviewed commercial fishermen, white-water rafters and environmentalists" (May, 2007). These interviews as well as the creative writings of students about the meanings of "balance" or "sacred" became some of "the most compelling parts of the performance script" (May, 2007). There were a couple of

monologues and scenes in the play that were inspired by Dr. May's experiences as she spent time with the Native students going on field trips and visiting sacred sites.

When I interviewed Dr. Theresa May she described to me some important moments that influenced the crafting of the script. Dr. May described her experiences as she and her students took a trip to the mouth of the Klamath River. They arrived there preparing to do some creative writing about the sounds, and the smells, and the memories there. Dr. May happened to be walking with three of her Native American students who had been in the area their whole life and have a lot of memories of that place. As they were walking along the beach, Dr. Theresa May describes an interesting social encounter that occurred:

"...we're walking along the beach and these other guys, native guys, drive by in one of these like moped things, they call it a quad. So they buzz by and there's all this whistling and yelling and um, I said 'what's up with that? Who are those guys?' And they said 'oh, they're our cousins', and they are like 'ugh', lots of rolling of eyes and a complete sort of teenage thing obviously going on and.....you know, I just thought, God, that for me, I am out there at this river like, you know, it's a national park or something. Where it's a, you know this pristine environment. For them, it's their neighborhood. So that whole piece, that whole monologue in the play, about that realization of the anglo-biologist and what she begins to get as she does her research, that character came out of my personal experience of the project." (Personal communication, March 28, 2008)

During their time on the beach and going down to where the water comes in, created another opportunity for an important learning experience to become part of the script. Dr. May describes a time where some of her Native American students were talking to her about eeling.

"...the girls were telling me about eeling and what eeling is and that you have this special kind of, you know, hook, and only the boys can do it and

Lauren, whose one of the students, was saying, 'yeah, you know, I saw this one once that was all carved out of bone, elk horn,..' and then, you know, she described it and she said 'I really want to do it'that was a story she told me in the parking lot and that became some of the lines of one of the younger native characters in the play.' (personal communication, March 28, 2008).

These examples illustrate how participation in the research process allows for the perspectives and stories of the community to be heard. Not only did Dr. May learn more about the history and scope of the Klamath issue but in the process learned about the world view and traditions of the community. This learning process and collaboration is important to validate the community's stories within the play.

This process informed the script using three different groups of students over a period of 2 years. "Those interviews, and those stories, and memories...were sort of collected like things collect on a beach after several storms" (Dr. Theresa May, personal communication, March 28, 2008).

Stories also came out of the public readings that occurred along the way. Dr. Theresa May coordinated public readings to encourage on-going dialogue with the community about the development of *Salmon is Everything* (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). During the very first reading in Spring 2004, she had students and staff read the compilation of creative writings and interviews they had gathered during their research (personal communication, March 28, 2008). There was a diverse audience in attendance---tribal communities, the environmental community, and other local residents (May, 2007). Dr. May looked forward to audience feedback that would help find the visual and theatrical elements for the play and asked that the

audience pay special attention to the images that came to mind while they listened (May, 2007).

The audience provided many rich stories and opinions about what they wanted to see in the play during a talk-back session. The community expressed their grief and anger about the fish kill and elders from tribal communities shared additional stories in response to the readings (May, 2007). The community's feedback influenced many of the play's scenes as well as the play's theatrical direction. For instance, there is a particular scene in the play that emerged from one of the audience member's story. Their story inspired the scene where a young boy runs down to the river during a family gathering and brings his family back a dead fish (personal communication, March 28, 2008).

One of the most influential moments to occur during the talk back session was when an elder mentioned that people from upriver need to hear these stories and the downriver people need to hear the farmers' stories (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). The elder suggested that they invite the upriver people down to share in a salmon dinner with them so that they can tell them what salmon mean to them, not just as subsistence, but spiritually (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). Dr. Theresa May explained that this comment "began to shift the direction of the conversation and consequently of the project itself" (2007). Keeping this conversation in mind, the next draft of *Salmon is Everything* included stories from upper Klamath communities. Dr. May emphasized that the development to include the stories of the farmers and ranchers did not come from her impulses, but as a directive from the community (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). "Once you hear your

voice, your perspective, your community's experience being spoken, then you are more in a place where you can listen to somebody else's story" (Theresa May, personal communication, March 28, 2008). Dr. May is convinced that had she initially suggested that the students listen to the perspectives of the farmers and ranchers, the idea would have been rejected (May, 2007). However, since their own elders were leading this directive they were open to exploring the possibility of including stories from the upper Klamath people (May, 2007).

How hearing the "other side" led to transformative action

As the development and research process continued, more opportunity for transformational learning arose. The research process had a huge impact on the script but also allowed for those participating in the research process to critically reflect on their own assumptions. Dr. Theresa May learned that many of her Native student collaborators were dealing with deep wounds that came from painful family histories. "Their characterizations of the upper basin farmers and ranchers grew out of their own knowledge of the history of Indian genocide" (May, 2007). During the research process, Dr. May found that many of her Native students her "very resistant to learning anything about the farmers and ranchers of the upper basin" (May, 2007). She understood their resistance but found that her students had as many stereotypes of the farmers and ranchers in the upper Klamath, as the upriver folks had of "the Indians downriver," as there was often talk amongst the students bashing the upper Klamath farmers (Theresa May, personal communication, March 28, 2008).

One of the cultural advisors and creative contributors, Sue Burcell, also reported similar reactions from her students who were involved in this research process.

“They [the students] were required to research all points of view relevant to the fisheries and the water use. You know, basically everything that had to do with the use of the water in the Klamath River basin. And, and that was difficult. You know I had students coming to me with tears in their eyes and saying I don’t like all the points of view and I don’t even want to know, I don’t want to be able to empathize with some of these people, you know. Their ideas are just so culturally inappropriate and foreign to me that, you know, I just don’t....I feel contaminated by them...” (personal communication, November 26, 2008)

Dr. Theresa May, Sue Burcell and the other advisors in the Klamath Theatre Project knew that although students were resistant to hear the other perspectives that it was a very important part of the process. They knew it wasn’t going to be easy but it was an important first step to break down barriers and get people to listen to each other.

Lauren’s story: how process and social change collide

Dr. Theresa May suggested that as part of research for the play, one of her students “...should attend a Klamath River Stakeholder workshop, sponsored by the Klamath agriculturalists and held in the upper Klamath Basin” (May, 2007). Dr. Theresa May had been to a few of these stakeholder meetings. She realized however, that she rarely saw native people from downriver participating in these conversations (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). Many of the farmers, ranchers and various agencies were coming together to discuss just water allocation and no one thought to invite people from downriver, or if they did, the Indians did not believe their invitations were sincere (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). In attending these meetings, Dr. May found that many upper basin people sincerely wanted to hear the tribal

perspective so she thought it would be a good idea for one of her Native students to go to the next meeting (May, 2007; personal communication, March 28, 2008). As a result of Dr. May's encouragement, a young woman by the name of Lauren agreed to go. Dr. May stressed "that the meeting needed her voice" (May, 2007).

Lauren's presence began to open the door to new dialogue, perspectives and a shift in future meetings.

As Dr. Theresa May describes:

"...she was the only native person there and everyone, from many people I heard from (anglo people), from that meeting said, 'we were so grateful to have Lauren there and her courage in telling her story and looking at all of us (farmers and ranchers and bureau of reclamation people and Klamath Project people and Fish and Wildlife...)She had great courage and said to us 'how can you even have this conversation when you haven't been down to hear our side of the story.' (Personal communication, March 28, 2008).

Dr. Theresa May went on to describe how through Lauren's courage and her single action, the whole stakeholder process shifted and began to include the voices downriver. The next stakeholder's meeting was held at the Yurok headquarters in Klamath and many people who worked in the tribal fisheries came out.

Besides the impact Lauren's presence had on the conference attendees, the experience also had a great influence on Lauren herself. Lauren's stereotypes were destroyed as she meet with farmers, ranchers, Bureau of Reclamation officials, Fish and Wildlife agents, and commercial fishing families (May, 2007). In her emails and conversations with Lauren, Dr. May learned that this experience was a positive one for Lauren, that she actually had a good time, and she learned more than she thought

possible. (May, 2007). In one article, Dr. Theresa May quotes how Lauren discovered that:

'these agencies and water users from upriver who we have been directing our anger at, are actually real people...people I genuinely like... We should be working together , instead of just being insulted that the tribes might have to consider the economic loss that our [needs] might cause for those upriver'

She had so much hope after meeting all those people and was even surprised that a Bureau of Reclamation official invited her to stay at her house (May, 2007).

Lauren realized that the experience of learning from each other's perspectives might be effectively applied to theatre.

'Both sides [need to be] represented in our script. We have so much to learn from each other's perspectives...Our audience is us and them—the people who don't understand each other—the cowboys and the Indians!' (May, 2007).

Lauren's actions helped to bridge the gap between meetings in the upper and lower Klamath Basin. Few, if any native voices, were present at the upper basin meetings. Lauren made the effort to find time to attend the meeting, arrange for childcare, and make the trip alone all the way up to the upper Klamath area. Her attendance helped to influence the location of the next meeting that occurred at the Yurok Tribal Office in Klamath, Ca (May, 2007). People from up and down the Klamath basin attended this workshop--federal and state officials, ranchers, upstream and downstream tribal members, commercial fishermen and more (Darling 2005). This event created another opportunity for dialogue and understanding to occur as stories emerged of ranchers beginning to have a better understanding of the plight of the downstream tribes.

Through Lauren's story you can see how the play's research process encouraged a shift in real life events. Interestingly, these events also helped shape the play's script. Ultimately, Lauren's experience inspired the narrative for the *Salmon is Everything* character, Julie. As Dr. Theresa May describes, "this narrative would follow the journey of a young Yurok woman, modeled after Lauren, caught between her own family and community's rage and grief after the fish kill, and her growing relationship with an upper Klamath rancher." (May, 2007).

Lauren's story is a good example of how the research process began to carry over into the world outside the play. This illustrates how a high level of involvement in the research process can lead to transformative actions. Mda (1993) mentions that a higher level of involvement in a project increases the potential for transformation. Davis (1997) mentions that transformation will occur through a process of praxis—combining critical reflection with action upon that knowledge. "In popular theatre the potential for praxis begins with the initiation of a project based on a community's stories, and their inclusion in the research process. Listening to a community's stories provides the important space for their voice to be heard and valued" (Davis, 1997).

The process: casting and rehearsals.

Another unique feature of the play that contributed to the power of its process was the community's involvement in acting in the play. The cast of volunteers included HSU students and faculty as well as community members from outside of academia. Many had no acting experience and some even experienced the aftermath of the Klamath salmon crisis in their own lives. The use of non-professional actors and those from the local

community that have a connection to the crisis brought important elements to the play, including community knowledge, passion and emotion, and unique visual expression.

Community casting brought community knowledge

Dr. Theresa May worked with the many community stories gathered from research and wove those stories together into a cohesive script. However, even after the initial script was created the cast continued to massage it further. Some of the dialogue in the script was added at the last minute as some actors informed the script through their own stories or through providing information about cultural norms.

One story in particular came from the personal experiences of one of the performers in the play. Dr. Theresa May described to me how Kathy McCovey's character as the elder woman came from Kathy's experiences with her grandfather. Kathy McCovey shared the ceremonial skirts that she made with her grandfather after a hunting trip.

"That whole story of those skirts was in fact her story and we just let her ad lib and tell the story and then ultimately we wrote down what she said in the script. So that was a very sort of new piece of the script right before production or in that final, you know, process. And.....you know, a more recent piece that was completely Kathy's and then performed by the person whose words those were" (May, 2007 p. c.).

Kathy's story informed the character she was playing and she was able to perform her own words.

There were also times when cast members would inform the script by suggesting more appropriate dialogue used to tie the stories together. Dr. Theresa May described how during rehearsals, some of the Indian actors would say "that is not the way we would

do it, that's not the way Indians would do it" or "they wouldn't talk to their grandmother that way." Dr. Theresa May would then change the script based on their proposals.

The cast members were also greatly involved and took initiative when it came to the visual elements of the play. Many of the items used to tell the stories were not props but were personal things from people's homes, including active ceremonial items. For instance, Kathy McCovey brought in the actual ceremonial skirt that she made with her grandfather to emphasize the visual element of her story. She had also brought salmon that she had canned for one of the scenes where the Indian and Anglo characters are sharing in a meal. McCovey influenced the addition of a scene where her character as an elder woman was explaining to the others about basket weaving. Being a traditional basket weaver, Kathy McCovey chose to bring in one of her baskets to use during the scene. Another example is when Marlon Sherman brought in a personal item of his own to add to one of the scenes. In the scene, his character, Phillip, the elder from the upper Klamath tribes, comes out holding a baby basket. Marlon Sherman brought in a baby basket that was used and passed down through his family as the visual element for that scene.

Unlike regular theatre where a prop person goes out and finds props to use in the play, the cast members brought in their own personal and special items to use. Theresa May described that these were not props, but were "living objects." She made a point of acknowledging this in the program so that the audience could be aware of the importance of what was being shared with them.

Community casting brought emotion and passion

Many of the cast members from the initial performance were local or had at least been in the area for quite a few years. Some knew about the Klamath issues, while other cast members lived it. Those who lived it actually had personal experiences and stories about how they were affected by the fish kill. The close and personal connection that community cast members had to the issues on the Klamath brought a certain passion and emotion to the play that actors from outside the community might not have been able to express.

An interesting situation occurred during the first performances as one of the native actors was essentially acting out the words of his father.

From his unique perspective as a fisheries biologist and member of the Karuk tribe, Ron Reed frequented the many Klamath stakeholder meetings offering his knowledge about the Klamath. Reed allowed Dr. May to use some of his words from the stakeholder meetings as part of the *Salmon is Everything* script. Jason Reed, Ron Reed's son, ended up being a part of the play during its first performances. Jason played the character Will, the young Yurok-Karuk fisherman. The dialogue for Will contained words spoken by Jason's father at one of the stakeholder meetings. He spoke words of passion and sometimes words of anger that his father had expressed over the hurt and pain surrounding the Klamath crisis. As Ron Reed's son, Jason must have heard his father express these same feelings many times and lived what his family experienced. The father-son connection undoubtedly brought a unique passion that any other actor may not have been able to express. No one other than Ron Reed himself could have expressed

those feelings more genuinely than his own son (Theresa May, personal communication, March, 28, 2008).

Other cast members also brought their unique passion and emotion into their characters. Kathy McCovey actually witnessed the aftermath of the salmon crisis and saw the dead fish on the river. (Kathy McCovey, personal communication, 2008). Kathy McCovey's experiences with the Klamath River and her spiritual and personal connection to salmon made for a powerful and emotional performance. Everytime I saw the play performed, she had tears in her eyes as she spoke about the dead salmon in her dialogue. As previously illustrated, Kathy McCovey also contributed a great deal as a cultural advisor as she passionately shared her experiences, wisdom and her personal and ceremonial items to help contribute to the *Salmon is Everything* project.

Mary Campbell also had a personal connection to the Klamath crisis. From my interview with her I learned that she is from the local area but was away at community college when the fish kill occurred. I also learned that she was very disappointed that she could not be there at the moment to help her tribes (Hoopa, Tolowa, Yurok). When she returned from school, she desired to get involved and went to many protests, meetings and events. She heard about the play through ITEPP and was one of the people to attend a reading and voice her opinion about what she wanted *Salmon is Everything* to look like. Campbell eventually ended up being a lead female character in the play. Her devotion and passion showed through as she contributed too many aspects of the play and sacrificed a great deal of time to focus on the play.

I would consider the emotion and passion given by all actors, native and non-native, a very important element of the efficacy of such a theatre project. Davis (1997) explains that passion and emotions are considered essential components of the theatre process to expand the learning of theatre in different ways. The valuing of emotions "... allows the crafting of a safe emotional environment that supports risk taking in the creative process. Secondly, it permits the inclusion of emotions themselves as a valid source of knowledge..." (Davis, 1997). For example, the experiences, knowledge, and emotion that many of the actors brought to the play enhanced and expanded the learning process as well as the creative process. Their contributions help others to learn important cultural values and how to enhance and align the creative process of the play with these values and the appropriate visual elements. These emotions and passions are valid sources of knowledge originating from the community that was affected by the crisis. The process: public presentation.

The process of collaboration, research, public readings, casting and rehearsals all lead up to the public performances. The style of performance differed slightly from 2006 to 2007.

After Dr. Theresa May finalized the script, the play featured its first staged production on May 5th, 2006 in the Studio Theatre at Humboldt State University and ran until May 7th. This was a full scale production with the set design, lighting, film footage and film montages of salmon accompanying the play experience. The play ran for a period of three days and produced positive feedback as well as the desire to take the play to other parts of the area.

Many people from the tribal community who saw this play, clearly voiced that the play should be seen by more people---it should be taken home to their tribal communities, taken on tour throughout the Klamath River watershed, to Oregon, and even to state legislators (Sue Burcell, personal communication, 2008). From there the second phase of the project occurred, called the Going Home tour. The performances that followed are where I began my study of *Salmon is Everything*. At this point it became more of a traveling theatre project, taking the play on the road. By this time Theresa May had left the area to be assistant professor at University of Oregon and turned it over to her co-director, Jean O'Hara to continue with the Going Home Tour. These performances were meant to be taken to the Indian communities whose stories they depicted. Many of the communities lived many miles away and had yet to experience the play. The theatre group wanted to take the show to the Hoopa, Karuk and Yurok tribes in hopes that they would be inspired to assume collective ownership of it. During this tour in 2007, the cast welcomed a few new actors, performing in a variety of locations and settings, with new audiences each time. These performances were done in the theatre studio at Humboldt State, a tribal headquarters conference room, a high school cafeteria, and a local community center. All were done without stage lighting, set designs, or extensive film footage in the background. Besides the lack of conventional theatre structure, the shows were organized the same way as the previous shows---the performance followed by a talk-back session. The nature of the performances, the locations and choices of venues, made this show much more accessible to the public and community.

The process: post-performance discussions

A large part of the participatory aspect of the play involved the post-performance talk-backs. This discussion section was one of the most important parts of the project and a great opportunity to involve the audience. The community members discussed their thoughts, opinions and feelings about the play, or the Klamath river issues, and engaged others in the revelations they gained from the production.

These talk backs were the origin of many significant developments within *Salmon is Everything*. During the discussion period that followed the initial readings of the script, the elder's idea about including the farmers' stories emerged. The talk-back that occurred in 2004, allowed the community to come up with the important visual elements that were used in the first few plays. Many more discussion points came out of the talk backs that occurred after the final script was created and performed. Many audience members also voiced their views about what they saw as the problem with the Klamath, what they thought should be done. They questioned the actors about specific issues, discussed resources to learn more about the issues, discussed what they could do to help, or provided new information that may not be common knowledge in the community. This provided a period of reflection about what they watched, what they learned and how it could be applied to what is currently happening. There were many discussions about the current political climate, state sanctioned salmon fishing closures, and the current developments in the re-licensing of the Klamath River dams. There were also discussions about what the current Indian communities and non-profit organizations are doing to change things along the Klamath River.

This community involvement was important to allow each audience group to critically reflect on Klamath issues as well as think about what changes can be made to reach the goal of health for the Klamath River and its people. Community forums and discussion periods used in other theatrical models have proved to be transformational in a variety of ways (Nda, 2007; Sullivan & Parras, 2008). Nda (2007) discusses how this section was important in revealing the comments from a community in Nigeria that illustrated that the community “saw and appreciated the need to effect changes in their environmental habits” (p.174). Issues that were not even addressed in their production became important action steps. For example, Nda (2007) mentions that the issue of selling firewood was not treated in the production but was brought up by one of the Nigerian women. The community discussed it and accepted it as one of the acts that must be refrained from if the environment is to be saved. “The community resolved to take action that would forestall the environmental drift of Ikot Ayan Itam.” (p.174). Also Sullivan & Parras (2008) describe the use of a community forum theatre to create community action and advocacy around environmental justice issues. Although *Salmon is Everything* was not as interactive as the Boal-style “spect-actor” approach that Sullivan & Parras explains, I believe the talk backs still exhibit the transformational aspects they summarize.

When discussing examples of how theatre can help communities take charge and deal with environmental justice issues, Sullivan & Parras (2008) point out that the community forum theatre process reveals five transformational outcomes. The first is *more knowledge = more power*. They state that the direct exposure to technical content

and basic facts about the community's health "enhances the personal role of each participant in their community as an informal educator and committed advocate, while elevating the knowledge base of the entire community" (Sullivan & Parras, 2008, p.37). This relates to the way *Salmon is Everything* provides an educational role and therefore lends to its transformational efficacy. *Salmon is Everything* provided facts and content about the history of what happened (and what is currently happening) along the Klamath. This knowledge can have the potential to increase the knowledge base of the community and empower them to be informal educators and subsequent advocates for the health of the river.

The second is *more presence = more confidence, more personal assurance*. Sullivan & Parras (2008) state that exposure to performance techniques "promotes greater efficacy in communicating risk and maintaining grace under fire as an advocate." I would contend that this at least applies to the actors in the *Salmon is Everything* play. Through involvement with the play, the greater presence of the issues, as well as the skills learned through theater work and interacting with the audience, may give them greater confidence to later act as advocates for the health of the river--at least the actors who were not already involved. I also feel that the increased connections that the audience has with the actors/advocates can provide them more confidence to themselves be advocates in the future.

Before building confidence there is often knowledge and motivation that inspires advocacy. This is related to Sullivan & Parras' third outcome: *more awareness of community burden = more effective personal agency*. They state that the forum process

releases tensions and frustrations and addresses community health risk factors within the container of the workshop. Communicating the burden by exposing the health and socio-economic ramifications can broaden the appeal of grassroots organizations to members of the community and make networking efforts more credible. This outcome is possible when it comes to *Salmon is Everything* as it exposes the ramifications of the salmon crisis on the health, spirituality, economic conditions of the people along the Klamath. Through making people more aware of this community burden more people may be encouraged to seek out grassroots organizations that address these issues, increasing opportunities for networking. The increased presence of the struggles and issues along the Klamath River may broaden the appeal to become advocates for the health of the river and its communities.

The other two outcomes that Sullivan and Parras (2008) describe are more specific to the theatre techniques and grassroots organizations they describe in their article. However, they describe how gaining better rhetoric through the theatre process may actually make advocacy more effective (Sullivan & Parras). Although the general outcome may be different in *Salmon is Everything* rhetoric and deeper understanding can make a difference in community actions.

The analysis of my interview and survey results illustrate these points in more detail. However, like Sullivan and Parras (2008) I have my own set of transformational outcomes that I think the process of SIE revealed. These outcomes were overarching topics that I pulled out from what people were telling me when I interviewed them or asked them survey questions. Moving beyond my initial analysis, I will now discuss what

impact the final product of the play had on actors and audience members that I interviewed.

The Product of Performance: What the Results Reveal

Throughout the previous paragraphs I have been analyzing how the beginning process of *Salmon is Everything* is transformative. I will now look at how the actual performances have illustrated transformative conditions. The results of my study (on how people were affected by the 2007 performances of *Salmon is Everything* illustrated viewpoints, behaviors, and changes in perspectives that I believe fall into four transformative outcomes. These outcomes were based on the nature of performance and what people revealed in their interviews and surveys. I feel these outcomes are essential components in the driving forces toward personal or social change.

The four transformative outcomes are:

- Education & Awareness
- Healing & Compassion
- Dialogue (increased communication)
- Activism & Advocacy (empowerment/inspired to help)

Within the following sections I will examine what my results say about how people interpreted *Salmon is Everything* and how they were affected by it.

The performance process: what the actor/creator interviews revealed

Here I examine what transformative outcomes are revealed in what the cast experienced through their time with *Salmon is Everything* and through what they declared in their interviews.

Just like there is a process leading up to the creation of the play, there is also a process that happens leading up to the stage performances, occurring with every new set of actors and rehearsals. Veteran actors may need to learn how to take on a different role, new actors are trying to learn their new roles and maybe even learn more about the KSC. Also through gatherings and rehearsals they are learning from each other and maybe even develop close relationships. During my documentation of *Salmon is Everything* actors and directors were experiencing transitions involving the playwrights absence, transitions between old and new actors, and the process of traveling with the performance. My data reveals how actors and creators were being affected by *Salmon is Everything* through their high level of involvement with the play. The actors and creators had a lot more background knowledge about the play and the KSC than a typical audience member. They weren't simply being affected by the play through watching it like an audience member but were more likely being affected by the performance process.

One of the ways the performance process begins to illustrate transformative characteristics is through the sustained use of non-professional actors drawn from the local community. Over sixty-percent of those interviewed revealed that they had no previous experience in community-based theatre before being involved with this play. Only about thirteen percent had any acting experience at all. This second round of using non-professional actors contributed again to the important elements of community

knowledge, passion and emotion, and unique visual expression that comes from community members with a connection to the crisis. Many of the performers had their unique stories reciting how they came to know about *Salmon is Everything*. However, most stated that their reason for wanting to be a part of *Salmon is Everything* came from either their fascination with using theatre to express issues, or they simply felt it carried an important message. Most saw this as a worthy and important enough issue in which to invest their time and effort.

Drawing from my interview data, most of the actors and creators felt that *Salmon is Everything* is about *Connection* and *Promoting better relationships*. For example, some mentioned that *Salmon is Everything* was about the connection between people, place, life and spirituality. Others mentioned that it is about all sides of the issue, understanding from all sides, and bringing the whole community together.

The actors and creators recognized many issues that were brought up in *Salmon is Everything*. Most responses indicated that the issue was about *sustaining communities and sustaining natural resources*. The other responses generally focused around individuals' relationships to others or to the natural world (whether it be good or bad). These responses, as well as the data about *Connection* and *Promoting better relationships*, reveal an overall idea of how those involved with the play view *Salmon is Everything*. They view the play as being about our connection to each other and to the natural world. It's about how to improve that relationship for the sake of sustaining our communities and our natural resources. People's recognition of these connections and relationships illustrate *Salmon is Everything's* ability to increase "education &

awareness”. People’s acknowledgement that there may be a way to improve these relationships illustrates its ability to promote “healing & compassion” as well as a link to “activism”.

Of course it would be a lot more difficult for the above transformative outcomes to occur without the avenue for increased “dialogue”. Those involved with the play stated that their association with *Salmon is Everything* did indeed help to increase dialogue between them and their friends & family (or with other people in their lives). This suggests that the actors and creators are spreading the word about the play throughout their social circle. Getting the word out may lead to increased dialogue about the issues presented or at least increase “education & awareness” about the play and its issues. When more people talk and communicate these issues, the opportunity to increase understanding between different groups can occur therefore contributing to “healing & compassion.” Increased dialogue and communication is also an important part of connecting networks of people who desire to unite for a cause. This contributes to the transformative outcome of “activism.”

The actors and creators all agreed that *Salmon is Everything* is an important production. When looking at their reasons why, it reveals some of the characteristics that may make *Salmon is Everything* transformative. They stated that it’s important because it “*raises awareness, increases education and understanding.*” Most simply stated that it was “*important and a way to make a difference.*” Others also stated that it is a vehicle to vent frustrations and/or it reaches beyond our intellect. People involved in the play sensed important characteristics that I include in my list of transformative outcomes. The

responses to this question revealed three of them: “education & awareness”, “healing & compassion”, and “activism”. Most people agreed that this play increases education and raises awareness about the issues, while others found it important because it vents frustrations and reaches beyond our intellect, implying that *Salmon is Everything* may provide a space for “healing & compassion”. An outcome of “activism” is implied when others stated that *Salmon is Everything* is a way to make a difference. People feel empowered by being involved in the play and feel their actions can create change.

A more in-depth view of these responses illustrates how *Salmon is Everything* can lead to a transformative outcome such as “healing & compassion”. When I interviewed Jean O’Hara she described to me how a great deal of information we take in appeals to our minds. She explained that the power of theatre and its stories focuses less on intellectualizing and more on engaging our hearts. Even if it is not our story, we can connect to someone else’s human story. It gives us the ability to “acknowledge and to recognize the enormity of that situation more than you ever could before” (Jean O’Hara, personal communication, 2008). She believes that transformation happens when the mind, heart and spirit are touched as opposed to just our brain. She used an example of an audience member she had a conversation with during intermission at one of the performances. It was after the “lamentations” scene where they are talking about all the dead salmon. She came up to her and asked her how she liked the play. She quickly noticed that the lady was crying. The audience member explained that she had lived in the community for many years. She knew this information and all the scientific studies but it was different to have a connection to the stories and how it affected people’s lives.

It's different to know a native reality of what the crisis really means. It's not just that salmon died and we're going to lose lots of salmon but "it's connected to spirituality...its intricate to their whole lives." (Jean O'Hara, personal communication, 2008). This person had all the information about the issues that appealed to their intellect but *Salmon is Everything* engaged their heart, as well as provided new perspectives.

Salmon is Everything also led to people wanting to find a way to create change. During the many talk-backs, Jean O'Hara witnessed many audience members saying "what can I do?" and "how can I help?" She described the evolution of this effect from seeing the play to wanting to take action. Seeing the play gave people the opportunity to acknowledge what happened and start thinking that this is not okay and we need to do something different. They start believing that we need to work together so that this can never happen again. It helped to galvanize people to come together, talk for the first time, and think "okay, we can challenge this, we can change this." (Jean O'Hara, personal communication, 2008). This opportunity for change to occur implies that *Salmon is Everything* has the ability to promote "activism" around an issue.

Another example of a response that explains SIE's three transformative aspects involves the presence of a diversity of viewpoints. Another interviewee described how SIE is important because it provides a wide range of viewpoints and informs people in a way they can heed it. She believes that with this play people are better able to hear both opposing views (not necessarily having to agree with any opposing viewpoint), and also better understand the "necessity of coming up with solutions that are mutually respectful." (Sue Burcell, personal communication, 2008). The opportunities for

“education & awareness, “healing & compassion” and “activism” can be summed up in the following quote as she states “being able to empathize with people, especially when you disagree with them...is important to finding solutions that will work.”

When looking at responses to my next question, the “education & awareness” outcome stands out in terms of how educated or aware the actors became after being involved in the play. When I asked how much the actors knew about the fish kill before being involved in *Salmon is Everything*, most reported that they already had knowledge about it. However, a similar percentage of those interviewed reported that they knew general information about the crisis but learned a lot more from being involved with the play. A small percentage reported that they did not know anything about the issue before their involvement in the play. These results suggest that *Salmon is Everything* had a small impact on the education and awareness of the actors in the play.

Whether they had previous knowledge or gained this knowledge through involvement in the play, all actors felt knowledgeable enough to describe what they thought were the problems behind the Klamath conflict. Most agreed that the *divergent interests* along the Klamath are the main problems causing the conflict. Others thought it to be the *environmental degradation* that is occurring, that the crisis *reflects our impact on the environment*, or that the problem is caused by *corporate interests/money*. Interviewees appear to view the source of the problem along the Klamath as stemming from the different yet competing interests involved as well as people’s negative impact on the environment. This suggests that they see the problem as being a disconnection in our relationships to one another as well as our relationship to the environment.

The above data provides a picture of what the actors/creators understand to be the main points and transformative aspects of *Salmon is Everything*. However, how much did *Salmon is Everything* actually inform some of these perspectives about the crisis? Does *Salmon is Everything* have the ability to change a viewpoint or perspective they had about something?

Well, according to the actor/creator responses, *Salmon is Everything* at least had the ability to create an awareness about another person's perspective or culture. Some interviewees reported that they now knew more about the farmer/rancher perspective, others reported they are more educated about Native American culture, while the rest reported they are more educated about all the general perspectives involved in the crisis. This is an important aspect of the play that allows for a transformative outcome to occur. Increasing awareness of an opposing viewpoint may change how a person feels or thinks about that viewpoint. It may, in other words, change their perspective about that person or group.

"Education & awareness" can do more than inform, but can also change perspectives. This is more clearly illustrated when you look at a response from one of my interviewees. She stated that she had no idea about how ingrained and essential salmon are to the Native American culture. She thought the loss of salmon to the Indians simply meant a loss in their main food source. She didn't know about the spiritual and cultural significance of the salmon. Being in the play and learning more about these issues changed her perspective and how she thought about Indians and their relationship to salmon. Her perspectives about the farmers and ranchers changed too. She no longer

viewed them as “evil” and uncaring but possibly just lacking understanding when it comes to certain situations. She mentioned that they are people too, ones that need to make a living like everyone else. The responses and examples given illustrate that education and awareness about another’s perspective may have even wider implications for developing a common understanding, mutual compassion and increased communication between people.

When looking at how the actors/creators view *Salmon is Everything*’s role in the overall Klamath Basin conflict, this theme of “education and awareness” came up once again. Most of those interviewed believe that SIE’s role is to raise awareness about the issues, about what is happening and about how much other people are being affected by this crisis. They also believe that its role is not only to make others aware but to educate them and help them to understand the issues. For example, one of the interviewees explained how revealing it was to hear feedback from the audience during the open forums or talk-back sessions. He recalls times where people stayed for the open forums and expressed their thanks for explaining all the different perspectives they saw in the play. From his experience he concluded that putting things in the context of the play makes it easier to get the message across and “wakes people up.”

It was revealing to learn what the actors felt was the most surprising thing about being involved in the play. Many of the following examples describe how the *Salmon is Everything* performance process affected the cast members on a more personal level.

Several cast members mentioned that they were pleasantly surprised by their acting abilities. One interviewee mentioned her amazement that she was able to go out on

stage and actually remember her lines (and all her cues) while all the people in the audience stared at her (Kathy McCovey, personal communication, 2008). Another interviewee mentioned that she was surprised by the bravery of the actors since most of them were new to acting (Jess Eden, personal communication, 2008). She described that the reason many of the amateur performers did such a great job may have been partly due to the fact that the crisis is such a potent issue and very relevant to them. This helped them to overcome any feelings of fear and embrace the importance of telling the story. A different interviewee also mentioned her surprise that the cast, a majority with no prior stage experience, “got so into the roles and became those people” (Sue Burcell, personal communication, 2008). She felt that professional actors may have brought valuable skills but “would not have had the heart and soul of the people who were doing it.” She felt that it may be hard to explain to a professional actor how to achieve the emotional and psychological level one must reach to relate to salmon on a spiritual level. The levels of emotion come easily and naturally to the amateur actors/community members because some of them are living out the real life hurt and grieving process. Kathy McCovey was actually very surprised at her intensity of emotion each and every time she acted out a particular scene. When she would talk about the salmon kill and its effects and the scene approached where they handed her the “dead salmon” she would cry. She assumed that after so many rehearsals and performances that she would eventually stop crying. Kathy McCovey soon realized that she will always cry because it “was such a bad thing to have happened” and that people could relate to her voice and her crying “because they felt it.”

Other significant events that my interviewees shared with me about their experiences were their stories of how the cast connected to each other and forged a community between them. Through the nature of bringing the cast together, relationships were formed between people who have different perspectives from one another or who just simply hang out in separate social circles. One of my interviewees mentioned that her most memorable experiences were bonding with the cast and crew regardless if they had different perspectives from her about everyday things or not. She mentioned experiences during rehearsals as well as time she spent with cast members outside of rehearsal (Darcie Beeman-Black, personal communication, 2008). Another interviewee mentioned the bonding as a significant experience. She mentioned that when they first came together they were all strangers. Throughout the process they got to know each other better and by the end they all became really great friends. (Kathy McCovey, personal communication, 2008).

Besides building relationships, they also seemed to have learned lessons from one another during this process. The co-director Jean O'Hara mentioned that this was occurring on many occasions. She mentioned that there were cast and crew potlucks and gatherings that provided such rich dialogue that she wished she could have captured it. It was a beautiful and powerful conversation between the cast itself and the crew because of the mix of native and non-native actors. Every time they got together there was a learning and a dialogue. She also believed that these connections and dialogues brought healing as well.

One of my interviewees mentioned an important lesson that she was reminded of during her involvement with the play. She was struck by a comment made by a fellow cast member that there had never been salmon runs on the Mississippi River. She was a bit upset about this because she knew very well that there had once been salmon runs in the Mississippi as well as Native Americans that depended on those runs. My interviewee reminded herself however, that she should not be quick to judge. There could be just a lack of knowing and the person was not aware of the information. If that is the case, she stated, you can't really be angry with someone who just doesn't know. She went on to relate this to a time when she was a child and was almost scolded for behavior she didn't know was wrong.

While attending a cultural ceremony, there was a large crowd between her and her mom and the quickest way to reach her mom was to run behind the fire. So that is what she did. This, however, was a big mistake that left her mother embarrassed and ready to punish her. Just as she was about to be punished an elder stepped in and told her mom that she can't punish her if she just didn't know any better. "Now that you know" the elder told her, "it's your fault after that." As I listened to my interviewee's words, I could see that the connections she was making between these stories were connections she was also making within the Klamath crisis. In terms of the crisis, people may rush to be angry at the opposing sides within the Klamath, not realizing the need for education around an issue. She mentions that if someone is lacking knowledge, then maybe it is our fault [meaning society's fault] for not teaching them. In that case, I believe that *Salmon is Everything* may be our tool to educating others about the Klamath crisis and the people it

affects. Once someone has the knowledge it becomes their decision whether they want to be part of the problem or the solution.

Affecting audiences: Comparing audience survey results

Within the following paragraphs I will analyze the results of the interview and questionnaire data gathered from some of the audience members that saw *Salmon is Everything*

As revealed in my results, about 25% of the people I interviewed had previously been exposed to the *Salmon is Everything* play. This may suggest that a good number of audience members were unfamiliar with the play and possibly with the salmon crisis. It's possible that *Salmon is Everything* exposed the audience to a new way of learning about the issues or exposed them to new information. The play may have provided an avenue for educating others and creating awareness. However, the audience may not have been completely unaware of certain issues. The main reasons they stated for going to see the play was because they were interested in local salmon issues or they were going there to support a family member or friend.

When looking at what many stated as the topic of *Salmon is Everything* the interviews and questionnaires revealed interesting interpretations. For my interview question I asked audience members: "What is *Salmon is Everything* about?" My survey question asked audience members: "What is the overall message of the play?" These questions were similar and may reveal what people interpreted as the message of the play. The majority of people interviewed interpreted *Salmon is Everything*'s being about *Different points of views/interests*. The majority of people surveyed described that the

overall message of the play was that the *Klamath River/Salmon can be saved if we all work together*. When looking at these together it would appear that the audiences interpreted the play's message as being about the different stakeholders involved, their views & interests, and about how if everyone works together, the Klamath River and salmon can be saved. One audience member stated that

“Well, I think it's about all the different points of view that this issue covers. I think that is what impressed me. I mean from my point of view as an environmentalist, it's like take the dams down, duh, why not? It's an obvious solution to the problem---save the salmon, get rid of the dams. But then when you see all the other different sides of it you realize it's a very complex issue and needs to be discussed from all angles.

Another stated:

“Well I think that the overriding issue that I thought was raised was the ability of people over time to try to work together even when they have conflicting goals. “...I thought the presentation did a good job of presenting both sides and then presenting the fact that in our community the culture today there is no such thing as you lose, you win. Everyone has to work together to try to find some way to accommodate conflicting goals that involve the same resources.”

When interviewees were asked “What were the issues raised in *Salmon is Everything?*” the majority of audience members stated that the main issues involved Native American culture, history, their dependence on the river and the salmon, as well as how this crisis affected the Native American communities. This suggests that although there were a variety of issues and viewpoints in the play the main issue that stood out to audiences was how the Native American community was affected by the Klamath Crisis. However, other audience members also mentioned general social and cultural issues and/or conflicting goals occurring when people are competing for the same limited resource.

It appears that everyone I interviewed reported that dialogue between them and others around them increased in some way. Most dialogue was between friends and family but audience members also talked with others about seeing the play. This suggests that audience members are telling others within their social circle about the play and about the issues, which can increase education and awareness of others.

When I asked about *Salmon is Everything's* importance, all interviewees agreed that this play was an important venture. The audience members thought it was important because it *Raises awareness, increases education and understanding* and because *Theatre is an important medium*. What they described were characteristics of how *Salmon is Everything* impacts people. Through the unique medium of theatre, that provides new ways of learning and the ability to tap into people's emotions, it can increase awareness, education and understanding.

To examine more about what audiences knew about the Klamath Salmon Crisis before seeing the play it was important to see if audiences felt knowledgeable enough to describe the problems within the KSC. Since over 80% of those interviewed had knowledge about the KSC they described a variety of problems they felt were the main cause of the crisis/conflict. However, the majority of responses fell under two themes, *Many divergent interests* and *Dams*. I thought this was interesting because it reveals what most people hear in the media and news articles. A lot of news surrounding the Klamath deals with either the battle between people's divergent interests or the effects of dams on the Klamath and the benefits of dam removal.

I thought an important question to ask was whether their perspective about the KSC changed after watching *Salmon is Everything*. In other words, I wanted to know if *Salmon is Everything* provided audiences with a new outlook on the KSC other than what they know from news stories. When looking at the results, most people responded that after watching SIE they felt *More educated or aware of another's perspective/culture*. Just as many people reported that after watching SIE they were more educated about Native American culture as those that reported that they were more educated about the farmer/rancher culture. The other two top responses were that they *gained a more positive outlook* on the crisis or the possibility of people resolving their issues and that SIE caused them to *realize the more human side of the issue*.

These responses indicate how SIE impacted most audience members' perspectives on the crisis and on those involved in the crisis. Different views are better understood, hope for future resolution is realized and the issue is personalized creating more awareness and compassion. For instance, one might see the crisis as being a battle between many different interests but *Salmon is Everything* may help to humanize the issue making it less about conflicting interests and more about efforts to understanding one another. The understanding and awareness gained from the stories of people along the Klamath appears to provide a new outlook on the KSC that cannot always be gained from news stories or media.

It is even more compelling that my survey results reveal very similar responses. I asked if there was any change in a certain thought, attitude, or perception they had after watching SIE. Of those who answered yes to this question, 75% stated that *they*

understand another's perspective much better than before, while 25% answered that SIE *changed an opinion about possible resolution or cooperation within the Klamath crisis*. Here again, these responses reveal that different views are better understood and the play provides hope for possible cooperation along the Klamath. In response to this question, audience members also listed ways in which they were greatly affected by the play. When looking back at the results they stated that they were either educated by the play, inspired by it, emotionally moved by it, or that SIE made the issue more real and personal for them. Like my interview results reveal, audience members reported that the play educated them in new ways, touched them emotionally and humanized the issue for them, thus creating new awareness and compassion around the issue. This suggests the ways in which SIE can play a role in the KSC---by providing understanding and new perspectives.

When I asked audience members what they thought the role of SIE might be, the overwhelming response was that the play *raises awareness*. They often stated that it makes people more aware of what is happening along the Klamath and the impact it is having on those involved in the crisis. The other top responses were that it *creates dialogue* and/or the play *needs more distribution to play a role*. The play's ability to inform people and get them talking about the issues could be the next step in how SIE play's a role. Once people know more about an issue and begin to discuss it and be concerned with it, there is more opportunity for individual or social change to occur. Although, it is important to note that the response that the play needs more distribution is an interesting problem. The impact may be greater once the issues are brought to light in

other areas where it is not well known. Many stated that if just performed locally, the play is “preaching to the choir.”

To gauge what was unique about SIE, I was interested to learn what surprised audience members when they watched the play. The overwhelming responses were that people were surprised by the emotional impact it had on them as well as the passion shown by the actors. This reveals that the play has the ability to touch people emotionally and impact them on a different level than other sources of information would.

At the end of my interviews I wanted to draw out any stories related to the play that might reveal some interesting information about how SIE affected them. One audience member mentioned how she had done a story on the Klamath River and had spent some time there with kids who went eeling. She stated that

“I learned a lot there too about how the river is being affected and how the salmon population is diminishing...so I was able to see...how much salmon means to people of all ages in that culture. So I had a little bit of an understanding but I had never been as emotionally affected as I had through watching the play.”

Another audience member reported that as he sat and watched the play he began to get a picture in his mind of how powerful it would be for him to participate in bringing communities together. He began to fantasize what it would look like and what could be done.

Audience questionnaires: a closer examination

The questionnaire data I gathered was a way to get more information on a greater number of audience members since only a handful of interviews were done. This data can reveal if the answers gathered from my interviewees are reflective of a greater portion of

the audience. With this data I was able to better gauge how much the overall audience knew about the Klamath issues, what message they got out of the play, and if they had any change in their perspectives after watching *Salmon is Everything*.

To get an idea of how much the audience knew about the Klamath and how connected they felt to it, I asked about their connection to the Klamath and why they felt that way. When looking back at my data it appears that most of the audience members knew about Klamath issues and stated that their connection stemmed from either their Native heritage or because they viewed the river as an important resource or an important part of the ecosystem. This goes along with the themes that were displayed throughout my interview data where audience members who knew about the Klamath often stated the cultural and environmental connections associated with the Klamath. Overall it appears that those who are familiar with the Klamath River feel a strong to moderate connection to the Klamath. Even after watching the play, a few people stated that they knew very little about the river and therefore did not have a strong connection to it. Other answers in the Undecided to Strongly Disagree category reveal that some people did not feel connected because they were new to the area, had never been to the Klamath or had never grown up on the river. So people who had watched the play still felt that they knew very little about the Klamath River. These reports suggest that the connection between people and their sense of place may be a stronger indicator of feeling a connection (and therefore a responsibility towards) something than knowledge alone.

The two open-ended questions on my survey provided me the most data about how audience members interpreted the play, how they felt about it or how they were

affected by it. When looking back at my data it appears that a moderate number of people reported no change in thought, perception or attitude. However, a majority of people reported a change in their thinking, their knowledge level or in their emotional state. Some people mentioned that they understand another person's perspective much better than they did before or that their opinions have been changed about possible resolution or cooperation within the Klamath crisis.

These responses are similar to what was described in my interviews. The report that they better understand another's perspective illustrates an outcome of Education & Awareness and a change in opinion towards hopeful resolutions illustrate an outcome of Healing & Compassion. Most stated how the play affected them in some way which further illustrates the transformative outcomes. Most said that they were educated by the play, which of course, illustrates *Salmon is Everything's* ability to educate and create awareness. The Education & Awareness outcome is also illustrated when people reported on their surveys that the play increased their awareness and understanding about the issues and the many connections between people and place. Some reported that they were inspired to be part of the solution which illustrates *Salmon is Everything's* ability to empower and inspire people and move them towards Activism. Lastly, those that stated how emotionally moved they were by the play and/or how the play made the issue more real and personal for them, illustrates *Salmon is Everything's* ability to create Healing & Compassion around these issues.

In terms of the last question of the survey, many answers explained a variety of messages that were pulled out of the play. However the top four types of responses

indicate what most thought was the main message of the play. The responses that the Klamath River & the salmon can be saved if we all work together describes a view that there is hope towards cooperation, dialogue, healing and compassion that will ultimately improve the conditions along the river. The second most popular type of response was that salmon are valuable and we need to save and protect them. People are making the environmental connections and feeling more aware of the importance of salmon. Others thought the message was to educate others about the issue. This illustrates that the audience feels that people need to be educated about this issue and SIE has the ability to do that. Last but not least, others responded that we need to be more responsible stewards of our water/environment because of its value to people's lives. This reveals audiences recognition of the connections between the environmental conditions and people's lives and how our actions can improve or worsen the situation.

CONCLUSION

Theatre has developed throughout the centuries into many forms, yet the art of storytelling has been at its core. Stories have the power to captivate us, educate us, keep us on the edge of our seats, entertain us and even move us emotionally. Whether the topic is local, national, or global we take notice when we see ourselves in characters or situations we relate to. Theatre often holds up a mirror to individuals and society allowing them to see the reality of their actions through what is presented on stage. By using the art of storytelling to engage the ecological and cultural issues we face, there is a potential for personal and social change. This potential is most likely realized when knowledge, awareness, critical reflection and civic action take root. A powerful and thought provoking play can change a person's attitude or perspective towards a certain subject matter. I have shown throughout this thesis how *Salmon is Everything* illustrates its potential for effectiveness as a tool for personal or social change through its process and its resulting performances. The stories about the creation of the play and the words of all those I surveyed and interviewed all showed examples of how *Salmon is Everything* increases "education & awareness, "healing and compassion", increased "dialogue" and "activism". The characteristics of the play (e.g. collaboration and participation) allowed for these transformative outcomes to occur throughout the play's process. These elements provide a good environment for representing community, building community and encouraging community activism and therefore increasing its efficacy as a tool for personal and social change.

Representing & Building Community

The play represents community in a meaningful way due to the participatory nature of the play. There is a difference between a theatre model that uses testimony and research to create theatre about a community “rather like a television documentary” (Moriarty, 2004) and a model that is a collaborative and creative process “owned by all those who agree to participate in it, striving to give voice to different perspectives (sometimes colliding, sometimes contradictory)” (Moriarty, 2004). *Salmon is Everything* is not simply a documentary play *about* a community but a collaborative piece that *represents* community. The community helped bring to light what they saw as relevant voices and perspectives around the Klamath crisis. From the creation of the Klamath Theatre project, to the HSU class and the initial public readings, the research process allowed the community to express its ideas about the play’s direction and visual elements. Their interviews, stories and comments made up the script and they were the ones that desired to hear multiple voices like the farmer/rancher voice.

There were many levels of community building displayed throughout the *Salmon is Everything* process. Diverse groups of people came together during the research process and crafting of the script, during the formation of the cast, and during the post-performance discussions. It was more than just bringing groups together that makes the difference in community building. The awareness and relationships that were formed between cast, crew and audience, between different cultures, and even between Klamath River groups (such as the relationships built during Lauren’s experience) contributed

most to community building. These elements are important to building up a community of people based on understanding and awareness of different ways of knowing.

The impact of education & awareness

Salmon is Everything's ability to represent and build community illustrates the impact the transformational outcomes can have. Greater "education and awareness" can be seen through *Salmon is Everything's* ability to make people more aware of marginalized voices and critical issues. *Salmon is Everything* brings to light the often untold stories of those most affected by the salmon crisis. It also makes people aware of information and issues that may not always show up in traditional media forms.

Performances like *Salmon is Everything* can often call attention to unjust political policies that promote the exclusion of certain cultural groups (Taylor, 2003). For example, many people may not have known the extent of the impact the salmon kill had on Indian communities, or they may not have known about the suppression of scientific data used to gain political favor during a critical election period and so on. Performance as a pedagogical tool educates people so that they are able to think critically, analyze social conditions and evaluate information (Howard, 2004).

Greater "education & awareness" can lead to building community through the awareness it brings people about multiple voices and multiple ways of knowing within the Klamath. Through this knowledge audience members are made more aware of who is involved, the different perspectives, and the many connections that are present. This allows for many people to better understand our connections to each other and to the environment. Awareness can further impact people by allowing an individual or

community to become aware of their personal habits and perspectives. Many people might be unaware of how their actions impact the rivers and the salmon, or how their opinion about how certain groups that live along the river, value or use the river, etc. This awareness about multiple ways of knowing allows them to reflect and decide how they are connected and what changes are possible. In other words, it uses the power of the aesthetic form to raise awareness “about how we are situated in this world and what we as individuals and as communities might do to make the world a better place” (Taylor, 2003) The play has the ability to bring to light our disconnection from each other and the environment and allow the audience to determine how they can rebuild that connection.

By pairing critical pedagogy with participatory forms of theatre it allows for critical reflection and gives people the authority and power to choose what issues to explore and how to give voice to their stories.

The impact of dialogue

Salmon is Everything's collaborative process also allowed for greater “dialogue.” The interviews during the research process created a course of action that brought different groups together and promoted civic engagement. People were coming together on all levels—Upper Klamath and Lower Klamath, native and non-native, student, teacher, staff, neighbor, young, old. Through the interviews, the class projects, Lauren’s story, and the post performance discussions, the process got people talking. It facilitated dialogue and challenged contemporary discourses through the “...power to bring together divided communities of different kinds...and engage creatively, productively and meaningfully with a wide range of issues...” (Taylor, 2003).

Impact of healing & compassion

Through representing community *Salmon is Everything* also illustrates an outcome of “healing.” There were times throughout the play’s collaborative stages where opportunities for healing occurred. The thoughts and stories put into dramatic form can act as a healing process because the sharing of stories can allow a community to express the inexpressible, process their hurt, break down barriers and even heal psychological wounds (Taylor, 2003; Howard, 2004). This therapeutic quality can help rebuild what is fractured within an individual or community. Looking back at the research process, the awareness of the community’s own stories made the community more open to wanting to hear other people’s stories (such as the Upper Klamath people). This critical reflection on one’s own stories opened the door for listening and trying to understand someone else’s stories. This led to a more transformative opportunity for participants as they went through the research process of seeking out those stories. This was especially clear when the Klamath theatre project class sought to gather stories from the Upper Klamath people. The initial difficulty and resistance to listening to stories associated with a painful past made many participants confront their own stereotypes and prejudices.

The healing process was greatly illustrated within Lauren’s story when she made the effort to attend the Klamath meeting and met with agency officials and Upper Klamath families. Her stereotypes were destroyed and her actions helped destroy others’ stereotypes and bridge the gap between meetings in the upper and lower Klamath Basin. *Salmon is Everything* took many people through a journey of self-understanding and personal change. Equipped with greater knowledge about the plight of others, one

community can begin to better understand another community and better understand themselves.

In general, learning more about others and even building relationships with others helps to create understanding to “humanize the opposing side.”

Activism and advocacy

The impact of all the previous outcomes creates opportunity for personal and social change through activism and advocacy. For example, through *Salmon is Everything's* ability to make people more aware of personal habits or perspectives, it encourages people to reflect, change their thoughts or behaviors, and take action to improve things. The reason why this awareness can be so influential is because of the ways in which the outcomes contributed to empowering communities. Communities were empowered through allowing their voices to be heard and valued, through a process of healing, through forums of civic engagement and through the hope for rebuilding connections. This empowerment allows an individual or community to have a new (or renewed) motivation, energy and confidence to be part of the activist/advocate realm. This relates back to Sullivan & Parras' explanations about how community forum theatre can help communities take charge in dealing with environmental issues (2008). First of all, as a community is armed with more knowledge it empowers them to become informal educators and subsequent advocates. Just the mere increased presence of these issues in someone's life (and/or being a participant in the process) increases one's confidence to be an advocate.

One of the greatest motivators towards advocacy may be the increased feeling of personal responsibility that is created when people realize the extent of the community burden. People may be so outraged by the ramifications that they are inspired to seek out ways to become advocates and make a difference.

This intersection between art and the environment has great potential to be used as a tool for change and a step towards civic action with the impacts spanning from personal, local or global levels. The impact from a local to a global level can be seen in examples like the community project called Circle the Earth. This project was a local ritual performance that later evolved into a participatory dance ritual called Planetary Dance (Worth & Poyner, 2004). These projects became large-scale ritual performances intended to act as a form of healing and restoration for local communities as well as the world. Various community concerns and events inspired the emphasis of the Circle the Earth project, a peace dance ritual. From the events in Chernobyl to the AIDS crisis threatening the community around San Francisco the performances were addressing an immediate and specific issue. All across America and the world, the interconnected personal and collective crises were being performed. "The intensity of both the process and the performance reflected the immediacy of the crisis for all concerned, participants and witnesses alike (Worth & Poyner, 2004). The Planetary Dance, which demanded group awareness and acted as a metaphor to achieving peace, was enacted on a global scale. The form created a sense of unity, yet framing the preparation and closure to the ritual was encouraged to meet the needs/character of the local community. The beginning and subsequent rituals all focused on addressing the community's shared cause and desire

for action. With projects like these comes recognition of both the “importance of creating a community with shared tasks reflective of a joint intention, combined with an acknowledgement of the difference each person brings from their own community” (Worth & Poyner, 2004).

Wider Implications: Theatre’s Role in Environmental Conflicts.

I believe that *Salmon is Everything* (and plays like it) performs an important role in bringing new light to the different sides of a contentious issue. The stories along the Klamath that *Salmon is Everything* illuminates is characteristic of many other environmental conflicts around the country. There are battles going on between diverse groups of people (and between people and nature) when you look at issues that revolve around water use, mining, deforestation and so on. These are tough issues to deal with and although theatre might not be the solution to solve these issues, theatre can begin to become necessary tools in a community’s toolbox. Fortunately groups and communities are starting to increase their utilization of theatre as a tool for education, healing, and creating change when it comes to environmental issues. The Ukiah Players have created eco-theatre performances around deforestation in Northern California where timber owners, loggers, and environmentalists are at odds. Their performance model in *Up-rooted/Re-rooted*, works toward the goal of creating “full communication, consensus building and healing” in hopes that communities will discover environmental and economically viable solutions to deforestation. (Animating Democracy, 2011).

Community groups like Climate Change North have created educational resources that

include eco-theatre so that students may learn about possible consequences of climate change, the causes, and what they can do to help. Even the new generation of El Teatro Campesino has taken on ecological issues by pairing with Monterey Bay Aquarium to create “new ‘Actos’ such as ‘Basta Busura’ and ‘Watt a Waste’ to raise awareness of global warming and the need for global conservation” (El Teatro Campesino, 2010). El Teatro Campesino is also partnering with Monterey County to create a k-12 school curriculum focused on the company’s history and principles (El Teatro Campesino, 2010).

Using a participatory eco-theatre model engages the community and begins to open up the doors toward participation in local decision making processes. This allows a community to feel more in charge of how to deal with the tough issues they face. Plays like *Salmon is Everything* can give the community the tools it needs to start building consensus around complicated environmental issues. Within the conflict around the Klamath River, each side focused on their own bitter feelings. Therefore, polarizing arguments and blame did not leave much room for dialogue let a long any efforts to find common ground. Dr. Theresa May thought that maybe if “diverse people of the watershed could hear one another’s stories, perhaps the compassion necessary to build consensus around the complex issues that plague our watershed might grow” (May, 2007).

Concluding Thoughts

Looking back at the history and discord along a troubled watershed takes us back to how the issues are framed by those involved in the crisis. The divergent perspectives, interests and controversies I described earlier in this paper illustrated the long-standing problems that have polarized stakeholders for generations. Many different communities have blamed each other for the decline in the health of the Klamath River. Blame went around on all sides. Farmers and ranchers were accused by environmentalists and native communities of bad agricultural practices that used up too much water and caused the decline of water quality. Environmentalists and government was blamed for the strong Federal regulations in the Endangered Species Act that caused economic loss and a destruction of their livelihoods. Native communities and ocean fisherman were blaming each other for over-fishing and causing salmon fishing closures. I am sure the list of blame is a mile long. Each side frames the issue in terms of opposing sides and who is to blame. Through the many ways *Salmon is Everything* has been shown to create a space for education, dialogue, healing and even advocacy, I feel that one of the play's biggest strengths could be the ability to humanize opposing sides.

Through using theatre works like *Salmon is Everything* people can begin the first steps to humanizing each other and reframing perspectives which can lead to building community across difference. This does not necessarily mean transcending difference but recognizing the importance of different perspectives. You saw this building of community across difference throughout the process and the interview results of *Salmon is Everything*. The play got people thinking about the salmon crisis, analyzing their

perspectives and seeing some things (and some people) in a new light. These simple results can have a powerful affect on how communities view a problem and work toward coming up with solutions.

It is difficult to firmly quantify and prove that *Salmon is Everything* contributed (or can contribute) to social change around the Klamath crisis. However, I believe that the many examples of how the play affected its creators, its cast, and its audience indicates *Salmon is Everything*'s strong potential to be an effective tool for change. It follows closely behind the many theatre models described in the literature that report significant changes in the communities involved. Other communities around the country are dealing with similar environmental and cultural issues so applying theatre models similar to *Salmon is Everything* may also humanize opposing sides and bring those issues to light. Davis (1997) states that “transformation will occur through a process of praxis—the combination of critical reflection, upon personal and societal assumptions, beliefs and metaphors, and action upon that knowledge.” So once those new perspectives give rise to new actions then maybe the necessary changes will be possible.

Theresa May (2007) once stated that the goal of *Salmon is Everything* was not to bring agreement or policy change, but a change of heart. Through bringing greater knowledge about the multiplicity of experiences a collective wisdom is formed, giving rise to innovative and compassion civic action (May, 2007)

May (2007) states that:

“ Community-based theatre is more than a preamble to social justice activism, it IS civic action. Trannscending the town hall, theatre functions

as a site of collective dreaming where a seemingly impossible future might be envisioned.”

Not only can theatre be a way for individuals or communities to see the reality of their actions reflected back to them but it can also be the place for “collective dreaming.” A process of praxis, and a collective vision of the future they desire, may strengthen a community’s self-determination and provide the inspiration and empowerment to make that future a reality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Ross. (2002, October 7) Fighting an Upstream Battle. Washington Post.
- Andrews, R. (2004). The Poor Theatre of Monticciello, Italy. In R. Boon & J. Plastow (Eds.), Theatre and Empowerment: community drama on the world stage (pp.33-59). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Animating Democracy. (2011). Ukiah Players Theatre: upRooted/re-Rooted. www. Artusa.org/animating democracy /Labs/lab_045.asp
- Baker, T.L. (1994). Doing Social Research (2nd Edn.), New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Barker, C. (1992). Alternative Theatre/Political Theatre In G. Holderness (Ed.) . The Politics of Theatre and Drama. (pp.18-39). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Bell, Maureen. (1991). Karuk: The Upriver People Happy Camp, CA: Naturgraph Publishers
- Boal, A. (1979). Theatre of the Oppressed. transl. Charles A. & Maria Odilia Leal McBride, London, Pluto Press.
- Boon, R. & Plastow, J. (Eds.) . (2004). Theatre and Empowerment: community drama on the world stage. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Braunworth, W.S., Welch, T., & Hathaway, R. (2003). Water Allocation in the Klamath Reclamation Project, 2001: An Assessment of Natural Resource, Economic, Social, Institutional Issues with a Focus on the Upper Klamath Basin. Oregon State University Extension Program.
<http://extension.oregonstate.edu/catalog/html/sr/sr1037-e/report.pdf>
- California Department of Fish & Game. (2003). September 2002 Klamath River Fish Kill: Preliminary analysis of contributing factors.
- Capo, K. E. (1983). From Academic to Social-Political Uses of Performance. In D. W. Thompson (Ed.) . Performance if Literature in Historical Perspectives. (pp.437-457). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Chorus, I. & Bartram, J. (Eds.). (1999). Toxic Cyanobacteria in Water: A Guide to Their Public Health Consequences, Monitoring and Management. World Health Organization, Routledge, London, England.
- City Data. (2007). Yreka, Ca. <http://www.city-data.com/city/Yreka-California.html>

- City Data. (2009). Weaverville, Ca. <http://www.city-data.com/city/Yreka-California.html>
- City of Klamath Falls. (2007). The History of Klamath Falls. <http://ci.klamath-falls.or.us/visitors/history> (March 2007).
- Davis, B. (1997). Eco-Theatre: Celebrating Our Connection to the More-Than-Human World. Trumpeter 14 (2) <http://www.icaap.org/iuicode?6.14.2.15>
- El Teatro Campesino (1986). El Teatro Campesino Archives. California Ethnic and Multicultural Archives, Dept. of Special Collections, UCSB. CEMA 5 1964-1988.
- El Teatro Campesino (2010). El Teatro Campesino. About: Mission & History. <<http://www.elteatrocampesino.com/About/missionhistory.html>>
- Etherton, M. (2004). South Asia's Child Rights Theatre for Development: the empowerment of children who are marginalized, disadvantaged and excluded. In R. Boon & J. Plastow (Eds.), Theatre and Empowerment: community drama on the world stage. (pp. 188-219). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fritsche, J. (1978). Beyond the Image of Dependency: Affecting Public Policy. Using Oral Interpretation to Affect Public Policy 23.
- Holderness, G . (Ed.). (1992). The Politics of Theatre and Drama New York: St. Martin's Press
- Howard, L. A. (2004). Speaking Theatre/Doing Pedagogy: re-visiting theatre of the oppressed. Communication Education 53(3), 217-233.
- Kann, J. (2006). Microcystis aeruginosa Occurrence in the Klamath River System of Southern Oregon and Northern California. Technical Memorandum. Aquatic Ecosystem Sciences.
- Kershaw, B. (1992). The Politics of Performance: Radical Theatre as Cultural Intervention. London & New York: Routledge.
- Klamath Basin Tribal Water Quality Work Group. (2011). <http://www.klamathwaterquality.com/>
- Lewicki, R. J., Gray, B., & Elliot, M. (Eds.) (2003). Making Sense of Intractable Conflicts: Conflicts and Cases. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Martin, G . (2003, November 19). Salmon kill linked to level of Klamath River's flow—reduced for irrigation—played a role in huge die-off, U.S. study finds. SF Chronicle.

- May, T. J. (2004). The Greening of American Theatre: Taking Ecocriticism from Page to Stage. In A. Ingram, Marshall, I., Sweeting, A., Philippon, D. (Eds.). Coming Into Contact: New Essays on Ecocritical Theory and Practice (Forthcoming). (Available as PDF file at www.humboldt.edu/emos)
- May, T. J. (2007). Toward Communicative Democracy: Developing *Salmon is Everything*. In P. Koppers & G. Robertson (Eds.), The Community Performance Reader (pp. 153-164). New York, New York: Routledge.
- Mda, Z., (1993). When People Play People: Development Communication through Theatre. London: Zed Books.
- Meillo, J. (1991). Issues in milieu therapy: Psychodrama as a contributor to the treatment of a case of anorexia nervosa. In P. Holmes & M. Karp. (Eds.), Psychodrama: Inspiration and technique. (pp.137-154). London: Routledge.
- Meiners, R. E., & Kosnik, L.R. (2003). Restoring Harmony in the Klamath Basin. In J. S. Shaw (Ed.) . PERC Policy Series (PS-27). Montana: PERC.
- Meldrum, B. (1994). Historical background and overview of dramatherapy. In S. Jennings (Ed.) . The Handbook of Dramatherapy. (pp. 12-27). New York: Routledge.
- Moreno, J. L. (1946). Psychodrama. New York, Beacon House.
- Moriarty, G. (2004). The Wedding Community Play Project: a cross-community production in Northern Ireland. In R. Boon & J. Plastow (Eds.), Theatre and Empowerment: community drama on the world stage. (pp.13-31). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Most, S. (2006). River of Renewal: Myth and History in the Klamath Basin. Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press.
- National Research Council. (2002). Scientific Evaluation of Biological Opinions on Endangered and Threatened Fishes in the Klamath River Basin: Interim Report. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Research Council, Committee on Endangered and Threatened Fishes in the Klamath River Basin, (2004). Endangered and Threatened Fishes in the Klamath River Basin: Causes of Decline and Strategies for Recovery. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- National Research Council, Committee on Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River. (2008). Hydrology, Ecology, and Fishes of the Klamath River Basin. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

- Nda, S.U. (2007). Preferring a drama-based model for sustainable development advocacy. In P. Kupperts & G. Robertson (Eds.), The Community Performance Reader (pp. 165-176). New York, New York: Routledge.
- NOAA Fisheries Service. (2011). About National Marine Fisheries Service. <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aboutus.htm>
- Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality. (2002). Upper Klamath Lake Drainage Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and Water Quality Management Plan, p. ii
- Oregon Wild. (2010). The Klamath River. The Klamath River: Wild, Scenic, and Dammed. <<http://www.oregonwild.org/waters/klamath/the-klamath-river/the-klamath-river/?searchterm=klamath%20basin>> (2011 September).
- Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Association (PCFFA). (2011). <http://www.pcffa.org/>
- PacifiCorp. (2011a). The Klamath River Hydroelectric Project. http://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pacificorp/doc/Energy_Sources/Energy_Generation_FactSheets/PP_GFS_Klamath_%20River_v2.pdf
- PacifiCorp. (2011b). PacifiCorp Klamath Hydroelectric Project Interim Operations Habitat Conservation Plan for Coho Salmon.
- Putnam, R. D. & Feldstein, L. M. (2003). Better Together: Restoring the American Community. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Razack, S. (1993). Story-telling for Social Change Gender & Education, 5(1).
- Roloff, L. (1983). Performer, performing, performance: towards a psychologicalization of theory. Literature in Performance, 3, 13-24.
- Soden, D. L. & Steel, B. (1999) . Handbook of Global Environmental Policy and Administration. New York, NY: CRC Press.
- Sullivan, J. & Parras, J. (2008). Environmental Justice and Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed: A Unique Community Tool for Outreach, Communication, Education and Advocacy. Theatre in Action 1 (2), 20-39.
- Taylor, P. (2003). Applied Theatre: creating transformative encounters in the community Portsmouth, NH, Heinemann
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. (2008a). About Us. <http://www.usbr.gov>
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. (2008b). Mission Statement. <http://www.usbr.gov>

- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. (2008c). General Description. Reclamation: Klamath Project.
<http://www.usbr.gov/projects/Project.jsp?proj_Name=Klamath+Project.html>
- U.S. Congressional Research Service. (2005, Sept. 22). Klamath River Basin Issues and Activities (RL30588), by K. Powers, Baldwin, P., Buck, E. H., & Cody, B. A. Text in: LexisNexis® Congressional Research Digital Collection. (2011, August 22).
- USDA National Resource Conservation Service (2011a). Understanding the “Klamath Basin. Klamath River Basin—Overview. <<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov>> (2009, July 10th).
- USDA National Resource Conservation Service (2011b). Klamath River Basin map and work plan. Klamath Basin Adaptive Management Plan. <<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov>> (2009, July 10th).
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (2003, November 7). Klamath River Fish Die-Off, September 2002. Report on Estimate of Mortality. (Report Number AFOW-01-03). Arcata, Ca; Arcata Fish & Wildlife Office.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011). National Wildlife Refuge System. (2008, May 12).
- Williams, D. (1983). From academic to psycho-social uses of literature Performance of literature in historical perspectives. D. Thompson. New York, University Press of America: 419-435.
- Worth, L., & Poyner, H. (2004). Anna Halprin. (Routledge Performance Practitioners). Routledge.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR AUDIENCE MEMBERS

1. When did you see *Salmon is Everything*? Is this the first time you have seen it?
2. What attracted you to this theatre production?
3. In your opinion, what is *Salmon is Everything* about?
4. What did you expect from the production?
5. In your opinion, what were the issues raised in the theatre production of *Salmon is Everything*?
6. After seeing *Salmon is Everything* did it generate a greater dialogue between you and the people around you about the issues raised in the production? Why or why not?
7. Do you feel the *Salmon is Everything* theatre production is important? Why or why not?
8. What do you know about the Klamath Salmon Crisis (KSC)? What about the fish kill of 2002?
9. What is your perspective on the KSC, such as what is the conflict about; what is the problem?
10. Has the above perspective differed since you have seen the production? If so, how?
11. What role do you see this production playing in the overall Klamath Basin Conflict (Klamath Salmon Crisis)?
12. What do you think about the voices portrayed in the theatre production? Are they properly represented?
13. What voice would you be/ are you, if any? Why?
14. Was there something that struck you/surprised you about *Salmon is Everything*?
15. Do you have a story/experience related to the play that you would like to share?

APPENDIX B

AUDIENCE MEMBERS CODED THEMES AND MEANINGS

Each question had a set of common themes that emerged from my interviews. I numbered each theme and provided phrases or key words that describe the meaning of that theme.

When did you see *Salmon is Everything*? Was this the first time you have seen SIE?

- Q1. (1) Yes First time ever hearing about or seeing the docu-drama
 (2) No Saw a previous SIE production or saw a reading of it.

What attracted you to this theatre production?

- Q2. (1) Supporting a family member/friend Went to see someone they knew who was acting in the SIE docu-drama.
 (2) Interested in local salmon issues Follows the stories in the media, has personal experience with these issues, job-related, live near issues, excited about topic.
 (3) Wanted to learn more about issues Either did not know much about issues and wanted to learn or knew some and wanted to learn more. Wanted to know more about all the sides of the issue.
 (4) Someone suggested they see it

In your opinion, what is *Salmon is Everything* about?

- Q3. (1) People's reaction to the fish kill Mentions fish kill, what the kill means to people's everyday lives, people expressing their concerns & feelings about the fish kill

- | | |
|---|---|
| (2) Different points of view/interests | Many different sides, views, perspectives, angles, people. All people of interest, parties of interest, different interests |
| (3) Conflict between groups/ways of living | Mentions conflicting groups, conflict between them, competing ways of living |
| (4) People trying to solve an issue | Trying to solve an issue, come up with a solution, working together. |
| (5) How the river relates to everyone | What happens on the river affects many people; groups of people, how health of river affects everyone, many parties. |
| (6) Expressing opinions of the unheard voices | Way for people to express their concerns, opinion, feelings because they felt unheard, upset, not understood, etc. |
| (7) Cultural identity | Expression of cultural identity, what role salmon has in culture. |
| (8) Loss of culture | A culture disappearing, loss of culture, cultural meltdown, taking over of land, generations, people lost, culture lost. |

What did you expect from the production?

- | | |
|--|---|
| Q4. (1) Yes. Expected certain viewpoints | Pro-salmon, pro-environment, pro-dam removal, pro-dams, etc, native American, farmers, ranchers, etc. only. |
| (2) Yes. Expected multiple viewpoints | Multiple sides of the argument, all different sides expected. |
| (3) No. | Had no expectations |

In your opinion, what were the issues raised in the theatre production of *Salmon is Everything?*

- | | |
|---|--|
| Q5. (1) Environmental issues | Mentions environmental issues, affects of logging and ranching, environmental degradation, poor watershed health, ecological issues. |
| (2) Social & Cultural Issues | People's roles within society, how people relate to each other, relationships. Cultural issues (non-specific). |
| (3) Native American culture/history | Mention N.A. culture, history, struggles, dependence on/use of salmon, the river, role of salmon/river in their lives, the effect this had on the lives of N.A., Native sovereignty, native connection to place. |
| (4) Farmers/Ranchers history | Farmers & ranchers dependence on the river, water use, history with the land. |
| (5) Efforts to work together | Mentions working together, efforts to compromise/work together, resolving differences. |
| (6) Conflicting goals/competing for same limited resource | conflicting goals, uses. Competing for same resource, limited resource, groups wanting water and salmon for their livelihood, battle. |
| (7) Water Rights | Water rights, ownership of water, who owns the water, etc |
| (8) Examining our priorities | What is more important to us, what our priorities ought to be; are. What actions need to be taken to solve a problem. |

After seeing *Salmon is Everything* did it generate a greater dialogue between you and the people around you about the issues raised in the production? Why or why not?

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| Q6. | (1) Yes. With family & friends. | Talked about SIE with family/friends who saw it. Co-workers, classmates. |
| | (2) Informed others to see it. | Told others that SIE was worth seeing; spread the word. People who didn't see SIE |
| | (3) No. Discussion did not occur. | Did not talk with anyone about SIE or the associated issues. |
| | (4) Yes. SIE better informed my discussions | Said yes because SIE gave them a better understanding of the issue and was better able to talk to others about the issues. |
| | (5) Networking occurred | Made connections with others that opened up new avenues, funding made available through connections made, offered their help or services to SIE, etc. |

Do you feel the *Salmon is Everything* theatre production is important? Why or why not?

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| Q7. | (1) Yes. Raises awareness, increases education & understanding | Mentions education, awareness, getting information across, awareness of different perspectives. Information; learned from it. Helps us to better understand the "other side"; an opposing viewpoint. How interests & actions affect others. |
| | (2) Yes. Theatre an important medium. | Mentions artistic expression, theatre, medium, art important and why, unique, reaches people in different way, alternative to mass media, effective in communicating the issue, dramatizing subject, effective presentation, powerful |

- presentation, touches people differently than if they are reading article; hearing a speech.
- (3) Yes. Creates dialogue. Mentions causing people to address issues, to talk about the issues, to talk to each other
- (4) Yes. Presents all sides of the issue
- (5) Yes. Vague.
- (6) No. Not important.

What do you know about the Klamath Salmon Crisis (KSC) or the local fish kill of 2002? (OR Did the play inform you of the issue(s) or did it encourage you to learn more about it?) What is your perspective on the KSC, such as what is the conflict about; what is the problem?

- Q8/9 (1) Felt knowledgeable enough to describe problem
- (1a) Dams Mentions dams, dam removal, blocking fish passage & spawning
- (2b) Environmental Degradation Mentions pollution, run-off, unhealthy watershed/river, logging affects, increased pathogens/toxic algae, resource extraction.
- (3c) Change in Water Conditions Drought, low water levels, high water temperatures, water diversion.
- (4d) Many Divergent Interests Mentions the many parties involved, conflicting interests, etc. Conflict between groups/ways of living, dispute between one side and another.
- (5e) Low salmon numbers Salmon populations low, limited access to fish, fishing closures/limits, no more, salmon die-off.

(6f) Water rights	Who owns the water; water rights; guaranteed water
(7g) Limited resources	One river resource, limited resources, not enough, many trying to use same resource, how we live, how we use nature, not paying attention to ecological limits.
(8h) Reflects our impact on the earth	Makes connections b/t sustainability problems all over the nation or worldwide. Our impact on the earth, web of life, mentions how SIE is reflects what is happening in many other places. How things are connected to each other, etc
(2) Could not describe problem/ did not feel knowledgeable	Didn't know and couldn't describe problem. Had no answer.
(3) SIE informed knowledge	Didn't know much before SIE, learned about the KSC from it, or it inspired them to learn more.

Has the above perspective differed since you have seen the production? If so, how?

Q10	(1) No new information or perspectives gained	
	(2) More educated or aware of another's perspective/culture	Learned more about another's perspective not previously exposed to this perspective, learned how others use the river, salmon, land. Knows the culture better. Sometimes an opposite viewpoint. More sensitive to others issues or what other side is going through.
	(2a) Educated about native culture	

- (2b) Educated about farmer/rancher culture
- (2c) Other
- (3) Gained a more positive outlook Gained a positive outlook for the future that didn't have before, feels more positive the future of the crisis, people getting along realized working together/resolving differences is possible and important.
- (4) Gained general information Gained information about fish kill, salmon Crisis, Klamath crisis, informed about issue.
- (5) Realized more human side of issue Put a human face to issue, realized how much/strongly issue affects many people, learned of the emotional side of the issue.
- (6) More aware of size or depth of issue Now realizes how deep or far-reaching the problem is, mentions size and depth of problem, more aware that problem is bigger or more complex than they realized.

What role do you see this production playing in the overall Klamath Basin Conflict?

- Q11 (1) Educates Helps people understand issues, educate(s). Informational; learn more.
- (2) Raises awareness Makes people more aware of the issues & what is happening, who is affected and how much they are affected. Alert, conscious, more concerned. Opening people's eyes. Enlighten.
- (3) Creates dialogue Helps open dialogue, gets people talking to each other about the issues.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (4) Needs more distribution to be able to play a role | Needs to be taped or done live at more places/locations, taken to other areas for people to see it. |
| (5) Allows people's voices to be heard | A stage to allow voices to be heard, often unheard and medium gives opportunity for that, allows them to voice desires, sides, emotions, needs. |
| (6) A form of activism | Activism, a form of activism, etc. Inspires people to take action. |
| (7) Creates a deeper level of connection | Touches people more deeply, has a profound effect on people, touches their heart, reaches people at the heart level. |

What do you think about the voices portrayed in the theatre production? (e.g. Is there a good representation of all voices?)

- | | |
|---|--|
| Q12 (1) Character portrayal/voices well represented | |
| (2) Suggested a voice to include | Felt a voice was missing, wanted to know more about a key player in the crisis that was not included in SIE. |
| (3) Wished for more character elaboration | Wished that a character was covered more in-depth, more background, etc |

What voice would you be/ are you, if any? Why? (e.g. Are there any characters/voices that you relate to most?)

Q13 DISCARDED THIS QUESTION

Was there something that struck you/surprised you about *Salmon is Everything*?

- Q14 (1) Passion of the actors

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| (2) Emotional impact | Surprised by how emotional SIE was how emotional they felt watching it. How powerful it was. |
| (3) Unique style of theatre | Non-traditional, unique, different style, nature of performance, mentions dialogue emphasis, etc. |
| (4) Content/Information presented | |
| (5) Perspective of a character | Surprised by the views/thoughts of a certain character |
| (6) Gaining more in-depth knowledge | Surprised by amount of in-depth knowledge gained about a viewpoint, way of living, the issues, etc. |
| (7) People's reaction to SIE | Surprised by the discussions that followed either during the scheduled discussion period or discussions they had with friends, family or other people they talked to. |

Do you have a story/experience related to the play that you would like to share?

- Q15
- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Story regarding telling others about SIE. | |
| (2) Related issues to personal experiences | Connection to someone they know, connection with their line of work, connection to something they did/experienced. |
| (3) Made a connection between SIE and other informational sources | Stated the play reminded them of previous news or knowledge they received elsewhere about the Klamath issue. |
| (4) No answer | |

(5) Not advertised enough

Mentioned that people didn't know SIE was showing so it needed to be advertised more.

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ACTORS/CONTRIBUTORS

1. Could you explain your role in the creation of *Salmon is Everything*? (How were/are you involved with *Salmon is Everything*?)
2. Which performances were you involved in? Where and when?
3. Have you had any previous experience in community-based theatre?
4. What attracted you to this theatre production?

QUESTIONS FOR CREATORS

5. If applicable, how was the *Salmon is Everything* script created?
6. If applicable, what criteria did you use to determine what was included or not included in the script?
7. What was the initial goal of this play?
8. Did this initial goal change?
9. What is *Salmon is Everything* about?
10. What do you think about the production? What did you expect from the production?
11. In your opinion, what were the issues raised in the theatre production of *Salmon is Everything*?
12. After being involved in *Salmon is Everything* did it generate a greater dialogue between you and the people around you about the issues raised in the production? Why or why not?
13. Do you feel *Salmon is Everything* is important? Why or why not?
14. What do you know about the Klamath Salmon crisis? The fish kill?
15. What is your perspective on the KSC, such as what is the conflict about; what is the problem?

16. Has this perspective differed since you have seen/ been involved with the play? If so, how?
17. What role do you see this production playing in the overall Klamath Basin Conflict (Klamath Salmon Crisis?)
18. What do you think about the voices portrayed in the theatre production? Are they properly represented?
19. Outside of performing in the production, what voice would you be/ are you, if any? Why?
20. Was there something that struck you/surprised you about the *Salmon is Everything* production?
21. Do you have a story/experience related to the production that you would like to share?

APPENDIX D

ACTOR/CREATOR CODED THEMES AND MEANINGS

Each question had a set of common themes that emerged from my interviews. I numbered each theme and provided phrases or key words that describe the meaning of that theme.

Could you explain your role in the production of *Salmon is Everything?* (How were/are you involved with *Salmon is Everything?*)

Q1 These answers will vary. In general:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| (1) Involved as a cast member | |
| (2) Involved as a cultural advisor | |
| (3) A part of the creative stages | Involved in initial discussions, beginning stages of creating the script, part of the working group, etc. |
| (4) Director | |
| (5) Playwright | |

Which performances were you involved in? When and where?

- | | |
|--|---|
| Q2 (1) Involved from the beginning | Acted or was involved from the beginning when the play first started; from readings to stage performance. |
| (2) Involved during first performances | Involved from the time the eco-drama started in the stage performance period. |

Have you had any previous experience in community-based theatre?

- | | |
|--|--|
| Q3 (1) No previous experience | |
| (2) Has had a lot of experience in community theatre | |
| (3) Has some general acting experience | |

What attracted you to this theatre production?

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| Q4 | (1) Felt it carried an important message | Compelled to get involved because they wanted to help get the message out/across; doing their part to let people know what happened. Mentions how important the issue is. Drawn to play because of the topic; deep concern for Klamath River and its salmon |
| | (2) Intrigued by the use of theatre to express issues | Mentions that they were drawn to or intrigued by the notion of using art to express the issues, how art impacts people; felt it was an important tool. Interested in pieces that deal with issues around oppression; that deal with real issues. |

If applicable, how was the *Salmon is Everything* script created?

Q5 *This question was not themed*

If applicable, what criteria did you use to determine what was included or not included in the script?

Q6 *This question was not themed*

What was the initial goal of this play?

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| Q7 | (1) Inform others about the issue | Get the word out, get the information out help others understand what's going on. |
| | (2) Express often ignored views and perspectives | Express views and perspectives that are left out; show perspectives of some of the people who are at the core of this issue and are often ignored. |
| | (3) Create awareness | Create awareness around the issue; awareness of the river, salmon, people, our |

(4) Metaphor for how we treat the planet/environment

Metaphor for saving the planet, for destruction of (native) land and rivers, natural resources or elements. Reminds us that environments need to be healthy if all living things are going to survive or be sustainable; awaken people to all of the environmental issues of the day. Its about a lot of complicating and contentious issues that we need to deal with that have a serious impact on our environment.

(7) Promoting better relationships

Come together around a significant issue and set aside personal differences in order to deal with a life and death issue; promote healing of relationships between conflicting communities; promoting empathy, sympathy or understanding. Finding consensus around something and move on from there. Understand where the other side is coming from. It's about bringing to light all sides of the issue, bringing the issues into real life, bringing the community together and helping them realize that we all have a stake in it/are involved in it.

(8) The impact of the salmon kill

Mentions the effects of the salmon kill on the native community, on the health of the river, acknowledging the value of salmon, the relationship, the loss, of how things happened, what occurred. Giving salmon a voice.

(9) Injustice

Bad government policies, racism, policies that created a disaster, preferential treatment of European Americans, etc.

What do you think about the production? What did you expect from the production?

Q10 (1) Came open minded/had no expectations

(2) Didn't expect how powerful it was

In your opinion, what were the issues raised in the theatre production of *Salmon is Everything*?

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|--|
| Q11 | (1) Water allocation | Water allocation; uses of water; not enough water for all groups; what is fair use of water resources. |
| | (2) Resource dependence | People who are dependant on resources for their livelihood. People who depend on the river to live; describing how much they need those resources. |
| | (3) Threatened livelihoods | People's livelihoods are threatened, security is threatened, their quality of life is threatened |
| | (4) Understanding Each Other | Trying to understand one another in a real way; finding common ground; recognizing we are all in this together; See past our differences, short-sidedness; humanized everyone. |
| | (5) Building Relationships | Compassion, sharing, collaboration, brings a sense of hope that no matter how old we are, or how long we are in the situation that we can change our perspective. |
| | (6) Power struggles/ Relations | Who is making the decisions, how did they get to make those decisions, why don't they care; people decide they have power over others. The people in |

always in the forefront; could see healing occurring through dialogue

(3) Yes. Outside of the production.

Created a better dialogue with people outside the production process; people asking them what they are doing and why; inspired to go to lectures/discussion groups and talked more with people there; had more discussions with people about salmon/river issues.

Do you feel the *Salmon is Everything* theatre production is important? Why or why not? Or, why is this important?

Q13 (1) Its important to get the message out

Need to let people know what is happening to the river. Message/story needs to be brought forward. We need to get the word out about this issue.

(2) A vehicle to vent feelings/frustrations

SIE attempts to be a vehicle for releasing feelings, frustrations, anger. People can be heard/voices heard. Allows people to be heard in a different way

(3) Raises awareness, increases education & understanding

Lets other people who don't know anything about the fish kill understand what happened, when and why it happened and how it affected others. Flushes out the issues. Makes us look at how we interact with one another. Informs people. Allows them to hear and assess all points of view, leads to understanding the necessity

of coming up with solutions that are mutually respectable. Creates empathy towards others/views. Displays a whole way of life. Brings a lot of issues to the table-- cultural and subsistence issues, how some people live on a daily basis, government wrong-doing.

(4) It's important and a way to make a difference

Stresses that the issue is important, tragic events happening; realize how much of a difference you can make as an individual through this play. Art like this has the ability to create change, create dialogue, create community. Helped galvanize people to come together, rethink problems, work together, etc. It affects people in different ways & they see how the community (all different types of people) came together to create this piece.

(5) It's transformative/reaches beyond intellect

It's powerful, it engages our hearts, it connects us to someone else's human story, it touches people's heart and spirit.

What do you know about the Klamath Salmon Crisis (KSC)? What about the fish kill of 2002? [better yet, what did you know about these issues beforehand and how much have you learned from being involved in the play?]

Q14

(1) Knew about the salmon kill

(2) Witnessed the aftermath of the salmon kill

- (3) Knew general information about the KSC, but learned a lot more from being involved with SIE.
- (4) Did not know anything about the issue before being involved in the play.

What is your perspective on the KSC, such as what is the conflict about; what is the problem? [obviously it's a complex issue but what is your opinion about the general problem?]

Q15 (1) Felt knowledgeable enough to describe problem

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| (1a) Dams | Mentions dams, dam removal, blocking fish passage & spawning, the problems dams cause, the existence of the dams, people wanting hydropower. |
| (2b) Environmental Degradation | Mentions pollution, run-off, unhealthy watershed/river, logging affects, increased pathogens/toxic algae, resource extraction; increased toxicity of our environment. |
| (3c) Change in Water Conditions | Drought, low water levels, high water temperatures, water diversion. |
| (4d) Many Divergent Interests | Mentions the many parties involved; conflicting interests, etc. Conflict between groups/ways of living; dispute between one side and another; a clash of worldviews |
| (5e) Low salmon numbers | Salmon populations low, limited access to fish, fishing closures/limits, no more, salmon die-off. |
| (6f) Water rights | Who owns the water, water rights. |

- (7g) Limited resources
- One river resource; limited resources; not Enough; many trying to use same resource; how we live; how we use nature; not paying attention to ecological limits; wasting resources, energy, water; serious misuse of natural elements; exploitation rather than a symbiotic or reciprocal relationship with the environment.
- (8h) Reflects our impact on the earth
- Makes connections b/t sustainability problems all over the nation or worldwide. Our impact on the earth, web of life, mentions how SIE reflects what is happening in many other places. How things are connected to each other, etc Arrogance; mitigating damages rather than preventing them. Reflects human relationship to earth and how we need to change that relationship
- (9i) Corporate interests/Money
- Money interests; corporate owners; PacifiCorp interests, behavior; agricultural interests, behavior, need to make more money. Greed, American Dream.
- (10j) Power and control
- Power and control. The country's history of racism, abuse towards the land and other life, etc.
- (11k) Lack of understanding
- Mentions the conflict is about lack of understanding, their lack of wanting to see our worldview/way of living, they need to experience what we do to understand the situation/issues.
- (2) Could not describe problem/
did not feel knowledgeable
- Didn't know and couldn't describe problem/ had no answer.

(3) SIE informed knowledge

Didn't know much before SIE, learned about the KSC from it, or it inspired them to learn more.

Has the above perspective [the perspective about the crisis] differed since you have been involved in the production? If so, how? [Has any perspectives at all differed?]

Q16 (1) No new information or perspectives gained

SIE just solidified already held beliefs

(2) More educated or aware of another's perspective/culture

Learned more about another's perspective, not previously exposed to this perspective, learned how others use the river, salmon, land. Knows the culture better. Sometimes an opposite viewpoint. More sensitive to issues or what other side is going through.

(2a) Educated about native culture

(2b) Educated about farmer/rancher culture

(2c) Other

(3) Gained a more positive outlook

Gained a positive outlook for the future that didn't have before, feels more positive about the future of the crisis, people getting along; realized working together/resolving differences is possible and important.

(4) Gained general information

Gained information about fish kill, salmon crisis, Klamath crisis, informed about issue.

(5) Realized more human side of issue

Put a human face to issue, realized how much/strongly issue affects many people, learned of the emotional side of the issue.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (6) More aware of size or depth of issue | Now realizes how deep or far-reaching the problem is, mentions size and depth of problem, more aware that problem is bigger or more complex than they realized. |
| (7) Realized the impact of many voices | Realized how other stories/voices reached more people; the more stories, the more others can relate. First felt it should be all one voice and then realized the importance of the other voices. |
| (8) Made aware of or challenged world view | Realized they came from a hierarchical perspective, not communal one and realizes how hard it is to change that; experienced a sense of life loss about that. |

What role do you see this production playing in the overall Klamath Basin Conflict (Klamath Salmon Crisis?)

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| Q17 | (1) Educates | Helps people understand issues, educate(s). Informational; learn more. |
| | (2) Raises awareness | Makes people more aware of the issues & what is happening & who is affected. Alert, conscious, more concerned. Opening people's eyes. Enlighten. Thinking about things more; asking more questions. Creates awareness around similar US or global issues as well. Sheds light on a small area of the bigger picture, it's a magnifying glass. See all sides of the issue |

- | | |
|---|---|
| (3) Creates dialogue | Helps open dialogue, gets people talking to each other about the issues. |
| (4) Needs more distribution to be able to play a role | Needs to be taped or done live at more places/locations, taken to other areas for people to see it. |
| (5) Allows people's voices to be heard | A stage to allow voices to be heard, often unheard and medium gives opportunity for that, allows them to voice desires, sides, emotions, needs, to have feelings. |
| (6) A form of activism | Activism, a form of activism, etc. Inspires people to take action. |
| (7) Creates a deeper level of connection | Touches people more deeply, has a profound effect on people, touches their heart, reaches people at the heart level. |
| (8) Promotes healing process | SIE played a big role in the healing SIE promotes healing; helps heal some of the hurt, etc. |

What do you think about the voices portrayed in the theatre production? Are they properly represented?

- | | |
|---|--|
| Q18 (1) Character portrayal/voices well represented | |
| (2) Suggested a voice to include | Felt a voice was missing, wanted to know more about a key player in the crisis that was not included in SIE. |
| 3) Wished for more character elaboration | Wished that a character was covered more in-depth, more background, etc. |
| (4) I don't know | Doesn't know how to answer that question |

- (5) Didn't understand the need for certain voices/felt some voices were not needed

Outside of performing in the production, what voice would you be/ are you, if any? Why?

Q19

This question was not themed

Was there something that struck you/surprised you about *Salmon is Everything*?

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| Q20 | (1) Emotional impact | Surprised by the intensity of emotion they felt during SIE performances. They felt very emotional. Certain parts of SIE impacted them or made them cry. |
| | (2) Audience response | Surprised by how the audience related to SIE; how they were impacted; what they thought or talked about. |
| | (3) Growth of relationships | Surprised by how cast members bonded, became friends, within the cast grew closer to each other, worked together. |
| | (4) Acting potential | Surprised by their own ability or someone else's ability to act in a play. Mentioned overcoming difficulties or challenges that the SIE performances brought forth. Being an amateur actor. |
| | (5) Other | Surprised by something someone said; told a personal story; or simply had a vague answer. |
| | (6) Being aware of how real this is for the community/people. | There is truth in this story, people lived it experienced it; its not just a show. This is real, part of the history of local people, the people involved. |

Do you have a story/experience related to the production that you would like to share?

- Q21 (1) Gave a performance-related story Talked about something that happened at one of the performances. Interactions that occurred at the performances, after the performances, between the cast members, etc. Could be a funny, strange, interesting, exciting story.
- (2) Described how SIE affected them Talked about how SIE allowed them to vent frustrations or feelings. Or how SIE affected them in some other way. How they received more self confidence in acting/stage performance, etc. How it helped them understand things better, be more open-minded, etc
- (3) Presented an historical perspective Talked about the problems of the past and how they relate to the present and future problems. For example, describes the injustices that occurred toward Native Americans in the past and how this is perpetuated today. Compared SIE issues with other examples of things that happened in other locations, past years.
- (4) Had nothing else to add

APPENDIX E
SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

I feel very connected to the Klamath River.

Category Name	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strongly Agree	6	19.4	15	78.9	10	40.0	31	41.3
Agree	13	41.9	2	10.5	11	44.0	26	34.6
Undecided	7	22.6	1	5.3	3	12.0	11	14.7
Disagree	2	6.5	0	0.0	1	4.0	3	4.0
Strongly Disagree	3	9.7	1	5.3	0	0.0	4	5.3
TOTAL	31	100.0	19	100.0	25	100.0	75	100.0

Why do you STRONGLY AGREE?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dislikes destructive corporations, political decisions and/or dams	2	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	5.9
Lived along associated river	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9
Klamath is their favorite river	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.9
Live on, recreated in, or feels connection when go to/use river	1	16.7	3	15.8	1	11.1	5	14.7
Connection due to Native Heritage	1	16.7	7	36.8	2	22.2	10	29.4
Feel connected to all waterways	0	0.0	3	15.8	0	0.0	3	8.8
River an important resource for them (food, water, spirit or cultural needs)	0	0.0	4	21.1	3	33.3	7	20.6

								161
No Answer (N/A)	0	0.0	1	5.3	3	33.3	4	11.8
Due to their occupation (e.g. fisheries, fisherman, restoration, etc.)	0	0.0	1	5.3	0	0.0	1	2.9
TOTAL	6	100.0	19	100.0	9	100.0	34	100.0

Why do you AGREE?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Rivers are an important resource for them (food, water, spiritual, or cultural needs)	4	25.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	6	20.0
They love salmon/Klamath River	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	2	6.7
River is a valuable part of the ecosystem; connects everything	6	37.5	0	0.0	4	33.3	10	33.3
Live on, recreated in, or feels connection when go to/use river	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	3.3
Feel connected to all waterways	1	6.25	0	0.0	1	8.3	2	6.7
No Answer (N/A)	1	6.25	1	50.0	2	16.7	4	13.3
Due to their occupation (e.g. fisheries, fisherman, restoration, etc.)	1	6.25	1	50.0	0	0.0	2	6.7
Connection due to Native Heritage	2	12.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.7
Lived along associated river	1	6.25	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3
TOTAL	16	100.0	2	100.0	12	100.0	30	100.0

Why are you UNDECIDED?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Has never been to the Klamath River	2	28.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	18.2
Knows very little about the Klamath River	1	14.28	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1
Feels connected to a river, just not the Klamath	2	28.6	1	100.0	1	33.3	4	36.4
No Answer (N/A)	2	28.6	0	0.0	1	33.3	3	27.3
Just moved to the area	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	9.1
TOTAL	7	100.0	1	100.0	3	100.0	11	100.0

Why do you DISAGREE?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Answer (N/A)	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
New to the area and river is unfamiliar	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
Did not grow up near the Klamath River	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
Knows very little about the Klamath River	0	0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	25.0
TOTAL	3	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	4	100.0

Why do you STRONGLY DISAGREE?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Has never been to the Klamath before	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
Knows very little about the Klamath River	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
TOTAL	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	2	100.0

Was There Any Change in a Certain Thought, Attitude, or Perception You Had Before Watching *Salmon is Everything*?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	9	28.12	3	17.6	2	7.7	14	18.7
Yes	3	9.4	2	11.8	3	11.5	8	10.7
Greatly Affected	9	28.12	3	17.6	8	30.8	20	26.7
Other	11	34.4	9	52.9	13	50.0	33	44.0
TOTAL	32	100.0	17	100.0	26	100.0	75	100.0

CATEGORY: NO

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	3	33.3	2	66.6	2	100	7	50.0
Awareness present but deepened understanding/emotions	6	66.6	1	33.33	0	0.0	7	50.0
TOTAL	9	100.0	3	100.0	2	100.0	14	100.0

CATEGORY: YES

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Understands another's perspective much better than before	2	66.7	2	100.0	2	66.7	6	75.0
Changed opinion about possible resolution or cooperation	1	33.3	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	25.0
TOTAL	3	100.0	2	100.0	3	100.0	8	100.0

CATEGORY: GREATLY AFFECTED

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Educated by the play	4	44.4	1	33.3	4	50.0	9	45.0
Inspired to be part of the solution	2	22.2	1	33.3	1	12.5	4	20.0
Made issue more real and personal to them	2	22.2	0	0.0	1	12.5	3	15.0
Was moved by the play	1	11.1	1	33.3	2	25.0	4	20.0
TOTAL	9	100.0	3	100.0	8	100.0	20	100.0

CATAGORY: OTHER

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Expectation/Opinion	4	36.4	4	44.4	5	38.5	13	39.4
No Answer	7	63.6	5	55.6	8	61.5	20	60.6
TOTAL	11	100.0	9	100.0	13	100.0	33	100.0

What is the Overall Message of the Play?

Theme	Arcata		Hoopa		Klamath		All Areas	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Need to preserve/conserv the balance of nature/env.	4	12.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	5.5
To educate others about this issue	4	12.1	1	5.6	0	0.0	5	6.8
To inspire change	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Farmers needs have negative impact on salmon	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Communication can facilitate change	1	3.0	0	0.0	2	9.1	3	4.1
Dams have a negative impact on salmon	1	3.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	2.7
<i>Salmon is Everything</i>	3	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.1
Understand everyone's perspective	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Klamath River/salmon can be saved if we all work together	3	9.1	3	16.7	4	18.2	10	13.7
Tragic/unjust event that needs urgent attention or lives/env. will be lost	2	6.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.7
Salmon are valuable; Save/protect the salmon	2	6.1	4	22.2	0	0.0	6	8.2
We are all connected	1	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Need to be more respons- ible stewards of our water/ env.because of its value to people's lives.	2	6.1	0	0.0	3	13.6	5	6.8

								166
No Answer	3	9.1	5	27.8	9	40.9	17	23.3
Expectation/Opinion	4	12.1	4	22.2	4	18.2	12	16.4
TOTAL	33	100.0	18	100.0	22	100.0	73	100.0