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I. INTRODUCTION

Public support for the environment seems to be at an all time high. A 1990 Gallup poll found that fully 76 percent of Americans call themselves "environmentalists" (Luoma, p. 27).

Almost everyone in America who watches TV or reads the newspapers is probably familiar with the issues of acid rain, the greenhouse effect, threatened and endangered species, pollution, toxic wastes, disappearing rainforests and other environmental issues. Although millions of Americans are donating money to non-profit groups to help protect the earth, not everyone is happy with the environmental movement.

A rapidly growing number of ranchers, farmers, loggers, miners, trappers, millworkers, hunters, off-road-vehicle owners, oil workers, labor unions, large corporations and other groups are convinced that environmentalism is a crusade to cripple the American economy, rob private-property owners of their constitutional rights, and grant government agencies license to lock up public lands and natural resources (Krakauer, p. 70). Together, these groups have formed the Wise Use Movement, an anti-environmental backlash rippling from coast to coast.

The wise use movement and the environmental movement seem to be in direct ideological conflict with each other.
The wise use groups promote the use of natural resources for personal gain and profit; the environmental groups promote conservation and preservation of resources for future generations. Value differences create the conflicts between the two movements.

As with all social issues, those on opposite sides of environmental disputes have strongly conflicting personal values. Enormous differences exist among individual perceptions about the existence of environmental threats, their origins, their relative importance and what to do about them. In most instances, very different conclusions can be expressed on these issues, based on evaluation of the same basic scientific evidence (Goldfarb, p. 4).

Values, as used in this paper, are guides, norms, or principles by which a person lives. Values are formed by a process that involves one's feelings, thoughts, desires, actions and spiritual needs. They influence a person's behavior in some way -- what a person says and does reflects his/her values (Smith, p. 7). Values lead us to take particular positions on social issues, and predispose us to favor one political or religious ideology over another. They are standards employed to persuade and influence people, to tell us which beliefs, attitudes, values and actions of others are worth challenging, protesting, and arguing about, or worth trying to influence or change
This paper will answer the following questions: What values and/or beliefs are held by the wise use movement? What values and/or beliefs are held by the environmental movement? How are the values and beliefs of the two movements similar and how are they different? Is it possible for the two movements to find common ground?

I will answer these questions by analyzing the implied or stated values found in the written material of three representative wise use and three representative environmental organizations.

The organizations studied in this paper represent national, regional (the Northwest), and local (western Montana) groups (see table 1).

Table 1.—Wise Use and Environmental Study Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wise Use</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for the Defense</td>
<td>The Wilderness Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Free Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td>Greater Yellowstone Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ribbon Coalition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td>Friends of the Bitterroot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots for Multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These particular groups were chosen because: 1) they all deal with issues relating to public land management (logging, mining, ranching, off-road vehicles, etc.), 2) the pairs have similar geographic target audiences, and 3) they all have the common goal of persuading people to join their groups and support their causes.

II. METHODS

I contacted each case study group with a letter requesting copies of past publications, information on the group’s history, their goals and objectives, membership benefits, and how to join the group. All the organizations sent me the requested information.

The information received was grouped into the same type of communication: flyer, newsletter, magazine, bulletin or pamphlet for comparison.

A content analysis was then conducted on the information. Paragraphs were analyzed for words, phrases, and/or sentences that suggested values of the groups.

Values were implied in the newsletters and other written information through the use of emotionally-laden words such as "tainted", "dangerous", "overzealous", "outrageous insanity", "berserk", "wreck havoc", "hysterical" and other phrases used to reenforce beliefs about specific issues or the "other" movement.
For this paper, therefore, value-laden communication refers to the conscious attempts environmental and wise use organizations make to elicit specific emotional responses from their target audiences through the transmission of messages (Bettinghaus, p. 20). Messages refer to the information transmitted between the communicator and the audience (Meyers, p. 124).

III. THE WISE USE MOVEMENT

The wise use movement grew out of the Multiple Use Strategy Conference held in 1988. The Conference had over 300 attendees representing loggers, ranchers, miners, oil drillers, dirt-bike riders, industrial firms and others who view the environmental movement as a threat to their livelihood and way of life (Krakauer, p. 69).

The leaders of the wise use movement believe that the planet's resources were meant to be exploited for human gain and profit. They believe in their inalienable right to use America's natural resources and private property unencumbered by federal laws. They resent government telling them, in the name of the environment, what to do with privately owned marshes, orchards, factories, or slag heaps (Knox, p. 32).

The wise use movement is attracting home buyers who are
angry about what the spotted owl might do to the price of a two-by-four, confused property owners forbidden to build in their own backyards because it's been labeled a wetland, and irate farmers whose irrigation water is needed to preserve fish (Krakauer, p. 68).

The general philosophy of the wise use movement is that human development is not inherently harmful to the natural environment, that needless restrictions on human use of the Earth's ecosystems are threatening mankind's ecosystem, and that industry needs to be protected and fostered just as nature does (Gottlieb, p. 5). America's resources should be used to create jobs and make products for Americans.

The wise use movement self-published a book in 1989 entitled The Wise Use Agenda, which was given to President Bush. The Agenda, a comprehensive list of 25 environmental reforms based on the wise use philosophy, call for opening up national parks to logging and mining, oil-drilling on wildlife refuges and the systematic cutting of all ancient forests (Gottlieb, 1989). The Agenda's goals serve as the rallying point for the wise use movement (see Appendix A).

To accomplish the Agenda, the wise use groups launched a major educational letter writing campaign to Congress and President Bush, presenting the goals and philosophy of the wise use movement in an organized, grassroots, united front.

Many of the groups that first developed the Agenda have
signed on to a new coalition that calls itself the Alliance For America (AFA), a national coalition to counter radical environmentalism. AFA has the support of 125 local organizations working for "sensible environmental policies" (Ruben, P. 27).

The targets of the wise use groups, from mainstream environmental organizations like the Sierra Club to the radical fringe of the Earth First! movement, see the hand of the oil, timber and mining industries behind the wise use movement -- big corporations masquerading in the guise of the little guy. Some of the organizations do, in fact, get much of their money from industries that would profit from less restrictive federal policies.

For example, People for the West is primarily bank-rolled by the mining industry. In 1992, 12 of 13 members of the board of directors were mining industry executives (Christensen, p.3). People for the West was formed in 1989 as a lobbying vehicle to stop the repeal of the 1872 Mining Law, which gives mining precedence over any other use for public lands. More than 200 corporations have contributed about $800,000 to the group, and 96 percent of its funding comes from industry (Ruben, p. 28).

Big industry money also plays a role in the two-year old National Wetlands Coalition, a group trying to decrease wetlands protection. Most of its members are oil and gas
companies who want to lift the burden of compliance with wetlands laws off the back of big business. Members of the Coalition include Amoco, British Petroleum America, Chevron, Exxon, Marathon Oil, International Council of Shopping Centers and a host of other oil and gas and real estate companies. Eighteen of the 67 member organizations of the coalition are located in Louisiana, where wetlands cover 20 percent of the state (Ruben, p. 28).

Wise use organizations can be found throughout the U.S. and Canada. They range from small, local, grassroots groups to international corporations. Examples of wise use movement members are: Alaska Miners Association, California Cattlemen’s Association, Exxon Company, U.S.A.; Idaho Trail Machine Association, Multiple Use Coalition, Northwest Timber Association, Yamaha, Inc.; DuPont Company, and Women in Timber (Gottlieb, pp. 157-162). Some groups have environmentally sounding names such as National Council for Environmental Balance and Coalition for Vehicle Choice.

Some of the more radical wise use leaders believe the environmental movement has an "anti-human agenda that ultimately includes the destruction of civilization and the eradication of human beings" (Baum, p. 72). They tend to see preservationists as anti-Christian and anti-technology, "pantheistic Druids who mix weird science with earth religions" (Knox, p. 31).
A report by Canada's Library of Parliament notes the wise use groups' use of "language that tends to deify their cause and satanize opponents." Examples: A Mormon associated with the Wilderness Impact Research Foundation sees environmentalists as anti-Christian; a writer in Land Rights Letter identifies the supreme appreciator of nature, Ralph Waldo Emerson, as "a fallen-away Unitarian minister"; a Montana rancher can't understand why "environmentalists want to go against the Bible, which says in Genesis, Man shall have dominion over the Earth" (Udall, 1992).

According to Charles Cushman of the National Inholders Association, "Preservationists are like a new pagan religion. They worship trees and animals and sacrifice people. What we're facing is a holy war between fundamental religious differences" (Christensen, p. 3). Our Land Society asserts that environmentalism wants "to destroy or at least badly cripple industrialized capitalism" (Udall, 1992).

Ron Arnold, executive director of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, nominates environmentalism as "the third great wave of messianism to hit the planet after Christianity and Marxism-Leninism" (Udall, 1992). Arnold urges his followers not to be "snookered by these activists that are out to destroy civilization." Among the myths he believes environmentalists have perpetuated: the disappear-
ance of the spotted owl, the ozone hole, the greenhouse
effect, and acid rain (Arnold, p. 2).

The spotted owl issue, especially, has really raised
hackles among wise use supporters. Says Bill Haire, a
logger in Douglas County, Oregon:

If it comes down to my family or the spotted owl, that
bird's going to suffer. Where would we be right now if
everything that lived on this earth still survived, the
saber-toothed tiger, the wooly mammoth? Things adapt or
they become extinct. We survived without the dinosaur.
What's the big deal about the owl? (Gup, p. 59).

Says Dub L. Condyle of Glide, Oregon:

If you are a good Christian, you know the Bible says God
gave man dominion over the earth. This means we can right­
fully place the interests of mankind above those of the
supposedly threatened owl. What good are these dying
"ancient forests" if they are not managed to the maximum
possible extent for the betterment of mankind? (Condyle,

Although most wise use groups are content to lobby and
educate the public through the media, a few groups are
threatening violence. The Sahara Club, a Southern
California-based organization of off-road motorcyclists,
miners, ranchers, and loggers has declared war on environ­
mentalists. Crude harassment is the favored Sahara Club
tactic. The newsletter attempts to stop somewhat short of
directly advocating violence. The third issue, for example,
offers a $100 "bounty" for the arrest of any Earth First!
member breaking the law (Baum, p. 72).

Says Rick Sieman, founder of the group:

At first we were thinking of offering a $150 reward if
the Earth First!er was delivered to the cops with a bloody nose and a few broken bones, but our lawyer advised us against this, saying it was illegal. Then there’s the fact that so many of them are homos that you might get splashed with AIDS-tainted blood... We will defend ourselves in a very, very strong fashion. If indeed we find Earth First!ers setting traps, we’re going to take care of them with baseball bats. If the police can’t take care of business, we’re going to take care of business for them (Baum, p. 72).

As Sieman views it, the Sahara Club is only reacting to the "anti-land-use scum" who want to "lock up" the desert.

IV. WISE USE STUDY ORGANIZATIONS

After reading various articles on the wise use movement, mostly from popular magazines, I decided to join three wise use groups to see if they actually fit the image the media gave them. This section describes the groups I joined and the values I encountered reading their newsletters or promotional materials.

A. Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise (CDFE)

Founded in 1976, CDFE is located in Bellevue, Washington. It has the reputation of being on the "radical" side of the wise use movement. CDFE was established so that "Americans who understood and valued the free enterprise system could contribute to the defense and promotion of the economic system that made America a prosperous nation."

Their motto is "Private Property-Free Markets-Limited

President Alan Gottlieb and vice-president Ron Arnold are the self-proclaimed leaders of the wise use movement, which consists of three branches: the property rights movement, the pro-jobs movement and the federal lands multiple use movement. Gottlieb says about 5 million people currently support the wise use movement and another 120 million people are potential supporters (Gottlieb, p. 10).

Gottlieb also headed the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms and the Second Amendment Foundation. He was one of the nation’s leading direct mail money raisers for far-right candidates and causes in the 1970's and early 1980's. In April 1984, he pleaded guilty in federal court to filing false income tax returns for 1977 and was sent to prison (Krakauer, p. 114).

Ron Arnold used to be an active Sierra Club member, but he grew disenchanted when the Sierra Club "manipulated information to discredit loggers." He’s one of the main speakers for the wise use movement (Arnold, p. 2).

Both Gottlieb and Arnold have been accused of being affiliated with the American Freedom Coalition sponsored by the Unification church of Rev. Sun Myung Moon (Krakauer, p. 70).

CDFE’s philosophy is "We want to save nature for people, not from people." Says Arnold, "Wise Use is not
against the environment. Their (the movement's) diverse members live, work and play in the environment—farmers, ranchers, fishermen, loggers, miners, recreationists. They have a real, everyday stake in using the earth wisely" (Arnold, p. 2).

CDFE is a national, non-profit organization with 125,000 supporters and 8,000 core members, and a budget of roughly 5 million dollars (CDFE Brochure). Their main focus is grassroots organizing and lobbying in Washington, D.C. They don't raise money directly for the wise use movement but rather circulate ideas, coordinate strategies and lobby to get wise use agenda items passed as legislation.

The Center's theme for 1992 is to offer Political Action Training Seminars to leaders of wise use organizations. Seminars include fund raising and media contact training, and strategies to promote the movement (Wise Use Conservation Memo, p. 3).

The organization structure consists of a president, executive vice-president, vice president, secretary, treasurer and a 40 member national advisory board consisting of congressional, academic and distinguished advisors (CDFE Stationary, 1992). Some members of CDFE's 1992 national advisory board included: Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, Senators Thad Cochran (MISS), Alfonse D'amato (NY), Orrin Hatch (UT), and Don Nickles (OKLA). Other senators who
openly supported the wise use movement during 1990-1992 were Steve Symms (ID), Conrad Burns (MT), Strom Thurmond (SC), Jesse Helms (NC), and Ted Stevens (AK) (CDFE Stationary).

Examples of corporate supporters of CDFE and the wise use movement are: Yamaha, Kawasaki, Honda, Exxon, Chevron and Shell Oil, DuPont, Boise Cascade, Georgia Pacific, and Louisiana Pacific timber companies.

CDFE publishes a quarterly newsletter called The Private Sector that is published in conjunction with The Wise Use Conservation Memo. CDFE has founded the Free Enterprise Press which publishes books on regulation, private property rights, anti-industry activism, taxation, free enterprise versus communism, and many more. Examples of published books are: Ecology Wars: Environmentalism as if People Mattered by Ron Arnold; The Asbestos Racket: An Environmental Parable by Michael J. Bennett; and Storm Over Rangelands: Private Rights on Federal Lands by Wayne Hage (Free Enterprise Press flyer, 1992).

Analysis: During 1991-1992, I received four CDFE newsletters. The newsletters contained six articles per issue for a total of 24 articles. The articles contain a total of 168 paragraphs. Of the 24 total articles, 16 (66%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 16 articles contained 112 paragraphs, 95 (85%) of which contained value-laden sentences. From the total articles read, 56% of the
paragraphs contained value-laden phrases.

Each phrase or sentence contained different words so it was very difficult to count how many times a particular word appeared in a paragraph or article. Instead, value-laden phrases and sentences were identified based on tone or underlying meaning.

Examples of CDFE phrases identified as value-laden are: "acid rain and ozone holes are global nonsense", "we need to eliminate the huge threat to timber communities we all face", "we need to bring threatened communities together for a showdown fight in defense of jobs, property rights and multiple use", "defend the right of individual Americans in the free market without hinderence of government", "Las Vegas nightclub act makes monkeys of the Animal Rights Movement..." etc.

The following are specific examples of value-laden paragraphs from the CDFE newsletters.

According to a Ron Arnold editorial in the February 1992 Wise Use Conservation Memo:

The cumulative impact of 25 years worth of excessive environmental laws is strangling our economy. Most of those laws do little to help nature but much to punish industry. Today, the cumulative cost of over-regulation is turning a normal recession into a Green Depression. It happened because eco-groups use fear tactics to create the illusion of crisis-scares over global warming, acid rain, the ozone hole, Alar on apples causing cancer, the spotted owl, the list goes on and on...Eco-group leaders don’t pay the slightest attention to inconvenient realities. The illusion of crisis is the basis of their fund raising. They don’t
let facts stand in their way, or people...Eco-groups want everything for themselves, nothing for you: they cut whole forests to make millions of fundraising mailers every year so they can lobby forest products out of your future. Their hypocrisy is shameless...Eco-groups are bad for people. Wise Use is good for people. They both want to save the Earth, but they’re different (Arnold, p. 2).

Another CDFE newsletter said:

The back-to-nature movement wants the human race to have no power over nature, to indulge no anthropocentric thought or deed...The simple biological fact is that human beings are the dominant species on planet Earth. To deny our power through pseudo-innocence is pathological—a mental illness promoting attitudes and behavior that are false to the facts. The implications are chilling: are large rich environmental groups promoting mental illness in a vast public? (Krakauer p. 69).

Arnold’s strikes at stereotypes of environmentalists and tells his largely conservative audiences that those who oppose the spraying of pesticides are most often marijuana users. It is "us" and "them" all the way (Hennelly, p. 37).

The main values/beliefs implied from the CDFE written material are: individual property rights must be defended, there should be limited government control on industry and property, environmental laws are strangling the economy, eco-groups are hypocrites, humans are the dominant species on Earth, environmentalists are pot-smoking eco-freaks.

B. Blue Ribbon Coalition (BRC)

The Blue Ribbon Coalition, founded in 1988, represents 500,000 motorized recreationists and resource industries united to fight the threats to motorized sports and to pro-
tect access to public lands. It considers itself a "key member" of the wise use movement. Its motto is "Preserving our national resources FOR the public instead of FROM the public." BRC publishes a monthly magazine called BlueRibbon Magazine (Siddoway, 1992).

Membership consists of trail motorcyclists, ATVers, snowmobilers, 4X4 enthusiasts, sportsmen, power boaters, and other resource users. BRC works with loggers, miners, and ranchers to share and preserve access to public lands. It promotes cooperation with resource industries, wise use of resources, and "user cooperation" instead of user conflict by promoting sharing of trails and facilities, acceptance of all trail uses, and good trail manners (BRC Brochure, 1989).

BRC conducts workshops on land use management and trail manners, lobbies for motorized use of trails, hosts national conferences, and supports wise use legislation. It assisted in preparing the recently passed "Symms National Recreation Trails Fund Act" which will set aside a portion of the federal gas tax for trails and facilities for all recreationists in all states. This Act is identical to item 24 on the Wise Use Agenda.

BRC has an executive board of president, executive director, secretary, treasurer and three others. Its efforts are organized into four divisions: public policy, land use, BlueRibbon Magazine, and membership. BRC works
with their member organizations on wilderness bills and other legislation that would negatively impact balanced recreation and resource use. BRC organizes letter writing and testifies at hearings in opposition to these proposals. BRC suggests strategies and methods of dealing with local land managers, other users, elected officials, and local communities concerning motorized recreation (BlueRibbon Magazine, January 1992).

BRC's operating budget for 1991 was around $285,000. Total membership is about 300 member organizations, 150 businesses and 3,000 individual members (Collins, 1992).

The member organizations that support BRC vary from small recreation groups to international companies such as American Honda Motor Co., Western States Petroleum Assoc., Boise Cascade Corp., Louisiana Pacific Corp., and Polaris Industries (BlueRibbon Magazine, January 1992).

The BlueRibbon Magazine goes to about 63 businesses, industry and recreation groups that support the Wise Use Agenda. Yamaha, Kawasaki and Honda sit on the advisory board of the magazine.

Most of the articles in the BlueRibbon Magazine are well-written. Topics have included: wilderness designation articles (usually against), public land access issues, back-country survival tips, opposition to the Endangered Species Act, private property issues, letters to the editor, trail
projects, trail ethics, legislative updates that threaten ORV use, and articles protesting environmental "propaganda".

Analysis: During my 1991-1992 membership, I received 10 issues of BlueRibbon Magazine. Each issue contained 16-18 articles. I read a total of 170 articles, containing 4930 paragraphs. Of the total articles, 102 (60%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 102 articles contained 2958 paragraphs, 1183 (40%) of which contained value-laden phrases or sentences. Of all the articles read, 24% of the total paragraphs contained value-laden sentences or phrases.

Each phrase or sentence contained different words so it was very difficult to count how many times a particular word appeared in a paragraph or article. Instead, phrases and sentences were identified based on tone or underlying meaning.

Examples of value-laden sentences found in the paragraphs are: "wilderness and the spotted owl attack your sport and threaten your job and home", "we won’t be here a million years from now—we have to experience the land now", "wilderness has no economic value, we should use natural resources, not let them die", "saving species will bankrupt humanity", "anti’s have a religion where nature is God", "enviros are hypocritic Nazi’s".

The following are examples of value-laden paragraphs from the BlueRibbon Magazine and other BRC written material.
In the August 1992 BlueRibbon Magazine, the Perspectives column written by "Fossil Bill" Kramer, was entitled "Extremists Seize Environmental Movement." In this column, Kramer says:

Everywhere we turn, environmental extremism is rampant. Our national life is permeated with hysteria and panic fomented by green fanatics. As a result, unnecessary and idiotic regulations are strangling freedom, private property rights and our economic vitality. Personally, I'm sick of what's happened to a vital movement. The lunatic fringe has taken over. Facts and science are out. Stupidity, hysteria, fanaticism, force, and even terrorism are in.

He goes on to say that environmentalists follow a false credo, that if it's natural, it's good: if man did it, it's "unnatural" and bad. He says nature is neither good nor bad and "its absurd to assign it moral values" (Kramer, p. 9).

Darryl W. Harris wrote in the perspective column of the January 1992 BlueRibbon Magazine:

The wise-use movement's goal is to keep winning, to expose extreme environmentalism as radical and actually damaging to resource management, and to continue to network with other groups to achieve maximum effectiveness. We will gain more victories because we have truth on our side. More and more Americans realize that ideology, not reason, has ruled past battles over the environment and the science of ecology. Such misguided ideology forwards the idea that man is an unwelcome visitor to the earth, that everything man does damages nature and that man must be stopped before the earth is destroyed. The environment doesn't need environmentalism, it needs the wise-use philosophy (Harris, p. 11).

The Blue Ribbon Coalition promotional brochure sent to new or prospective members says:

Places you used to ride are closed. More closures are planned. Don't be locked out. Fight back! It's no secret. Your sport is under attack. Wilderness, the desert
Some of the BRC flyers/bulletins have fairly strong language in them. Clark L. Collins, BRC Executive Director, in the 9/24/92 flyer railed that:

They (enviros) will stop at nothing to destroy us and the entire motorized recreation industry. Their propaganda machine has accused us of attempting to use the Symms Trail Fund to blaze motorized trails into Wilderness areas. They call us "land abusers" and accuse us of being anti-environment. They say we’ve received huge sums of money from industry to support irresponsible use of our natural resources...What it boils down to is that right now we’re confronted by a super-financed, anti-recreation access juggernaut that is craftily masquerading behind a totally deceitful media blitz to conceal their elitist, anti-recreation access agenda. As usual, they are not hindered by the truth. It is extremely important that all non-wilderness public land users work together to protect one another from the vicious attacks of the environmental extremists.

The main values/beliefs implied from the BRC written material are: land is to be used now, wilderness threatens jobs and homes, wilderness has no economic value (and therefore is unimportant), resources are to be used for humanity’s benefit, environmentalists worship Nature, nature has no moral value, its misguided ideology to think that man is destroying the earth.

C. Grassroots for Multiple Use (GMU)

When I joined GMU, they welcomed me and sent the
requested information. But shortly afterward, I received a phone call from one of their board members asking me if I was really interested in multiple use. He left a message on my answering machine and I attempted several times to return his call. He never returned my calls. GMU is still holding my membership check (it's never been cashed) and has stopped sending me any information.

GMU was formed in 1990 in the Bitterroot Valley of western Montana. The initial focus was on local public land management issues and the people whose livelihoods depend on these lands. GMU's motto is "To Use-Not Abuse/To Conserve-Not Preserve".

Its position statement reads:

The assumption that preservationist groups represent the majority of people is totally irresponsible and unfounded. Uncompromising, single-issue positions, politics, sensationalism, and biased reports are, in fact, managing our public lands and resources. We, the majority, will pay the ultimate price. Loss of jobs, homes, life-styles and family stability is too great a price to pay for silence. Continued lack of management leadership on Public Lands and preservationist one-sidedness have awakened the sleeping giant. We, the People, shall speak! (Grassroots for Multiple Use News, Sept. 1991, p. 2).

GMU supports 1) balanced multiple-use management of our natural resources for all, not a select few, and 2) a viable economic base where people, families, jobs, life-styles, dependent communities, schools, roads, tax bases and other amenity values are considered for all, not a select few (Grassroots for Multiple Use News, Sept. 1991).
Most of GMU focus has been on local and state issues, networking with other wise use groups and organizations, and addressing the needs of the growing organization.

Membership is about 1800 people in several states, with chapters in Montana and Idaho. GMU's board consists of a president, executive director, and an eight member board of directors specializing in timber, water, mining, agriculture, recreation, and grazing issues. It also has an action committee, a Grassroots News staff, and a graphics and advertising department (GMU News, Feb. 1992).

Grassroots for Multiple Use is a group member of Alliance for America and the Blue Ribbon Coalition.

Current home-front issues GMU is concerned with are: getting support from congressional candidates, passing state legislature pertaining to public land uses (mostly the Bitterroot, Lolo and Salmon National Forests), weakening the Endangered Species Act (grizzly bear and wolf recovery, salmon listing), upholding private property rights, reducing wetlands protection and wilderness designation in Montana, expressing concern with the increase of tourism and decrease of commodity jobs in local communities, monitoring over-regulation of water storage and water use, and reducing government domination (GMU News, Sept. 1991, Feb. 1992).

GMU also calls for national boycotts on companies who promote preservation such as Anheuser-Bush and McDonalds who
run ads on the importance of saving the rainforests and oceans.

I found numerous articles in the Grassroots for Multiple Use News that contained value oriented opinions.

Analysis: During 1991-1992, I received three newsletters. These newsletters contained about 26 articles per issue. I read a total of 78 articles, containing 936 paragraphs. Of the total articles, 49 (63%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 49 articles contained 588 paragraphs, 241 (41%) of which contained value-laden phrases or sentences. Of the total articles read, 26% of the paragraphs contained value-laden sentences.

Paragraphs with value-laden phrases or sentences were identified based on tone or underlying meaning. Examples of sentences found in the newsletter are: "our culture, customs and lifestyles are at risk from over-regulation of our natural resource industries", "With all the demands on our water supplies, beyond irrigation, anyone who says 'let the rivers run free' is a dreamer--our trees, farms and lawns would dry up", "The Earth Summit is a gathering of eco-freaks to tell the world how bad everyone, except them, of course, is in protecting poor old Mother Earth".

The following are examples of value-laden paragraphs from the Grassroots for Multiple Use written material.

Environmentalists are determined to destroy the environment of others. The ability to care for, feed and shelter
the family is more of an environmental problem than the color of the hills...the needs of mankind all come from the Earth so if resources can’t be reached, all mankind will suffer, the renewable resources wasted...When Government agencies and some citizens place more emphasis on the welfare of a bird with poor prolific history than the welfare of today’s children and their families, the Human Race is in trouble (GMU News, April 1992).

On wolf recovery and rancher compensation:

How much payment makes it swell to endure the horror of watching your livestock ripped apart and eaten, often while still breathing? Depredation by wolves will double then quadruple. The Defenders of Wildlife will need more money to pay more ranchers as more domestic animals make dinner for wolves. From whence will this "compensation" money come? You guessed it—from you and me. Our taxes will pay to "recover" the wolves; our taxes will pay for the destruction of our livelihood...it’s hard to trust people who want to introduce death and destruction, devastate you economically and emotionally, and call the results beneficial (Petersen, p. 10).

The Future article of the GMU News, Feb. 1992, states:

Those who call themselves Environmentalists are actually Obstructionists in a green disguise. To all appearances the aim is not paradise for all, but hardship for all. Population control appears to be the bottom line, acquired by separating man from the Earth, from where comes mankind’s subsistence. So is starvation their planned means, or is the resulting violence the end? Nothing is heard from them discussing their self-sacrifice. Regression to primeval times is a terrible waste of the gains made by the human brain.

Concerning the 1872 Mining Law:

There are those that say that the Mining Act must be changed to protect the environment and prevent exploitation. Those people are wrong, wrong, wrong...if the eco-freaks of the money-rich, brain-poor ecology groups were as sincere and dedicated to solving problems as the mining industry is, this world would be a much better place in which to live (GMU News, April 1992, p. 16).

The main values implied in the GMU written material are: fear of lost jobs—people before environmental
protection, utilization of resources for human needs, environmentalists are elitists, environmental regulations hurt the economy.

V. THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

Like the wise use movement, the environmental movement also started with grassroots groups. Earth Day 1970 is generally credited as the event that really established the environmental movement (Nelson, p. 58).

On April 22, 1970, millions of Americans took part in a national series of demonstrations, teach-ins, marches, concerts, prayer services, and other activities to celebrate the environment. Earth Day 1970 prompted Congress to pass laws like the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act and the Environmental Education Act (Nelson, p. 58).

Unlike the wise use movement, the environmental movement does not have a definite, set agenda that unites all the groups together into one front. Each organization has its own goals and objectives, and its own area of expertise such as pollution, toxic wastes, forest protection etc.

Earth Day 1990 did have an environmental agenda of sorts, but it was broad-based without clear, manageable objectives. Where the Wise Use Agenda deals primarily with federal and private land issues, the Earth Day 1990 Environ-
mental Agenda was global in scope with goals such as: to ban chlorofluorocarbons (CFC's) worldwide, slow the rate of global warming; implement strong, effective recycling programs in every community and ban non-recyclable packaging; establish a swift transition to renewable energy sources; halt global deforestation coupled with tree planting programs; establish a comprehensive hazardous waste management program that emphasizes source reduction, etc. (Natural Resource Defence Council Newsline, p. 4).

Because the health of the environment affects every human being on earth regardless of race, class, sex or location, the environmental movement is broadening its constituencies to include minority groups, the religious community, organized labor, and the young people of the world.

Environmental organizations vary from small, local grassroots groups to large, international organizations. Some examples of regional and national groups respectively are: Friends of the Everglades, Greater Yellowstone Coalition, Citizen's Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes, Inc., American Rivers, Inc., TreePeople, Zero Population Growth, and World Wildlife Fund (Seredich, 1991).

While the environmental movement has pointed fingers at the wise use movement for having corporate sponsors, environmental groups themselves are supported by some big

How do environmental organizations view the wise use movement? Jay R. Hair, President of the National Wildlife Federation, has this to say:

The Wise Use Alliance does not understand the environmental movement, or the human values at its core. They are people who would convert our natural heritage to short-term wealth and damn the consequences...The leaders of this anti-environment campaign represent a last vestige of a backward-thinking crowd that has profited by exploiting publicly-owned natural resources, harkening back to the James Watt-inspired "sagebrush rebellion." They are unwilling to acknowledge that a sustainable environment is essential in maintaining a healthy economy. In fact, their entire strategy is based on the divisive and erroneous premise that either jobs or the environment must be sacrificed. The wise use movement is determined to turn back years of genuine grassroots environmental work that ensures every American has the right to a healthy environment, a right that opinion poll after opinion poll proves Americans want to maintain. Their goal is not only anti-environment, anti-wildlife and anti-people, it's anti-American, too (Hair, p. 30).

Environmental groups accuse the wise use movement of preying on communities' fears of unemployment, presenting their issues in black and white, and using issues that are polarizing communities to move their agenda.

Ron Judd, Executive Secretary of the Seattle-King County Building and Construction Trades Council, says:

They (wise use movement) breed on social and economic
unrest of the communities by going in and using the right terminology and telling people what they know these people want to hear. That’s very superficial and if you look very deep into what the Wise Use Movement is all about, they are about undermining the social structure of this country by trying to put individual rights alone on the forefront, forgetting community rights and losing sight of social rights and social justice (Hupp, p. 2).

According to John Gatchell, project director for the Montana Wilderness Association:

They (wise use movement) are trying to make out as though it’s un-Christian to have a reverence for nature, when really the biblical notion of dominion implies responsibility, a sacred trust. Tree-huggers and tree-cutters both have an interest in sustained yield, but the wise-use movement is deliberately and purposefully trying to drive a wedge between people who should be natural allies (Baum, p. 93).

While the wise use movement groups use environmentalists as the "boogey man" to help further their cause, the environmental groups are not above using the wise use movement to benefit themselves. The Wilderness Society president George Frampton said in a fund-raising letter, "Now, for the first time ever, the anti-wilderness special interests are organizing. They’re banding together, pooling their considerable financial resources. They’re giving their organizations benign-sounding names like the "Blue Ribbon Coalition", but their names can’t disguise their true purpose" (Collins, p. 12).

Like wise use advocates, some environmentalists tend to get emotional over issues. Ted Turner, CEO for Turner Broadcasting System, said the following in an address to EPA
employees in Washington, May 1991:

I don’t like what we’re doing to the national forests, cutting trees down at taxpayers’ expense and destroying the forest, just so we can have a few jobs. That is like saying, Adolf Hitler tried to justify the Nazi concentration camps because they provided employment for people. Bullshit! I’m fanatical. A part of me is so angry that I want to take out a gun and do something about it...Even though in my heart I do get angry and frustrated, I have never done anything...and I want to go down and burn lumber mills in the middle of the night and spike trees. I don’t do it. I just dream about it occasionally. I work within the system (BlueRibbon Magazine, April 1992, p. 14).

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY ORGANIZATIONS

It seems that people in both movements are emotionally attached to their causes, and believe in a variety of values. To compare and contrast the values I found in the wise use groups, I joined three environmental organizations and identified the values in their written materials.

A. The Wilderness Society (TWS)

The Wilderness Society (TWS), founded in 1935, is a non-profit organization devoted to preserving wilderness and wildlife, protecting America’s prime forests, parks, rivers, deserts, and shorelines and fostering an American land ethic (Wilderness, 1992, p. 1).

The Society’s programs stress a commitment to and protection of wilderness areas, and the preservation and proper management of the nation’s public lands and eco-
systems. It considers itself unique among conservation organizations because it is exclusively devoted to issues relating to all public lands (Seredich, p. 419-421).

TWS goals are to: educate the public by sponsoring conferences, seminars, and workshops on public land management; analyze and critique administration decisions that affect public land management systems; lobby for land management policy changes; meet with members of Congress and their staffs on programs to preserve and properly use the nation’s lands; discuss proper regulation and management of public lands directly with key officials of federal agencies in charge of them, and testify at legislative hearings; activate concerned citizens to participate in programs to protect public lands, and work to establish cooperative programs with other conservation organizations (Seredich, pp. 419-421).

The Wilderness Society has helped pass wilderness bills in 44 states; defended more than 90 million acres of America’s designated wilderness against developers; helped pass the 1990 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which established 12 new national parks, 11 new wildlife refuges, and 25 wild and scenic rivers in Alaska; and strengthened coalition efforts to protect areas such as the Everglades, the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem and the California Desert (Seredich, pp. 419-421).
The Wilderness Society has been labeled by the wise use movement as "elitist bureaucratic yuppies, overpaid juice-less functionaries scurrying around in the warrens of fat-cat organizations, picking money out of the pockets of a gullible public that has been spoon-fed misinformation by a captive press. Environmentalists like crisis, they like environmental destruction, they like the deaths of species, because these little tragedies keep them in their BMWs" (Watkins, p. 8).

TWS has a council of 33 members including a president, counselor, secretary, treasurer, vice chairmen, chairman, and an honorary council of 11 members. TWS employs a staff of 118 people who work on regional and national conservation issues, finance and administration, resource planning and economics, membership and development, and public affairs. Membership is about 400,000 (Wilderness. Summer 1992, p. 1)

TWS publishes the 75-page quarterly magazine Wilderness and mails out copious numbers of flyers and special bulletins on public land management issues. It is not at all shy about calling members and asking for money pledges for its causes and sending out "emergency" flyers at least twice per month.

Articles in Wilderness magazine consist of hard-hitting critiques of land management practices.

Analysis: I received four issues of Wilderness magazine
during the 1991-1992 year. Each issue contained between seven to nine articles. I read a total of 32 articles containing 1024 paragraphs. Of the total articles read, 20 (63%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 20 articles contained 641 paragraphs, 370 (58%) of which contained value-laden sentences or phrases. Of the total articles read, 36% of the paragraphs contained value-laden sentences.

Paragraphs with value-laden phrases or sentences were identified based on tone or underlying meaning. Examples of value-laden sentences found in the written material are:
"What is the benefit of logging when wildlife habitat is destroyed, fish streams devastated, and scenic vistas obscured?", 
"The preservation of wilderness sustains species, the protection of species serves to protect wilderness and to lose either is to lose the whole", 
"Public-lands grazing programs are little more than 'cowboy welfare'",
"Waste, competition, overuse and abuse of valuable rangelands and watersheds are eating into the very heart of the Western economy".

The following are examples of value-laden paragraphs from Wilderness Magazine.

One issue was devoted to the mining industry: "Dips, Spurs, and Angles-A Special Issue on the Great Anachronism: the General Mining Law of 1872." The article says:

The American mining industry that helped settle and civilize so much of the West has, in fact, damaged much of
it beyond recovery- and will continue to do so, if it is permitted...land is not just a platform for things like homes, malls and factories. It is also an entity in itself consisting of soil and vegetation and habitats for other living creatures...(Byrnes, p. 30).

The Spring 1991 issue of *Wilderness* discussed the problems of livestock grazing on public lands. In the article "How the West Was Eaten", Nancy Green, Director of BLM programs for the Wilderness Society, says The Society is not against grazing, per se:

The livestock industry, properly regulated, can have a place in the web of uses on the public lands of the West. But, where, when, and how much grazing should be allowed depends entirely on what the land, habitat and wildlife resources themselves can absorb in good health. Too often and in too many places, grazers have been allowed not merely to use the land, but to abuse it. That has got to stop (Wuerthner, p. 37).

TWS does not hide the fact that it is often at odds with extractive industries. George Frampton, Jr., the President of the Society, wrote in an April 1992 memo on the National Forests Campaign:

National Forests are national treasures, belonging to all Americans. Yet the Forest Service acts as though our great living forests are just timber waiting to be cut down! The timber companies and their allies in congress are trying to derail the legislation we support with a "reform" bill of their own. But their "reforms" are riddled with loopholes that would allow the devastation of our National Forests to continue. These forests should be handed down from generation to generation. We can’t let them be destroyed for the short-term profits of private timber companies!...Until Congress reclaims the Forest Service from the political influence of the timber industry, and demands that it preserve our National Forests for ourselves and our children, America’s public forestlands will never be safe.

The main values implied in *The Wilderness Society*
written material are: natural resources should be valued beyond their economic worth, wilderness preservation is key to saving species, industry subsides on public lands should be stopped, land has intrinsic value, resources should be preserved for future generations.

B. Greater Yellowstone Coalition (GYC)

The GYC was formed in 1983. It’s motto is "Preserving and Protecting the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem." The Coalition’s mission is to protect and preserve the 18 million acres of national parks, national forests, national wildlife refuges, and private ownership that make up the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (GYC Brochure, 1990).

GYC is committed to saving habitat for endangered species, pioneering ecosystem approaches to wildlands protection, protecting the open space and scenic character of the region, scrutinizing the impacts of human development (logging, oil and gas exploration, mining) on the landscape, and insuring the long-term well-being of the natural and human resources of Greater Yellowstone (GYC Brochure).

GYC meets its goals by: 1) encouraging and organizing local and regional groups, individuals and communities to participate effectively in resource planning and protection, 2) steering federal and state agencies toward a sensitive ecosystem approach to planning, management and protection,
3) educating the public about the value of Greater Yellowstone and the threats to its future, and 4) lobbying and introducing legislation to protect the region (GYC Brochure).

GYC publishes a quarterly journal, the Greater Yellowstone Report, and "Eco-Action" alerts, and conducts workshops, annual conferences, and field trips.

It has a paid staff of 16 which includes: executive, program, membership and communications directors; office manager, staff assistants, and a broad array of volunteers. Support comes from 100 member organizations and 4,500 active individual members. The 1992 budget was $726,000 (Sutherland, 1992).

The executive committee consists of president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer plus three others. The board of directors has 19 members representing consultants, attorneys, loggers, resort owners, planners, college professors, ranchers, businesses, biologists, and media executives. GYC also has a science council of 14 specialists in ecology, wildlife biology, forest ecology, animal behavior, fish biology, sociology, geography, soils, botany and economics (Greater Yellowstone Report, Fall 1991, p. 1).

GYC is making a real effort to bring people together to discuss the environmental and economic needs of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. But the region is "under siege from
interests that want to see development proceed unchecked and resources extracted at an excessive rate, with little regard for the ecological or economic future of the region. The development activity runs counter to emerging trends" (Inside Greater Yellowstone, 1992, p. 12). The Greater Yellowstone area is in an economic transition from extractive employment to service employment, a trend that is threatening to the wise use groups of the area.

The Greater Yellowstone Report, the quarterly journal of GYC, is well written and objective. Most of the articles are straightforward, factual and free of emotionally laden words. Topics have included: the Endangered Species Act; diversifying the economy; status of wilderness bills; updates on legislation important to the area; natural history briefs; water issues; public land management; and development threats to the ecosystem such as timber harvest, forest roading, oil and gas drilling, hard rock mining, and rural subdivisions.

Analysis: During the 1991-1992 year, I received four issues of the Greater Yellowstone Report. Number of articles varied from 10 to 13 per issue. I read a total of 44 articles containing 1100 paragraphs. Of the total articles read, 13 (30%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 13 articles contained 325 paragraphs, 81 (24%) of which contained value-laden phrases or sentences. Of the
total articles read, 7% contained value-laden paragraphs.

Value-laden phrases and sentences were identified based on tone and underlying meaning. Examples of value-laden phrases or sentences found in the Reports are: "We are committed to saving habitat for endangered species; we are aggressive in trying to protect open space and carefully scrutinize the impacts of human development on the fragile landscape", "GYC fights against the destruction of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem so that future generations will not only have Yellowstone, but an evergreen asset for the economic health of Ecosystem residents...", "Rivers are arteries and veins, the lifeblood of ecosystems; they deserve respect and protection", "photos of abandoned, bleeding mining operations or massive clearcuts you can see from outer space tug at the heartstrings of anyone who loves Greater Yellowstone".

The following are examples of value-laden paragraphs found in the Greater Yellowstone Reports.

Says GYC President John Winsor:

The emerging economic trends are tied to the landscape. So Greater Yellowstone, if protected, will create jobs now and for future generations. The term "jobs", however, has become the Holy Grail to those who want to extract and exploit the Yellowstone Ecosystem for short-term profits. They (wise use supporters) are masters at manipulating residents with propaganda that spreads fear, hatred and greed. They cast the issue as "jobs versus the icon": after all, they cynically ask, what’s more important, people’s survival or the land? There are two different kinds of jobs in the Ecosystem: those that help destroy it, and those that are benign, that help protect it...Yellowstone is the battle
ground for the war as to how much the American Public is willing to see their icon (Yellowstone) exploited (Winsor, p. 18).

The Spring 1992 Greater Yellowstone Report has an article called "Polarization--Tactics by the Wise Use Movement Push People Apart". The article says:

GYC is attacked by industry organizers who make false claims about GYC's goals. In addition, these same organizers say that wilderness advocates are responsible for alcoholism, child abuse and other social ills simply by supporting wilderness designation...the wise use movement is designed to deliberately mislead and polarize, intent on developing destructive, short-sighted land use policies on public lands for the benefit of a handful of extractive industries...Their wise use dogma denies the environmental consequences of development. It is sadly misleading to suggest that proposals to increase development, and eliminate regulations and laws protecting health and environment are the answer for communities in distress, for families and workers anxiously trying to accommodate changing technologies, economies and values (Souvigney, pp. 6-7).

The main values implied in the GYC written material are: the environment should be protected against damaging human development, environmental health and economic health are compatible, preserve resources for future generations, the intrinsic value of nature, it's acceptable to feel emotions toward the land.

C. Friends of the Bitterroot (FOB)

FOB was founded in 1989 and contains about 700 members. Its motto is "A good economy, a healthy environment and a sustainable future." FOB is a "a group of concerned citizens who are working to improve and enhance the lives of
people in the Bitterroot Valley (of Montana) while assuring protection of the valley itself, its beauty and natural resources. We accomplish these goals by educational means and seek the involvement and participation of the broadest possible representation of valley people" (FOB Newsletter, Oct. 1990, p. 2).

FOB is concerned about the impact of national forest management on the Bitterroot environment, the need to protect more wilderness areas, and the need for sustainable economic growth that does not degrade the environment (FOB Report, 1989, p. 1).

FOB hosts public meetings on land management issues (timber, grazing, mining, recreation), leads field trips and air surveys to review forest management practices, conducts special studies, negotiates and/or appeals Forest Service timber sales for compliance with environmental laws, and hosts grassroots leadership conferences.

To convey its message of protection and conservation of the Bitterroot Valley, FOB uses newspaper ads, radio spots, news conferences, public displays and distributes newsletters. FOB recently co-sponsored some videos and a film series for national network television to create public awareness of the issues and conflicts of forest management.

The organization is run by a volunteer 25 member steering committee, which is responsible for working
committees on membership/public education, forest management, wildlife and fisheries, watershed protection, wilderness protection, fund raising, legislative action, river and agriculture land protection, and organization needs (FOB Newsletter, May 1990, p. 1).

Because it does not have a paid staff, FOB relies heavily on membership and donations. Its 1991 budget was $15,000 (Soelne, 1992). FOB’s main goal is to bring people in the valley together in a cooperative effort toward finding common solutions to their long term needs for forest, water and wildlife.

FOB sent a full-page ad to both Bitterroot Valley newspapers in May 1990, berating the timber industry for sabotaging timber sale appeal negotiations with the Forest Service. The ad said:

We’re for true multiple use as legally required under the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960...We’re for the sustained production and use of water from our forests for our farms, ranches and communities, for the sustained production and harvest of timber, for sustained grazing resources, and for wildlife and recreation of all kinds. We are willing to work out disagreements over timber sales. The timber industry representatives sat through the entire Forest Service negotiation proceedings. They participated in them as intervenors and at any time in the process could have indicated they wouldn’t go along with the settlements made. Instead, they chose to create further polarization, to intensify the debate and further polarize the community, and once again demand that the over-cut of the Bitterroot forest continue—something that absolutely must not be allowed if we are ever to achieve a stable local economy, let alone protect all the multiple values on a sustainable yield basis (FOB Newsletter, May 1990, insert).

The ad also asked the reader to ask some hard questions
about the motives of the timber industry leaders, and said that it is possible for people with basically similar goals but opposing viewpoints to listen, learn, understand and achieve solutions with each other.

The FOB newsletters contain factual articles on natural resource economics, reviews and critiques of Forest Service plans and documents, and community solutions to problems.

**Analysis:** During the 1991-1992 year, I received four FOB newsletters, averaging eight articles per issue. I read a total of 32 articles containing 288 paragraphs. Of the total articles read, 16 (50%) contained value-laden paragraphs. These 16 articles contained 144 paragraphs, 48 (33%) of which contained value-laden phrases or sentences. Of the total articles read, 16% contained value-laden paragraphs.

Value-laden phrases and sentences were identified based on tone or underlying meaning. Examples of value-laden phrases or sentences are: "not all people view nature as 'resources' for 'use' by humans", "What does he (the governor) want us to do--drink the dirty water coming into our water sources and then keep our mouths shut while we watch our streams being destroyed?", "it is unreasonable to let timber industry leaders continue to dupe their workers and others into the notion that violating sustained-yield principles serves anyone's interest".
The following are examples of value-laden paragraphs from the FOB newsletters.

Says Marilyn Olsen of Darby, MT:

It is the decisions of this generation of humans that determines the outcome for all life on earth as we know it. This is an ethical and moral matter that ranges far beyond the question of balancing competing special interest user groups on our public lands. Human beings are not the measure of all values. We do not have special permission to dominate the natural world. I speak for the intrinsic value of living communities of soils, water, plants and animals on the Bitterroot National Forest. They have a right to exist for their own sake unrelated to human benefit. We must extend the right to exist to those excluded from the law. I attempt to do this by using the Forest Service appeals process...It is time for new ideas. Clinging to an extremely limited way of life, based on the extraction of a finite resource, and trying to protect it with attempts to polarize the community by yelling 'terrorist' is hopelessly counter-productive. Seeking a sustainable future for human and non-human life will require vision, courage and resourcefulness—the qualities of American patriots, past, present, and future (Balance, Fall 1991, p. 7).

Kirby Erickson of Hamilton, MT writes:

I have been an active member of Friends of the Bitterroot for two and one-half years, and during that time, have received several anonymous death threats and numerous face-to-face threats of death and violence to me, my family, and my property. I am not the exception in FOB. Certain members live in constant fear of violence to life and property. I find it amazing that certain public figures have been so successful in painting a picture that FOB’s approach of sustained yield and above-cost logging is lawless radicalism, and their method of openness, dialogue, and compromise is somehow a form of terrorism. But on the other hand, the timber industry’s approach of reckless, massive road building and clearcutting is somehow sound forest management and their tactics of distortion, threat, and intimidation are the accepted social norm (Balance, Fall 1991, p. 7).

The main values implied in the FOB written material are: nature is not for utilization use only, resource use
should be sustainable, nature has intrinsic value, people should strive together to work out conflicts.

VII. CONCLUSION

When comparing the six organizations to each other, the national groups rank the highest in percentage of total paragraphs containing value-laden communication: Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise (CDFE)—56%, The Wilderness Society (TWS)—36% (see table 2).

Table 2.—Comparison of Articles and Paragraphs W/ Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDFE</th>
<th>TWS</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>GYC</th>
<th>GMU</th>
<th>FOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total articles read</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paragraphs read</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>4930</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total articles w/values</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total paragr. w/values</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise is directed by two of the wise use movement leaders, it seems logical that the CDFE newsletters contain the most value-laden language of the wise use groups. The inflammatory language used by CDFE seems to be an organizing technique to increase membership in the wise use movement. The rhetoric has an economic angle that plays on people's fears of losing their jobs and livelihoods. People who feel powerless often look for a cause or flag to rally around, in
this case the wise use movement, to help them feel in control of their lives.

Because The Wilderness Society is an older and larger organization than CDFE (see table 3), and part of an established, long-term movement, it probably doesn't need to use as much inflammatory language to maintain its membership. However, as stated earlier in the paper, TWS does take advantage of each new threat to the environmental movement to boost its membership or budget, and the wise use movement is considered a threat. Most of the TWS articles I read in 1991-1992 had some value-laden paragraphs concerning the wise use movement either directly or indirectly.

Although TWS is a major player in the environmental movement, Earth First! might have been a better choice as a national environmental organization to compare to CDFE. The wise use groups often refer to environmentalists as "terrorists", "eco-freaks", and "anti-humans", terms normally used to describe the most radical environmentalists. Had Earth First! been analyzed in this paper, its percentage of value-laden paragraphs may have rated closer to CDFE's.

The regional and local sets of organizations rated within 9 percent of each other, respectively, for the percentage of total paragraphs containing values (see table 2). Both Blue Ribbon Coalition (BRC) and Grassroots for Multiple Use (GMU) rated between 24-26 percent, Friends of
the Bitterroot (FOB) was 16 percent, and Greater Yellowstone Coalition (GYC) rated the lowest with 7 percent of the total paragraphs containing value-laden communication (see table 2).

Table 3.—Comparison of Group Organization Structure 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CDFE</th>
<th>TWS</th>
<th>BRC</th>
<th>GYC</th>
<th>GMU</th>
<th>FOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership #</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget $</td>
<td>5 mill</td>
<td>25 mill</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>726,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Board Members</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Board members includes steering committee members for FOB, and science council for GYC.

The Greater Yellowstone Coalition is the oldest of the four regional and local groups; it also has the greatest membership, largest budget and staff, and the largest number of board members (see table 3).

Although GYC is dedicated to preserving the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, it is also concerned with the local and regional economies. One reason that GYC uses such a low percentage of value-laden language in its written material might be due to the broad values of its board members. Board of Director members include loggers, ranchers, resort owners, attorneys and business people, as well as scientists and environmentalists. This variety of people probably
helps balance the ideas and goals of the organization between the extremes of pro-environment and pro-industry.

GYC also has a council of professional scientists. Scientists usually try to be objective and keep emotionalism out of issues to maintain credibility in their field. Over the years, GYC has probably learned that its credibility as an organization depends on reporting factual, balanced information, especially if it hopes to attract both industry and environmentalists to its membership.

**Wise Use and Environmental Values**

The battle between the wise use and environmental movements is basically a battle between people who have a different view, technologically and spiritually, about why we exist on Earth. Though the language of the environmental debate is scientific and economic, its core is cultural and emotional (Chicago Tribune, 1992).

Like the abortion and gay rights issues, the wise use and environmental movements seem to have diametrically opposing values and beliefs (see table 4).

Because the values are so different, is it possible to find common ground between the two movements?

Although I expected to find some common ground between the groups I studied, based on the written material I analyzed, I found little common ground or shared values
between the groups.

Table 4.--Summary of Values Held by the Two Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wise Use</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accruing material wealth now</td>
<td>Conserving resources for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited economic growth and development</td>
<td>Environmental protection and limited development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land used for profit and individual gain</td>
<td>Land used for social good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic market determines usefulness of land</td>
<td>Nature has intrinsic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources are infinite</td>
<td>Natural resources are finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs more important than environmental quality</td>
<td>Environmental and economic health are compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate environ. regulation and government control</td>
<td>Eliminate industry subsides on public land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropocentric view of nature</td>
<td>Biocentric view of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans dominant over nature</td>
<td>Humans part of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain industry status quo</td>
<td>Change industry ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-moral views of nature</td>
<td>Moral views of nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common words that were used by both sides were "sustainable", "stewardship", and "use". Both the wise use and environmental movement advocates say they want a sustainable economy and a healthy environment. But what does this mean? Without a common frame of reference, a
shared vision, or agreed upon definition of what constitutes a sustainable economy and healthy environment, there will always be conflicts between the two movements.

Perhaps if the two movements can get beyond the posturing and inflammatory rhetoric, they might find some common visions for the future. Advocates of both movements want to enjoy the outdoors and use natural resources according to their own values (whether it’s cutting trees for lumber or hiking trails in wilderness areas).

A future study could include interviewing people from both movements and asking them if they see any common ground. Other possible studies are: analyze which environmental issues cause the greatest conflicts at the local, regional and national levels; what is the most effective approach to reach people or get them to support a cause—emotional rhetoric, logical reasoning, or a combination of both? How do the two movements recruit new members, what tactics do they use and how effective are they, etc.

As long as human populations continue to increase and natural resources decrease, there will always be conflicts over resource use. People with "radical" viewpoints will probably never compromise their values. But, not everyone takes sides. Some people are able to understand many viewpoints and perhaps they are the ones who will test new
waters and develop common visions.

John Lundquist of Lake Almanor, California, may be just such a person:

I was a timber faller for 15 years. I felt the prejudice that comes with being stereotyped a "tree killer" who cares nothing about spotted owls or old-growth forests. I do care, more than anyone knows. I took the job because I wanted to live and work in the woods, and I have no regrets. In fact, I’m glad I was there because I made a difference. I left trees I knew were homes to squirrels and avoided putting trees down in sensitive areas. The public eye is changing things in the woods for the better. Change is difficult, though, and we need a balance between what’s good for the land and what’s good for us. We’re all consumers of this earth, and we are all responsible for its exploitation (Lundquist, p. 6).
APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF WISE USE AGENDA

1. Initiation of a Wise Use Public Education Project by the U.S. Forest Service: Federal deficit reduction through prudent development of federal lands.

2. Immediate wise development of the petroleum resources of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).

3. The Inholder Protection Act: legislation to eliminate eminent domain power over inholdings.

4. Passage of the Global Warming Prevention Act: legislation to convert in a systematic manner all decaying and oxygen-using forest growth on the National Forests into young stands of oxygen-producing, carbon-dioxide-absorbing trees to help ameliorate the rate of global warming and prevent the greenhouse effect (ie: cut all old growth forests and replace with plantations in the name of global warming).

5. Creation of the Tongass National Forest Timber Harvest Area in Alaska to be the first unit of the National Timber Harvest System designed to promote proper economic forestry practices on federal lands, set harvest at 30,000 acres/yr.

6. Creation of a National Mining System: following the 1872 Mining Law and opening all public lands, including wilderness and national parks, to mineral and energy production.

7. Passage of the Beneficial Use Water Rights Act: legislation to embody the 1866 Water Act and recognize rights of states to control all waters originating in or passing through them. Water would not be reserved on federal lands.


9. The Rural Community Stability Act: enable the U.S. Forest Service to offer a reasonable fraction of the timber on each ranger district in timber sales exempt from administrative appeal.

10. Creation of a National Timber Harvest System: by
Congressional authorization to identify and preserve for commodity use those timberlands suitable for sustained yield timber growth, repeals non-declining even flow so timber may be harvested in the interest of domestic economies and national security.

11. **National Parks Reform Act**: massive expansion of concessions in all 48 national parks with the help of "private firms with expertise in people-moving such as Walt Disney...All actions designed to exclude park visitors such as shutting down overnight accommodations and rationing entry should be stopped."

12. **Pre-Patent Protection of Pest Control Chemicals**.

13. **Create the National Rangeland Grazing System**: on all federal lands presently under permit where no application shall impair the operation of the rangeland as livestock grazing areas.

14. **Compassionate Wilderness Policy**: allow motorized wheel chairs in all wilderness areas.

15. **National Industrial Policy Act**: federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment shall be required to include detailed statements on the economic impact of delaying or denying the proposed action.

16. **Truth In Regulation Act**: legislation to require agencies to separate out overhead costs from offering timber sales, display all costs associated with meeting environmental regulations.

17. **Property Rights Protection**: abandoned railroad easements to revert to adjacent property owners, no easements for "Rails-to-Trails" programs without compensation for loss of economic opportunity.

18. **Endangered Species Act Amendments**: create separate treatment of species which were in decline before human presence, exclude "relict" and "non-adaptive" species. Disclose all costs associated with meeting the Act. Hiding any costs shall be a felony.

19. **Obstructionism Liability**: make individuals and groups liable for the economic losses suffered on projects which they challenge unsuccessfully. They shall post bonds equivalent to the economic benefits to be derived from the challenged project plus cost overruns caused by
delay.

20. **Private Rights In Federal Lands Act:** establish the principle of private domain in Federal land. Make timber contracts, mining claims, water rights, and grazing permits private domain.

21. **Global Resources Wise Use Act:** free trade measure of developing nations favoring private enterprise and technology exchange for sustainable resource development, takes steps to insure raw material supplies for global commodity industries on a permanent basis.

22. **Perfect the Wilderness Act:** create categories of wilderness for human exclosure (sic), wild solitude, back country, front country and commodity use. Split into areas allowing hostels and toilets, developed campsites, motorized trail travel, limited commercial development, and commodity industry uses in times of high demand.

23. **Standing to Sue In Defense Of Industry:** pro-industry advocates should win standing to sue on behalf of industries threatened or harmed by environmentalists.

24. **National Recreation Trails Trust:** return off-road vehicle gasoline taxes to a "National Recreational Trails Trust" for multiple-use, motorized trail development.

25. **The End of the "Let Burn" Policy:** All national parks and wilderness areas will be managed to prevent the long-term buildup of ground fuels such as dead and down trees that create the ignition base for wildfires, such wood to be moved by tractor or chipped and sold.
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