

OUTDOOR ETHICS -- THEIR CONSTRUCTION AND USE

Lynn A. Greenwalt

The subject of ethics and behavior based upon ethical principles has been studied and commented upon for centuries. The interest in what drives a person to behave as he does --that characteristic that in many ways separates the human species from all the other animals-- has been a pervasive one. Philosophers have always been intrigued by human behavior that is above the level of instinct: Man's ethical performance.

These characteristics and our interest in them are accentuated when we see the results of behavior that is clearly apart from the instinctive, as has been driven home to us recently by the actions of the sixth survivor of the airplane crash in Washington, D. C. As you recall, five men and women survived that tragedy, at least in part because a sixth passenger passed along to them the lifelines that were offered by rescuers. When at last the rescue crews could return for that man, he was gone. His behavior was in sharp contrast to the instinct for self-preservation that is so strong in all of us. He behaved in accordance with an ethical standard that caused him to do a thing that most of us might not have done in his place. It's not hard to understand why ethics and the human behavior based on ethics have fascinated people over the centuries.

I don't propose to discuss ethics in a philosophical way; I intend to be a little more down to earth. Even so, I think it is appropriate to offer two or three definitions, since it is important to have a common understanding as we proceed. The sponsors of this workshop have offered the standard and correct definition for ethic: a principle of right or good conduct, or a body of such principles. To apply this standard of ethics, to be ethical, is defined as: acting in accordance with the accepted principles of right and wrong governing the conduct of a group. The word ethics --with an 's'-- has several definitions, but two are useful to us. One is: the rules or standards governing the conduct of the members of a profession. Another is especially fitting, I think: the moral quality of a course of action; fitness; propriety.

So much for definition. We're interested in outdoor ethics, that body of principles that guides those who engage in outdoor activities. One could consider our concern simply as being about outdoor recreation, but I think we cannot divide outdoor recreation activities from other kinds of outdoor activities, since they can affect recreation, just as recreation can affect other kinds of outdoor activities. For reasons you will comprehend shortly, I prefer to relate outdoor ethics to the more comprehensive idea of ethics applied to the use of natural resources, which, as we all have noted, are mostly out-of-doors.

It is appropriate, I believe, that we explore briefly the historical development of outdoor ethics. They have changed dramatically in the last half-century and an understanding of that change is important if we are to

Remarks at Outdoor Ethics Workshop sponsored by the Idaho Chapter of The Wildlife Society, January 28, 1982, at the Boise Interagency Fire Center, Boise, Idaho.

cope with the challenges of ethics that are to be applied today and into the future.

In the years before the Second World War, outdoor activities were taken pretty much for granted in this country. We were still essentially rural in nature and outlook. The tradition of deriving a living from nature --hunting and fishing and trapping; using nature's largesse pretty much as we wanted-- was still the order of the day. We were subduing nature with irrigation projects, awesome power dams and the extensive use of forests and grasslands. We were getting only a glimpse of the fact that the growth of this use is limited and that Mankind cannot work against nature's grain without problems. The great drought of the 1930's drove that home, but we were still blissfully ignorant of the problems we would encounter as industrial development flowered and new and more dramatic technological processes emerged. We knew nothing of acid rain, or chemical contaminants; we had only begun to realize that Man's intervention in natural processes could have terrible long-term consequences. In short, it was a period of transition; a wrenching time when we began, slowly, to understand that things could not always be as they had been. We still took things for granted, but perhaps with a growing comprehension that we could not always do so.

In the decade of the 1950's there began to emerge some clues about what we would face in the future. Even in the world of outdoor recreation we began to find occasional conflicts, small sparks struck as the kinds of things an improved economy and increased leisure time enabled us to do began to clash with one another. We learned that water-skiers and fishermen do not enjoy each other's company, sometimes. We discovered that economic exploitation could jeopardize wild places and wild things. Even so, we tended to leave the resolution of these problems to others --generally the government. We still believed that government knew best and even if it didn't there was little anyone could do about it. Or, more likely, most of us didn't care all that much.

Problems mounted in the next several years. Off-road vehicles became popular and showed signs of offending the growing number of hikers and others who liked their outdoor experiences free from noise and dust and interruption. Earth Day sparked a new view of the environment --and we changed ecology from a term describing an esoteric science to one that defined the world around us. We became concerned about what was going on around us, and perhaps a little apprehensive, too. At the very least we discovered that the out-of-doors never was a simple thing, and that in fact it is a fragile aggregation of complex and intensively active things. Outdoor recreation grew by leaps and bounds. We all wanted a part of it, and generally wanted it on our own terms.

In the 1970's perhaps the most dramatic kinds of changes occurred. There were still conflicts between activities: speedboaters and fishermen still were not in fervent embrace; snowmobilers and snowshoes were not strong friends. It was during this time that a more fundamental kind of conflict began to emerge: a conflict of ethics; a grating of principles; a growing disharmony of ideals.

This was a decade during which people learned that their government --at whatever level-- is not always right. They learned that public opinion makes a difference, that organized effort can use the tools of democracy to make change. It was a time when some folks decided that snowmobiles were in conflict with the environment; that hunting might be morally offensive; that the science of wildlife management might be being prostituted in favor of consumption by a few who capitalized upon the resources that belong to everyone. It was a time when there emerged many examples of conflicts in ethical views.

It was also a time when strong national laws favoring the environment were passed. That was the era when the National Environmental Policy Act came into its own; when the Endangered Species Act literally became a household word; when the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act began to grow teeth and claws. It was also a time when these laws made provision for citizens to get into the act in a big way. Society was being regulated about many activities and people discovered that they could have an effective voice in the way those regulations were developed and enforced. They learned that a cause, a lawyer and a filing fee are all that are needed to have a day in court.

Combined with this was the heady conviction that the Nation had a lot of money. We believed we were rich --and we were-- and when we have few worries about money, or jobs or the immediate future, we Americans have a strong urge to embrace causes. Many of us looked to the environment as a cause. We cared about wildlife, we were concerned about wilderness and its protection, we got sassy with industry and other developers and exploiters, and we made sure that our legislators knew what we wanted and that their jobs and futures might well depend upon their cooperative performance. We spawned ethical conflicts on every hand. Beach users fought with beach-buggy devotees; hunters skirmished with animal-welfare groups; clear-cut forest management felt the wrath of the environmentally concerned --and discovered that among the latter were other foresters. Wildlife managers found themselves in court with anti-managers who found it ethically unacceptable to manage lands in ways that might be damaging to some kinds of "non-game" wildlife.

Ethical standards were crystallizing all over the place. The problem has been that ethical standards on the one hand conflicted with standards developed on another front. People didn't --and still don't-- agree about what is "the proper moral quality of a course of action." Amid this flurry of conflicting ideals, and perhaps because of it, the public agencies responsible for most of the out-of-doors in this country enjoyed unprecedented opportunities. They had more money and more people than ever before, even though it was not enough to do the job that all the people wanted. Private land was purchased in unheard of quantities to add to national parks and refuges, county and city and state forests and recreation areas; state-sized blocks of public land were set aside for special environmental purposes in Alaska --one of the most far-sighted and controversial conservation actions in the Nation's history. It was a heady, exciting time, and we are still enjoying the momentum of that period.

Times are changing, though. It's clear to most of us that the economy

is in trouble; people are out of work, the level of production in the country is declining, money is worth less and it costs more to rent, and there has been an enforced and perhaps overdue retrenchment in the role of government in our lives. People are beginning to have to worry about themselves and their families again; they lack the resources to permit the luxury of embracing causes, and their interest in "out of sight, out of mind" concerns --like natural resources-- is sure to decline accordingly.

Our collective ethical standards are shifting. Our government seems to want to retreat to the good old days --whatever they were-- and to improve our lot by letting go of the strings. I detect a tendency not to contemplate the consequences of those actions, especially for the more distant future.

There is an evident uncertainty among conservation organizations about what to do next; there is quiet on that front. There seems to be equal uncertainty on the part of the Administration --surely so when environmental matters are concerned. There has been a lot of rhetoric and little action; what action there has been reflects little recognition of the long-term impacts of those actions. Our ethical convictions are shifting, it seems, and it is not clear to me where or when they will once again reach some kind of steady state.

Observing the situation for a bit of distance, I find an eerie quiet, as in the eye of a storm, broken only by the soft tinkling as an agency is partially dismantled, or the creak as the appropriations valves are closed a turn or two, or the soft shuffling as one or another conservation organization assembles its petitions or mass mailings.

It has been observed that change is the only thing that will remain unchanged. That's true enough, because now we are confronting another set of changes and they are reflected in our ethical behavior. We simply change the rules to accomodate the situation; all very normal and to be expected. But worth watching --and watching out for.

I have promised not to engage in too much philosophical discussion. I must confess that I cannot keep that promise in its entirety. I am not an expert on the detailed ethical problems of outdoor recreation. I have been an often bruised and battered participant in the results of some of those problems, but it is clear to me that one who has survived a building collapse is not made a skilled architect as a result. I would like to make some observations about the dilemma of ethics and the out-of-doors in spite of that fundamental defect, and to offer some suggestions about what to do with that problem.

I see the problem of ethics and the development of ethical standards as two-dimensional. On one dimension is what I think should be seen as the fundamental ethical dilemma, one which is clear to me, but which does not always get much thought as we struggle with the definition of our own set of ethics.

That level is a basic one. It is the level of over-all consideration.

How will we regard some basic questions so that when we confront detailed questions we can address and overcome them? Perhaps the best way for me to describe this is to pose some of those questions I think must be answered before a set of solid, useful, effective ethical standards can be drawn.

- What are the standards we are going to use to evaluate the long-term uses of land?
- How should wildlife and other living natural resources be regarded as public policy is made?
- How are we to view the worth of natural resources and natural processes in the long term?
- How should we resolve the conflicts inherent in the pursuit of profit (that is, how will we view profit in light of some other important level of human well-being)?
- How are we going to reconcile the pressures of national self-interest with the harsh truth that the world is shrinking and that we cannot easily avoid the implications of that truth?

There is a host of additional questions in the same vein that we could ask ourselves, but these suffice to give you the idea of what I mean by "basic" concerns. That they seem to have little to do with, say, fishing for trout, or running whitewater in a canoe, does not diminish their importance. They do have a relevance, and one that I think it is important to emphasize. As one example, look again at the question about profit. In all my years of dealing with natural resource management, I have noted that we tend to avoid that question, putting it aside where it cannot be overheard, like putting the dog --and perhaps some of the children-- in the garage when company comes. Yet profit is the fuel that has driven the American political machine since the Nation was founded. There's nothing wrong with that; something goes wrong, though, when we do not see it as a factor in all of the ethical considerations we entertain. We simply have to recognize that when profit is faced off against some other consideration, we are inclined to give the profit motive the edge. Again, there's nothing wrong with this, either --so long as we clearly understand the trade-off that may be involved. All of us have observed the quick disengagement phenomenon: "Oh, I'm in favor of wilderness --some of my best friends like wilderness-- but I have to make a living." This most often manifests itself in the familiar trade-off of the long-term value in favor of the short-term gain. We do it every day and probably always will. I ask only that we learn to assure ourselves that we know what the worth of the one is when weighed against the other. We must learn to ask the right questions about the comparative values, too. And, most important of all, we must learn to look at the consequences of our actions before we take them.

So much for the level of fundamentals in the ethical question. Now let's turn to the lesser or closer-to-home ethical problems about which so much of the discussion at this workshop will center. These are derived from those I

have outlined earlier, but we tend to be overwhelmed by the immediacy of these second-level questions. They are common, they are numerous, they are always accompanied by pressures of time --and they almost always overwhelm our inclination to look at them in light of the more basic questions. After all, we can debate at leisure about the ethical question^{of} where our fellow-creatures fit in the construction of national policy, but the problem of coyotes and sheep is here, now, immediate.

These are the problems that make up the library of war-stories all of us know so well: the conflict between beach hikers and mechanized surf-fishermen at Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia; powerboats and waterfowl production at Ruby Lake in Nevada; ORV's and the California desert; motors as opposed to paddles in river-rafting in the Grand Canyon; anti-trapping legislation before Congress or in the Ohio legislature --the list is long and complicated. It probably will grow --soon.

Those of you here no doubt represent many kinds of interests, and many points of view. Those points of view are dominant for you, as they should be. You're interested in this elusive idea of "outdoor ethics" and the application to the problems that confront you. Let me offer some suggestions about how you might approach the construction of ethical standards that will stand the tests you give them and which will at the same time, perhaps, answer some of the fundamental questions I have surfaced for you.

First of all, obviously, think about the basic questions; they are fundamental to the way you will develop the detailed standards that will guide you. Perhaps you need not frame an answer in so many words, but the mere work (and it is that, I guarantee you) of thinking about the basics will help you clear the air about the less formidable ideas. Most of all, it will drive home to you the idea that your rules or standards for governing the conduct of the members of your organization must include some comprehension of the consequences of employing those standards of conduct --or, perhaps more dramatically, in NOT employing them.

I cannot overemphasize this business of understanding the consequences of your actions. All of us here are professional of some kind or another, I think. A professional is a person who derives the greater part of his livelihood from the pursuit of some special skill, as you know. Some years ago I was impressed by someone who added to that the idea that the professional is one who is always aware of the probable consequences of his actions. That's one reason why there are few amateur brain-surgeons or bomb-disposal experts. Whatever you do, whatever kinds of standards of performance or behavior you develop, always look at them in terms of the probable consequences they imply.

Once you've established some ethical standards, there is the matter of applying them. The performance of the group or body is, after all, the test of all that has gone before. I have some advice on that score, too.

First of all, I think outdoor user groups need to work hard to improve

their images. Most of them become their own worst enemies, largely because they are not effectively organized to execute a follow-through. User groups are prompt to respond to issues and problems that affect them, but do not maintain that coherence well enough to offset the problems that occasionally beset them. They too often pay a great price for the impact of the 1% or so of their population that leave a bleak record behind. Hunters who trespass or set the woods on fire; ORV users who don't stay on the trails; trappers who do not run their lines regularly; hikers who vandalize facilities --all of these are in the minority and leave the whole user group to be categorized in their image.

These events frequently leave whole groups of people with distorted images of the user groups, often in surprising ways. Not long ago I read a marvelous book by a gifted and eloquent scientist, Carl Sagan. In this, one of his earlier works, The Dragons of Eden, Sagan talks about the evolution of the human brain and the way each of us is the product of accumulated changes --and presumably, improvements-- in the brain and our use of it. At one point he offers the following footnote to a passage describing evidence that wild marijuana may have been available to early man. I quote in part from that footnote: ". . . It would be wryly interesting if in human history the cultivation of marijuana lead generally to the invention of agriculture, and thereby to civilization. (The marijuana-intoxicated Pygmy, poised patiently for an hour with his fishing spear aloft, is earnestly burlesqued by the beer-sodden rifleman, protectively camouflaged in red plaid, who, stumbling through nearby woods, terrorizes American suburbs each Thanksgiving.)" It's clear that somewhere, somehow, a hunter or hunters offended Carl Sagan's sense of what is ethical, leaving him with an image used so dramatically in making an almost gratuitous point. I'm sorry that happened; Carl Sagan deserves to have a better image of this kind of outdoor user than he seems to have developed. One can only imagine what might have happened to establish such an image in that gifted mind.

One of the more obvious solutions to this kind of problem is for user groups to be more effective in policing their own membership. Make unethical behavior unacceptable. Even those wild and wooly individualists who may not be members of any organization cannot stand being set apart as the exception to proper behavior, and may well be influenced by an improved ethic, practiced diligently.

A more difficult approach, perhaps, is for the user groups to be sensitive to conflicts --especially the developing ones. Remember the probable consequences of your actions and take the initiative in resolving them. If beach-buggy users could have sensed the kinds of conflicts their interests would develop and then set out to deal with those whose standards might have been offended before there were conflicts in fact and on the beach, then emotional and often thoughtless confrontations, litigation, and endless heartache might have been avoided. Not altogether, perhaps, but the wrenching and essentially non-productive collision of ethical views surely would have been lessened.

Beyond the arena of being sensitive about possible conflict, it would be well for user groups to identify those issues about which otherwise varying groups can agree. Learn to find those common problems toward which

everyone can turn their efforts, thus improving the image of the user group and having a greater collective impact on the problem itself. Strange as it may seem, it is not impossible to envision a sportsmen's group finding a common bond with an animal welfare organization in behalf of an endangered species, say, or a budget crisis affecting the state game department. In addition to improving the image of the user group, such an advance would serve to demonstrate to everyone a fact that could be extraordinarily constructive: that the aims of even such disparate groups as I have described are likely to be virtually coincidental (protecting wildlife and its habitat, for example) and that the disagreements most often involve which road to take to get there. In short, consider joining forces with the opposition --or those you think are in opposition-- when you can do so in mutually supportive ways. You might be surprised at the outcome.

Another important facet of an ethical action program, I think, is to be aware of issues that may seem to be outside of your immediate interest, but which are relevant to your fundamental concerns. Local land-use decisions should be of interest to you for many reasons; national issues like the Clean Air Act should concern every group; funding for environmental management organizations at every level of government must surely pique your curiosity and concern. Become involved in these issues, since minor conflicts of the kind that can bedevil you often arise out of these often distant and seemingly unrelated deliberations. You know that the processes of nature are often entwined in a complex way; so, too, are the processes of politics, especially those that may affect the natural world.

Don't be reticent about expressing your opinions on issues or about taking part in the decisions. It might surprise you to know that the bureaucrats who must make the decisions want participation; they want to know how people feel about the issues and they are happiest when a large number of people express an interest. At the very least that shows that folks are aware and are willing to make their views known.

I remember once going to a lot of effort to seek public reaction to a Task Force report on policies governing the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System. The Refuge System is a sizeable one and I entertained the hope that we would be deluged with reactions from the people for whom the System was established and is maintained. We did get about 2,000 responses --which represented about 1/2 of one percent of the people who visit refuges each year. About 1,000 of those replies were in the form of a pre-printed card produced by an active and aggressive organization with a single-minded membership. I was distressed at the result and would have been much more comfortable with the decisions we reached had there been a greater body of public expression on the subject. Be alert to the issues and don't be at all hesitant to get involved in them.

Be evangelists. Carry your group's message to the uninformed and the uncommitted. Don't try to convert outright opponents. They are already set in their views and you simply waste your time. Don't succumb to the temptation simply to talk to the already committed --they do make an agreeable audience and it is comforting to hear them support you, but they, too,

already have made up their minds. The trick is to carry your views to those who have not yet made up their minds, those who are uncertain, and to that great mass of people who simply don't know about the issues. The uncommitted, whether they aren't informed, or know about an issue and don't care, are the unmined lode that can be made to pay great dividends. Have a convincing story, express it well, and you will sway them. People can be made to understand and agree, if you work at it. Don't be reluctant to sell your story, even if you feel the audience might be inclined in another direction. Don't be dismayed --somebody suggested to me the other day that an environmentalist is a political conservative who has just discovered his well has been polluted.

All of this advice presupposes that you know your own position, that you have thought it through and understand it well enough so that your arguments are impeccable, your logic is unassailable, and your ability to cope with questions is invulnerable. Take me seriously on this point -- it is often the undoing of efforts of this kind when proponents of an argument discover that they have not done their homework well and are trying to sell a sick horse.

Framing an ethic and living up to it is not as easy as it sounds. It requires a personal conviction and an adherence to that conviction. Your personal ethics are basic; if you cannot live with them, then you can hardly be expected to discipline yourself to support and advance the ethical standards of the group. Your outdoor ethics may be simple: "I will not fish for trout with cheese," or, "I will maintain a quiet-running snowmobile," are simple and may be easy to live by. Think of some others, with greater implication in terms of consequence, and you'll find them a little more difficult to stick with. Try "I will not condone arbitrary or knee-jerk reflex opposition to somebody else's ideas," or, "I will draw no conclusion without proper consideration of the evidence."

Once you've reached this point in the process of developing your set of ethics, you must remember one more thing. Ethical decisions, to be good ones, must be made against a background of good information. A body of ethics is worthless unless it is applied only after having digested information about the issue in question. The use of information is a difficult business sometimes. You've probably learned that things are almost never as simple as they seem, or as they may have been described to you. There are often more than two sides to any given issue. Recognize, too, that for some people there is never enough information and decisions are therefore never made. Be willing to reach a conclusion based on the best information at hand; don't be deterred simply because you do not have enough information to make you comfortable. This problem is particularly acute when natural resource questions are at issue, as we have all observed.

Ethical conduct --by its very nature-- demands that you consider the points of view of others. Even as you step into the other fellow's shoes, recognize that he may not be doing the same thing for you. If you are to be true to your ethical standard, you will accept this possibility. Do not let yourself revert to it in return. Those who are inclined to say,

"Hunters! They're all depraved," are not likely to be very objective on the subject, but that should not drive your objectivity into the background.

The same general principles apply in developing and using ethics for a group. The "sportsman's creed" or "the waterskiers pledge" may be the body of principles by which the organization functions. Again, know what the ethic means, and have a good idea of the probable consequences of adopting such a principle. Know how it translates into action or reaction; recognize that these may have far-reaching implications, occasionally of the most disturbing kind. For example, if there is a conflict between sport fishing and commercial fishing --where the same fish are being taken-- and the run of fish is in jeopardy, are you prepared to live up to an ethical standard that give pre-eminence to the preservation of the run? Are you prepared to go the whole way, if necessary? Will you give up sport fishing on that run in order to assure its future, even though the commercial fishermen may not? Pretty heavy stuff, but it may be something you will confront one day if you are to stick with your ethical standards.

In closing, let me offer some final observations. It is clear to me that outdoor behavior is often not based on well-founded ethical standards. I suggest that this well-meaning but sometimes flawed approach is the source of much unnecessary conflict. I think most of you can call to mind the kinds of conflicts to which I refer. For example, the problems caused by people who oppose wildlife management because they do not understand it. If our ethical standards had been buttressed with a greater effort to explain what we professional wildlife managers are about, then there might not have arisen the anti-management fervor of recent years. As another example, we have never quite bridged the gap between the idea of the wildlife manager's concern for animal populations and the animal welfare supporter's worry about the individual animal. Both are logical and commendable points of view and need not be in conflict, but somehow we manage to permit this ^{mis}understanding to become the centerpiece of much non-productive conflict between the groups.

In spite of our commitment to our ethical standards, we find ourselves plunged into conflicts that are divisive; we seek arbitrary solutions to problems because we are not willing to examine the issues thoroughly. We fight among ourselves and the power of our organizations is diffused and diminished. The controversy about steel shot is a sad and woebegone example of that kind of problem.

We can never achieve perfection in the process of developing and exercising our ethics, but we can strive to do so, and we must, simply because so very much is at stake.

Maybe what we need most of all is some kind of universal ethic --one that can be embraced by everyone, including the millions who are uninformed or uncommitted. Such an ethic could be the Grand Master of them all, from which we could derive the lesser, but still important, codes that guide our special interests. Perhaps it is something akin to Aldo Leopold's "land

ethic" of which he wrote so persuasively and eloquently forty years ago. A sweeping, broadly accepted idea, based on understanding, is desperately needed, along with informed and committed people to spread its gospel. Such an ethic would be somewhat different from those with which we are familiar, I think, because it would reach beyond present concerns to future ones; because it might require a sacrifice of present profits or self-interests to assure something for the future; and most distinctive of all, because behavior based on such an ethic would be of the most noble sort, since its beneficiaries are others whom we may never meet or know.

Maybe those of us who care about the out-of-doors are the proper developers of such an ethic, because we have unique insights into the value of these resources, now and for tomorrow. We know what's at stake as no one else does; let's act before it's too late.

Rockville, Maryland
January 23, 1982

OUTDOOR ETHICS WORK GROUP TASKS

Please examine each task in terms of what is "ethically [traditional, ecological, and sociological implications] and aesthetically right" - Sand County Almanac, Leopold.

OE Task 1 - Chrysler 450 Club

Your powerboat club just received a copy of a letter that was sent to the Governor, County Board, police, newspapers, fish and game, etc. about banning all power boats from the reservoir your club uses for outings. A bass fishing association was upset by your Club's exercises over the Memorial Day weekend; they want your activity stopped. If your Club wants to continue to use the lake, what can be done?

Group Responce: - Zone the lake; physically if large enough, in time frames if small. May also put zoning on specific times of the day, i.e. Fishing: Dawn - 9 am, Power boating: 9 am-noon, etc. The task group said they needed more feedback about what exactly the club did to offend the other users.

OE Task 2 - Lizard River Waterfowlers

The Board of Directors of an organization of elite and wealthy waterfowl hunters have maintained an extensive marsh area for waterfowl production fishing, trapping, and hunting for 75 years. Fall hunting is more an annual ceremony than bragging about numbers of ducks harvested. A museum of hand-carved decoys, ancient gear, and old water craft is maintained by your membership. The local animal lover's association requests a visit to the waterfowl area during a hunt. The membership says no way. What will the Director's do?

Group Responce: - Be prepared by handling it up front, rather than wait. Explain the entire waterfowl - marsh program to the animal lovers at first. Get their "feelings" better understood. Steel vs lead shot did not come up. The task group thought trapping would most offend the association people. They expressed an exposure of resource benefits to the animal lovers would help the waterfowl club.

OE Task 3 - Happy Rock Outing Group

During a wilderness backpacking trip, some outspoken members of your group had heated debate with the traditional pack trip outfitter of the area about his horses and the damage to the vegetation, trails, and pristine solitude and odor of a subalpine meadow/lake area. After this encounter, the very respected, but outraged, outfitter reported your group for littering and indecent exposure. As your group returned to base camp, a contingent of rangers surrounded the group. If all was true, how does the discussion inform the public land manager what your group considers as the rights of others?

Group Responce: - Rights of other users not expressed in the field. Neither group had more or less right to do their thing. Enforcement or rules would not need to be increased, understanding of the rights of others would. The task group decided the land manager had to resolve the problem though. Expectations or personal beliefs of outdoor conduct were discussed. What is the tolerance level of others afield? The group did not discuss private use versus the commerical use of the outfitter. Both groups should be told to grow up.

OE Task 4 - The Grouse Hunters

An annual event for three mature couples since 1952 has been a quality grouse hunt up on Wolverine Gulch. This year you discover, somewhat amazed, that several new roads have been pioneered into the area. To your disgust, you find more active woodcutters than blue grouse. One of the party notes the large snags that used to host woodpeckers and squirrels are now in many pieces on the forest floor. A logging truck runs over one of the group's bird dogs while you were breaking camp. When you folks got back to civilization, what was your message and to whom did you give it?

Group Responce: - Go straight to land manager and complain, question the abrupt physical changes made. Also complain to the F&G (Fish and Game Department) about grouse and den (cavity) habitat losses. Find the truck driver and demand he pay for new hunting dog. Go to political representative, media, and finally other "pressure" groups to voice outrage. Or, task group admitted they could have reviewed forest plans before they were carried out. They did talk about rebuilding the habitat in the area in lieu of finding a new place to hunt grouse (it may have been some other group's old place).

OE Task 5 - Salmon Fact Finding Commission

Your group has been formed by a Congressional Committee to report on salmon sport fishing in the Northwest. After a briefing on hydropower economics and fish migration, the group is taken to a low-head power site adjacent to the King Salmon Hatchery. Members of the group see lots of the trash and hear outrageous language during arguments between boat and bank fishermen. They also notice several "foul-hooked" fish not returned to the water. The one that was returned to the water was held up by the gills for 3 minutes of picture taking. When the group was about to leave, someone spotted a young girl futilely trying to rid a seagull of a bunch of fishing line it was tangled up in. What does the group report back on "sport" salmon fishing after seeing such things first-hand?

Group Responce: - It looked hopeless at first. Need a larger sample, was the activity representative of all salmon fishing? Who owned or maintained the fishing area? Put up trash receptacles, more signs, etc. Better enforcement, possibly local volunteers. Possible to segregate users. May need new "use" restrictions. Better education of fishermen.

OE Task 6 - Blanco Peaks Multiple-Use Committee

Your group has been asked by the Governor to draft a multiple use plan for the Blanco Peaks Area, to include mining, timber harvest, and various recreational pursuits. A Tierra Club representative, also a committee member, is denied his right to speak out because of his preservation feelings. He vents his anger and frustration to the Governor and State Legislature. The Committee comes under fire from all fronts. Can your group pick up the pieces and finish the plan?

Group Responce: - The task group thought this scenario was utterly unrealistic. The committee was surely doomed unless they would allow all viewpoints.

OE Task 7 - Woolpullers X-C Skier Team

During a trail blazing effort by your group in the summer, you encounter 20,000 sheep on the mountain you ski on during the winter. Some members voice concern; others argue that the sheep improve skiing conditions by removing or reducing forage. Some even promote sheep because of the use of wool clothing to keep warm during outings. A rancher and his herdsman approach your group. They want to know what the group is doing and why all the fuss - should it concern them. How does your group relate to the sheep rancher's questions?

Group Responce: - Better try to understand rancher outright. Help educate him about your activity, why are you clearing trail, what do you do in the winter, etc. Rancher may think your group is a bunch of environmental extremists - that love coyotes and don't want to lift the ban on 1080's use of Federal lands. Aesthetics are important. Did the skier team have a permit to be clearing trails?

OE Task 8 - Flower Foto Function

Your group is busily taking pictures of flowers in an alpine meadow. They are exercising extreme care, not to damage, any of the meadow's fragile vegetation. A group of 20 backpackers starts marching single file through the meadow. They rid their packs about midway and start frolicking in the meadow. Some pick bouquets of flowers; others play tag or frizbee. Your group is outraged! How can you relate to them what they should be doing to correct their future behavior without getting into a fistfight?

Group Responce: - Extreme care (tact) to approach other group. Both groups [again] have the right to be there. There could be nude frolicking. Split up and go one on one to talk with backpackers. Use angle on how rare plants are up in the high meadows. Scare them with a bad bear story. Other group does have right to frolick-but in another meadow without the forms of vegetation the foto people think are important.

OE Task 9 - We-Go-Far Snowmobilers Club

Your club just received a letter from Ranger Richard expressing serious concern with your sport in general and the welfare of wintering big game animals. Past observations by others have reported that your club members have harassed deer and elk, not been using established trails, shooting coyotes from your snowmobiles. Your club members deny these accusations; yet, a sanction on all motorized vehicle use in your favorite snow motoring area is posted by the Federal landowner. How will your club membership change their ways to re-establish your particular use after being banished?

Group Responce: - Find out ranger's source and level of understanding. Check authority to complete a closure. If this club doesn't have, they will get a code of ethics published, use peer pressure to clean up acts, and use others with more field experience. Better public relations - media and general public users. What does the term harassment mean? Need clarity on "winter conditions". Back east it has been popular to have a serial number imprint put on the tread of the snowmobile. It was thought by the group that 95% of the snowmobilers would be penalized for the bad 5% in their ranks. (The cost of the number).

OE Task 10 - Youth Hiking Bunch

Your young group of happy trail walkers is just returning from a super and memorable day hike in the mountains. The start point was at Pinecone Lake Campground. The group, approaching civilization again, hears a loud ruckus. Kids are chopping on trees, radios are blaring, dogs are barking, and someone is shooting at beer cans floating in the lake. Five large "motor homes" are parked about 30 feet from the lake; some have their hoses leaking out on the ground. Since your group is very concerned, what should be done? There isn't a ranger for every campground.

Group Responce: - The leader of the kid's hiking group is on the spot. Everything he has instructed about eithics is now in front of him. He must bring both groups together - 1st to talk about why they enjoy the outdoors. He must resist thinking that the land manager or agency takes care of these kinds of problems. But, it will be very hard to impose different values on another use group - therefore, a tactful approach. Authorities should be notified later - and the filing of a formal complaint, if necessary.

OE Task 11 - Krazywater Kayak Klub

During an outing on Whitewater River, some members are upset because various fishermen, rafters, canoers, and tubers have bothered them. At the take-out place, all the groups come together again, face to face, after several slight to moderate conflicts. A large pile of beer cans, used diapers, and non-functional parts of various floating gear has also accumulated at the take-out.

A large traffic jam is taking place and a sheriff's car is approaching. After some discussion, one brave soul announces everyone will to lose their floating privileges if something isn't done. What does your Club do?

Group Responce: - Do not want to impose a permit system. The task group identified the following: 1) write a code of ethics, if necessary. 2) police the Klub's own ranks, use peer pressure. 3) arrange a meeting with the leaders of the other groups. 4) Call a public meeting - to get the unorganized groups together (the tubers, fisherman). Schedule a clean up program. Have inter-group meetings or joint-outings with other users. Put out a trash barrel the klub buys and the members maintain it themselves. Klub believes in paying for their own play. Pack in - pack it out signs. The task group never defined "who" owned the river though.

OE Task 12 - Fragile Hills City Council

Several letters from irrate citizens have been sent to the City about the 4x4 and dirtbikers ORV Park east of the city. It seems the erosion, dust, and com-motion are really becoming offensive. The City deferred all grazing and hunting on the 4,000 acre tract 10 years ago because the Mayor liked dirt bikes. Two present day councilmen are afficionados. The original Mayor is still Mayor. With dwindling budgets, less personnel, and angry citizens, what does the Council do about the ORV park?

Group Responce: - Call town meeting with public feedback. Let towns people decide. They could-options-1) close park; 2) do nothing; 3) institute land exchange and rest roughed-up areas; or 4) close a portion of park closer to city-move noise, dust, ect. away.

OE Task 13 - Exuberant Elk Hunters

After a 10-day affair in the mountains, a group of elk hunters are breaking camp and going their separate ways. Emotional hand shakes are taking place due to the parties super-swell time. They shot some fine bulls, had mutually enjoyed a beautiful area of public lands, and ran into friendly and courteous people while being afield. Most of the party knew all wouldn't be physically able to do it again. They agreed to demonstrate their respect though, because it was felt that a similar experience to theirs should be shared by future outdoor users. How do they go about doing this?

Group Responce: - Problems were two fold: Protect their resource information and experience while sharing the same with whom? Praise agencies responsible for management of resource and habitat. Keep tabs on what is planned in that management unit. The task group considered it very important to have a controlled fashion for who is told about the hunting locations, details, etc. They would not want any change, season length, more permits, deer hunts, etc. in area. They also said a good public relations deal is the "campground host program" where volunteers stay for extended periods at campgrounds to watch things - here they could also let people know and share good will, etc.

OE Task 14 - Bountiful Bird Watchers Society

Your group has some of the most dedicated birders around. Some have life lists from the four corners of the Globe. In recent years the group has greatly increased in number, most new members being young environmental types. At a monthly

meeting, the topic of "museum collections" and "sport hunting" came up. The youth ranks want no killing of any animals. They think roadside mortality and hard winter times keeps the animals in balance with their habitat. More mature club members of the Society tried to explain the traditional support that birders have had with hunters, trappers, etc. A violent argument erupts. Finally, the chairperson requests the two groups debate the issues, formulate resolutions, and document why the Society should oppose all sport animal killing. Your group represents the spokespersons from both groups that must resolve the above problem so the general membership can vote on it.

Group Response: - This task caused the most dissent and grief by the task groups that looked at it. After committee set-up, found no resolution between kill and no-kill ambitions. Society was obviously changing, not only from within but on the outside. Could they re-decide the reason of the club, to find the new common ground by: 1) re-establish group purpose; 2) decide what to do on the issues; 3) set up the formal organizational stand. It was also felt this was a very emotional issue (blood-letting) and that this alone, could keep the Society split. So, they decided to have a Roger Tory Peterson Club and an Aldo Leopold Club. Or, they may want to suppress the whole problem - leave it unresolved. Could be a fight between parent society and chapter.

OE Task 15 - Howling Hounders Club

Your group of "Houndsmen" has been asked by the Federal land manager to make a statement about your activity of chasing bears, cougars, and bobcats with your

hounds, snowmobiles, 4X4's, etc. The belief is that the general public is basically appalled by your outdoor pursuit methods. Many other outdoor users think your dogs chew these predators to death. To gain public awareness and approval of your activity, how does your statement read?

Group Response: - This is emotional, need to bring out science or skill of dog training, for bear or other predator pursuit. Demonstrate that one does not exploit the resource, i.e. difference of sport and commercial pursuit. Inform the outsiders about the strong tradition, amount of hound training and experience necessary, along with the fact that the "pursuit" is the big thing to houndsmen, not the kill, etc. Demonstrate that responsible citizens enjoy the sport, that houndsmen pay for and support conservation.

OE Task 16 - Beaver Tooth Trapping Club

Your group of trappers have just recently come together. Outside pressures against trapping, i.e., inhumane traps, killing non-target species, arguments with duck hunters, etc. have all been faced by individual members. One of the basic objectives of all your members was to write a clear set of outdoor rules for trappers to follow. The traditional approach had been not to leave a trace. Now pictures of dead animals hanging from leg traps are in the local news. With fur prices and tempers rising, how does the group set its rules so others won't take offense?

Group Response: - First statement of rules was that their pursuit was not in sport, but for profit. Therefore, it will always be offensive. The club should make their doctrine reflect the history, economics, safety and disease control.

It is a wildlife management tool. There should be a national code of ethics, because they (in a no-trace element) remove the resource. Trapping course (education) for all trappers - young and old, unskilled or proficient. Work for sound levels of expertise among trapper club ranks. Both hounder's and trappers' pursuits will continue to be offensive outdoor activities to other users and public.

OE Task 17 - Fish River Outfitters

A valuable fishing area for your group members is being studied for a recreational plan. The Fish River has always been good fishing. In more recent times, others have discovered it. A draft plan summary appears in the paper. Evidently, jet boats are too loud to whoever wrote it because they want all power boats excluded from certain parts of the river. Your group isn't too happy with the rafts and private jetboats right now. But, something must be done to keep your use of the river. What does the group do?

Group Responce: - First in use, first in privilege, tradition-oriented discussions. The commercial look was at making a living at it, not a killing at it. The task group said they would need a public meeting amongst the users and regulators. May schedule use periods for groups. Conduct an environmental appraisal. Go to catch and-release. And, tell all floaters to wear ear plugs. This group also said that power boaters' ethics dictate that safety of people involved in self-propelled sports is a paramount objective of their group; they will assist when they find trouble. They can also carry-out things that the floaters or "hike-ins" cannot.

OE Task 18 - Rural Farm Community Elders

Your group formed because city folks are bothering your community's lifestyle. In recent years the Old Mill Falls and City Park have been getting carloads of fishermen and bathers from out of town. They offend the locals by catching the local fish, littering, and messing around where they shouldn't. The city constable quit his job because of the long hours and low pay. The F&G recently told the farmers to patrol their own lands for trespassers since hunters were also bothering the rural people. Many locals didn't like all the shooting anyway. What do you, as the town's elders, do to get the urban out-of-towners and your town's life style in some form of co-existence? You can't keep'em out!

Group Responce: - The task group decided to take on a step by step approach: 1) raise money to return a constable on duty by charging user fees; 2) start controlling access; 3) have landowners patrol their own lands; 4) address access needs; 5) call a meeting, plan for future changes; 6) possibly need to change local ordinances; 7) use retired folks to collect user fees and watch over things (help constable); 8) sponsor get-to-gether "coffees" or breakfasts for out-of-town folks; 9) intensify city planning though town meetings, etc.; and 10) city must recognize that the visitor use is important to their community (whether they like it or not, they must live with it.).

OE Task 19 - Outdoor Impacts

Describe the no trace and minimal impact ethics you heard about Thursday, from your group's standpoint. Critically compare the two and relate the real world problems inherent to both. Explain how outdoor regulations can be better enforced in our wilderness areas.