

Chapter 5

Meet the Enviro-Resourcists

I suspect that the enviro-resourcists who seem to be quietly taking over conservation neither understand our love for wild Nature nor our ethic of valuing other species for their own sakes. They simply don't get it. Or they've forgotten it. Lumping together environmentalism and conservation is a big reason for why people-oriented enviro-resourcists have been able to take over the Nature conservation movement.

Although I've coined the term and explained the concept of “enviro-resourcism,” the problems I lay at its feet have been recognized by many of my friends in the conservation movement. They've told me the stories on which I base my analysis. They've confided their worries about the direction and effectiveness of the conservation movement to me. They have encouraged me to put out this warning and to call for reform. One tough leader of a wilderness group emails me: “Currently we can barely respond to any issue without a bevy of media specialists trying to make people think of...other value[s] that in some cases [are] peripheral of what the issue really is....[In response to the Bush Administration's attacks on conservation] we have responded in a weak and technical manner, void in many cases of emotion, or more appropriately outrage....[We must] be willing to say what we believe. If we continue to move with caution we will have little left to fight for.”¹

Because of the Myth of the Environmental Movement, which lumps together conservationists and environmentalists, few have been paying attention to how human health-and-welfare-oriented enviro-resourcists have been infiltrating the Nature-first conservation movement. I use the word “infiltrating”

¹ I do not cite sources in this chapter where the author wishes to be anonymous.

advisedly. Some will take this as a slander. I don't mean it that way because I don't think the enviro-resourcists are bad people (there are some exceptions), but "infiltrate" does describe the process, if not the morality. Moreover, this infiltration of Nature-for-its-own-sake conservation by humans-first environmentalism is not always deliberate or even conscious. Some is meant to be tactical—by which I mean that they seek to protect Nature using human welfare as the overbearing argument and get further sucked down that path. In Table 5.1, I summarize the ways conservation is being changed into enviro-resourcism. The terms I use are a catchall of values, buzzwords, and characteristics, but as a whole they give a sense of how resourcism is creeping into the conservation den. Admittedly, I am defining enviro-resourcism in a big, sloppy, sprawling way in this chapter. In Table 5.2, I list some of the entities that are dragging and pushing conservation groups into enviro-resourcism. And in Table 5.3, I sum up the methods of enviro-resourcist influence.

Table 5.1

Trends in the Conservation Movement

NATURE CONSERVATION > > > > > > > > > ENVIRO-RESCOURCISM	
Nature	People
Protected Areas	Ecosystem Management
Protected Areas	Sustainable Development
Strict Protection	Resource Extraction
Vision	Compromise
Limits	Cornucopianism
Realism	Political Correctness
Challenge	Pander
Fight	Negotiate

Toughness

Softness

Mission

Organization

So, who are these enviro-resourcists reining the conservation movement? (See Table 5.2.) They include *some* staff members and board members of foundations that make grants to conservation groups. Most of these funders are members of the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA). There are also some very big individual donors who link their gifts with suggestions (wink!) for politically correct behavior. (Other individual donors are hard-core conservationists unhappy with current trends, however). Many trainers and consultants who help nonprofits with “organizational effectiveness” come from outside the conservation movement and are enviro-resourcists, as are most media consultants and pollsters.

Some leaders of big conservation groups and a growing number of professional staff members of conservation groups of all sizes are enviro-resourcists. They come to conservation groups after working for social-justice or other progressive groups. Another downside of the link of conservation to the progressive political movement is that there seems to be a revolving door policy between all manner of groups in progressivism.

Most of the supporters of conservation in politics—office-holders, candidates, staff, pollsters, media consultants, and campaign staff—are enviro-resourcists or at least are not inspired with a love for wild Nature. Many social scientists, especially anthropologists and economists in both universities and think tanks, who work on resource and poverty issues, are enviro-resourcists. These folks mostly lodge left of center. Slightly to the right on the international level, the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and other financial

institutions provide much of the push for sustainable development instead of conservation. I'll look at them more in Chapter 10 on Sustainable Development. In the United States and Canada, rural elites (county commissioners, miners, loggers, prominent ranchers, charismatic good ol' boys and gals) and sobbing "victims" pressure naive and softhearted environmentalists into enviro-resourcism. Canadian friends tell me this is a greater problem in Canada than in the States.

Table 5.2

Enviro-resourcists

Foundations and other funders
Consultants and trainers
Leaders and staff of organizations
Organization board members
Friendly politicians
Political/media consultants and pollsters
Social scientists
Corporations
Media
World Bank and other international lenders
Rural elites

Table 5.3

Methods of Enviro-Resourcist Influence

Funding and other support
Organizational effectiveness training

Media strategy
Professionalization
Lure of being a “player”
Subtle changes in language (framing)
Insistence on optimism

Many enviro-resourcists think our political stumbles and failures are caused by our upfront and unapologetic stress on biodiversity rather than on poor strategy and fierce opposition. They blame the conservation movement for failing to convince the public that there is an extinction crisis, or a climate change crisis, or sprawl...because we talk about how industrialism harms Nature instead of how it harms people' health or livelihoods. The problem, however, might just be that the public doesn't listen—or doesn't care. Blaming deep conservation values for our “failures” also overlooks the sweeping power our foes have. Given all that is arrayed against conservation, maybe we've done pretty darn well. This argument from the enviro-resourcists uncovers a deeper view--that they do not include Nature in their idea of community, as one of my friends writes.

Some types of enviro-resourcists are more important than others in pushing large and small conservation groups away from steadfast conservation. Let's look at a few of these and how they work in more detail.

FUNDERS

Foundations and wealthy donors certainly have every right to decide where their money is going and whom they are going to support. My perception, however, is that increasingly many staffers for these foundations tend to be more enviro-resourcist in values and policy than the board members or the wealthy persons behind the foundations. Today, unlike the recent past, many staffers

come from outside the conservation family; instead they have been molded in the environmental and social-change movements. For example, in 2005, the Environmental Grantmakers Association (EGA) convened several salons for their members in key cities across the United States to discuss future direction. These meetings were largely triggered by the “Death of Environmentalism” challenge. Along with Carl Pope of the Sierra Club and an urban think-tank head, I was invited to join the San Francisco Salon. A couple of dozen foundations were represented, nearly entirely by staff members. A handful of these folks were conservationists, but others seemed uninterested in biodiversity issues. In my ten minutes, I brought up the mass extinction crisis and the role of human overpopulation in causing it. Both points plopped like lead balloons. Most of the rest of the discussion to which I listened was about social issues, including personal problems foundation staffers were having. There was much more environmentalism served up with the tasty snacks and nice drinks than conservation. At the end of the evening, I offered a free copy of my book, *Rewilding North America*, to anyone who wanted one. A few folks there already had copies, but only one other person asked me for one. Some friends with ties to the foundation community in San Francisco were not surprised by my experience—nor was I. Earlier I had sent copies of *Rewilding North America* to people at more than a dozen foundations I thought would be interested. The response I got was a deafening silence. That these foundation staffers in charge of selecting conservation groups for grants were not interested in *Rewilding North America* does not mean they are bad people. Their lack of interest is merely evidence of how unconcerned some conservation-grantmaking staff now are with serious biodiversity issues. I remember a different attitude a decade ago when I spoke on the subject to another EGA meeting. Today, very few employees of the foundations that fund conservation groups have personal

experience in conservation groups or out in the wilderness (there are admirable exceptions). I tell these stories not to be catty or rude (I had a nice time in San Francisco) but to show the trend to enviro-resourcism.

Foundations also cause problems by the kinds of things they fund and don't fund and in what they expect of funded groups organizationally and stylistically. Peter Lavigne of the Rivers Foundation of the Americas and David Orr of Oberlin College recently wrote a cutting critique of what is wrong with how foundations support conservation groups: "Rethinking Green Philanthropy." They write, "Environmental giving from private foundations misses the boat when it comes to systematically addressing the major problems we face." They go on to contrast how "environmental" funders work compared to the far more effective way right-wing foundations work.² Their review has been largely ignored, despite the credibility and prominence of the authors, while the superficial and self-serving "Death of Environmentalism" has had hosannas sung to it. Lavigne and Orr highlight the following problems in how foundations fund conservation groups:

- A "myopic emphasis on project funding and on measurement of those projects. General support and infrastructure funding is nearly impossible to come by."
- The "environmental grantmaking community barely supports research and idea generation."
- They don't fund books, films, policy papers, and public speakers.
- They don't fund "people and leadership."

² Peter M. Lavigne and David W. Orr, "Rethinking Green Philanthropy," *OneNorthwest*, September 8, 2004, <http://blogs.onenw.org/onelist/001685.html#comments>.

- They don't fund systemic approaches and groups and individuals that “cross boundaries.”³

I've heard like criticisms from others knowledgeable with grantmaking institutions. I would add that many conservation grantmakers are fickle and change their priorities much too often, thus preventing the maturation of specialists and the development of long-term programs. Some also push conservation groups into more bureaucracy by requiring excessive staff in management and administrative realms. Non-profits end up with more overhead than program staff. There is a strong tendency among foundations to fund groups that behave. Roy Beck and Leon Kolankiewicz, in their piercing “The Environmental Movement's Retreat from Advocating U.S. Population Stabilization,” show that foundations became unwilling to fund serious population stabilization efforts after such became politically incorrect.⁴ (I'll go into this more in Part IV.)

One seasoned conservation leader writes me, “Foundations are not willing to invest in the long-term. Their measurements of success are formatted in a way that forces organizations to move away from campaigns that take a long time to implement. As an example, if Group X wants to get a one-million-acre reserve designated, they need the first nine years to organize and then have it designated in Year 10. Foundations want 100,000 acres a year, which may be impossible to achieve. Foundations generally lose interest in a project after two years or so and look for the next new approach.” A fundraising consultant for nonprofits tells me that “most foundations are obsessed with the need to have a measurable, tangible ‘product’ as the ‘outcome’ of their funding.” Fixation on

³ Lavigne and Orr, “Rethinking Green Philanthropy.”

⁴ Roy Beck and Leon Kolankiewicz, “The Environmental Movement's Retreat from Advocating U.S. Population Stabilization (1970-1998): A First Draft of a History,” *Journal of Policy History*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 2000, 150-151. An abridged version was reprinted in *Wild Earth*, Summer 2001, 66-67.

such “products” prevents conservation groups from doing the kind of careful, strategic, long-term work that will pay off with bigger “products” years down the pike.

I have some understanding, by the way, of how foundations work. During the early years of Doug Tompkins's Foundation for Deep Ecology, I advised on what groups should receive grants out of the wilderness and biodiversity pot. I read the grant proposals, talked to people, and then recommended who should get what out of a pile of around two hundred thousand dollars. My recommendations were nearly all followed. My long-time sidekick John Davis was later hired to do this task and he regularly queried me about grants. Thinking about how we worked, though, makes me realize how differently the Foundation for Deep Ecology operated from most foundations today—and how it was a more effective funder. John and I were both as inside conservation as insiders can be and we knew from our own hunger what folks in tiny, hard-hitting groups were facing. From those days, I also remember Peter Bahouth, who ran the Turner Environmental Foundation. He was hard-charging, passionate, and committed to both wild Nature and grassroots conservation groups. The EGA could use his leadership again today.

Trouble also comes from some who work as fundraisers for conservation groups. For example, Lawrence Noble of the Center for Responsible Politics warns, “The problem is that eventually many fundraisers come to view the issues as commodities with a monetary value separate and apart from the societal cost of the outcome.”⁵ Enviro-resourcists in such positions tend to think that way more than do Nature lovers. I think it would behoove many folks in the conservation community to sit under their favorite wilderness tree with a good

⁵ Lawrence Noble, “Dividing Citizens Lucrative for Special Interests,” *Albuquerque Journal*, November 14, 2005.

bottle of wine, and chew over that insight until the wine is gone. *The issues as commodities with a monetary value.* Think about it. Sip the wine. Watch the sun go down. Stumble home with a better outlook and a new resolve.

CONSULTANTS

A recent phenomenon in the conservation movement is the big new role of consultants and trainers for the nonprofit community. Since 1992 or so, I suppose I have been a trainer and consultant bringing conservation biology and a big, hopeful vision to conservation organizations, as have the groups I've helped found: The Wildlands Project and The Rewilding Institute. My old buddy Bart Koehler, who honed to Bowie-knife sharpness grassroots-organizing and Washington-politicking skills from his experience leading groups in Wyoming, Alaska, and Montana for decades, and several younger but similarly top-notch organizers, including Melyssa Watson and Brian O'Donnell (for whom I have unbounded respect), formed the Wilderness Support Center (WSC) out of Durango, Colorado, to work directly with state and regional wilderness groups. Rural organizing, working with members of Congress and their staffs, media relations, campaign strategy, and fundraising are the major areas where WSC staff have most helped wilderness groups. WSC, now a project of The Wilderness Society, has been essential to the revitalization of the wilderness movement and their staff is made up of unquestioned experts—and true-blue Nature lovers.

The Pew Charitable Trust funds another wilderness consulting service—the Campaign for America's Wilderness. Their staff includes legendary wilderness campaigners Doug Scott and Mike Matz. Scott is also a leading scholar of the history of the Wilderness Act and what it means.⁶

⁶ Doug Scott, *The Enduring Wilderness* (Fulcrum Publishing, Golden, CO, 2004).

Another organization that provides first-rate training is Patagonia, Yvon and Malinda Chouinard's visionary and exemplary outdoor clothing company.⁷ Patagonia gives operating grants to dozens of grassroots groups and runs a regular Tools Conference, where thirty or forty upcoming conservation leaders are given three or four days of workshops on all kinds of useful and needed topics. Patagonia also helps groups with design of printed material, T-shirts, and multimedia presentations. I've worked with them over the years—and Patagonia has long been one of my top funders.

What makes these efforts so helpful and essential is that the folks behind them come right out of the American wilderness movement; they have the lore and knowledge of the wilderness crusade and a deep love for Nature burned into their souls. And they get out into the big outside.

More recently, however, nonprofit-group consultancies, staffed by folks *usually from outside the conservation family*, have begun working with many small groups at the behest of funders. Some of their services are worthwhile and help staff, board members, and citizen volunteers sharpen fundraising, management, media, and other skills. Some work as “facilitators.” Much of the stress, however, is on “organizational effectiveness.” Of course, grassroots conservation groups need organizational management skills and need to be responsible organizations, but the drift of “organizational effectiveness” is to lift the nonprofit corporation over the cause and the movement; to sort paid staff, volunteer board members, and volunteer members and activists into walled-off separate roles; and to water down the conservation message and to steer talk away from Nature for its own sake so it will supposedly better appeal to the

⁷ Yvon Chouinard, *Let My People Go Surfing: the education of a reluctant businessman* (The Penguin Press, New York, 2005) gives an inspiring overview.

public. The health and stability of the organization becomes more important than the organization's conservation mission.

Most of the organizational-skills trainers I've encountered do not have experience with nor do they understand the particular style and history of the conservation family. In particular they don't know that citizen conservationists have played a much more central role in leadership, policy, strategy, philosophy, and so on than board members and volunteers for, say, urban soup kitchens. The thrust of training sessions stresses paid staff over volunteers. This part of the trend of professionalization is harmful to the style and character of the conservation clan.

Staff and board members from several grassroots conservation groups have griped to me how such consulting groups try to work their way into every nook and cranny of the organization. They grumble that the consultants call constantly, ask inappropriate questions, offer to help when help isn't needed or requested, and try to take control over policy. "I want to tell them, 'Don't call me, I'll call you when I need help. I know how to do my job,'" said one staffer. They bring a cookie-cutter for how conservation-group boards should be modeled after those for run-of-the-mill urban nonprofits. Such a model doesn't fit for wilderness groups. I know conservationists who have left their organizations' boards after they have become fed up with consultants. Why do groups put up with this? Well, they are sometimes required to do so by certain funders whose support is essential. I know of one wilderness group that simply rejected the draft organizational effectiveness audit such a consultant group did. I'll not go into details. In other cases, employees of such consulting/training firms get themselves on an organization's board of directors, which seems to me to be a conflict of interest.

The type of training and the outlook of trainers also draw conservation down the path of enviro-resourcism and away from Brower-like true grit. Much of the training is generic and suitable for any kind of nonprofit organizational effectiveness or policy action. It's vocational-technical, nuts and bolts. The essence and singularity of conservation is shunned: its history, lore, philosophy, and science.

Organizational and media consultants press doughty conservation groups to work with other “stakeholders” to find consensus, get along, seek common ground, and build happy rural communities. (“Stakeholders” is the bureaucratic/sociological jargon for those with an interest in any issue, hence including many opposing viewpoints.) This problem rides especially high in the campaign to fight giant energy companies looting the public lands with the connivance of the federal government. For example, the aptly named Resource Media outfit, which works with groups funded by the Rocky Mountain Energy Coalition (RMEC) to fight massive energy exploitation of the public lands, have told wilderness group leaders to cool their rhetoric lest they offend ranchers, because certain ranchers are potential allies on energy issues, even if opponents on other issues. Resource Media directs such groups not to talk about endangered species because they are controversial and may offend other opponents of drilling. This has happened in the battle over drilling on the Otero Mesa grasslands in New Mexico—conservationists were told not to talk about how Otero Mesa is valuable habitat for the very rare aplomado falcon. The media consultants also insist that the public spokespersons should be ranchers and others talking about how energy companies have ruined their property or livelihood or “way of life.” Wilderness group leaders are told to stand on the sidelines. Resource Media and RMEC work to get all groups speaking with a single voice and tone about energy issues—generally a wishy-washy, social one.

The upshot is that the frothy-mad looting of fossil fuels from the public lands is not being shown as a conservation issue so much as an environmental and social one.

I fear some groups are not so independent anymore, as they become increasingly dependent on the funding that comes with being part of the team. Fortunately in New Mexico, straight-shooting hunters and uncowed conservationists don't bow to the party line and keep wildlife and wilderness front and center in the energy campaign.

These consultants and trainers are not bad people, but I don't think they understand how the wilderness family is special, nor do I think that they have the fire in the belly for the intrinsic value of wild Nature that we do. They can be helpful, but their work should be tightly boxed in.

There is a deeper problem with the whole consultant presence in society today. Conservation groups generally lag politicians and industry in fads and trends such as consultants. There is now sweeping awareness that just as for the money-chase, reliance on political consultants is a huge part of the problem with politics and governance today. Political writers seem to consider themselves far cleverer than anyone else, and Joe Klein of *Time* is no exception. Nonetheless, his April 16, 2006, column in *Time* should be required reading for anyone interested in the health and integrity of the conservation community and the conservation institutions that partly make it up. His title is, "*Pssst! Who's Behind The Decline Of Politics? [Consultants.]*" The front-page pull-quote reads, "Consultants have drained a good deal of the life from our democracy...Specialists in caution, they fear anything they haven't tested." In this case, his analysis is wise rather than just clever. He warns the Democrats that "there is a demand for leadership, as opposed to the regurgitation of

carefully massaged nostrums.”⁸ Now, the consultants, media-spinners, pollsters, and marketers who work for conservation and environmental groups are better people than the hacks running political campaigns, but much of what Klein lays on political operatives applies very well to what is wrong with the conservation and environmental movements. Klein's article and the book from which it is adapted should be read and chewed on by conservation leaders lest we become ever more prisoners of hesitation and caution like John Kerry.⁹

STAFF

When my Wilderness Society-Friends of the Earth-Sierra Club friends and I started Earth First in 1980, we did so partly because of the growing “professionalization” in conservation groups. A few years later, I wrote an article on such dangers, which was then included in my 1991 book, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior* (see Table 5.4). In the decades since, the problem of professionalization has gotten even worse than what I hit then. Today there is a pool of liberal or leftist professionals who work for progressive nonprofits, including conservation and environmental groups. They bring their people-oriented worldview and interests to new jobs with conservation nonprofits and to foundations that fund conservation groups. They bring their notions of what is possible and practical from their political work with the Democratic Party or progressive movement. Many simply don't “get” wilderness and the wild. Of course, there are exceptions to the trends in Table 5.4. There are still some great hellions for wilderness working for groups big and little.

⁸ Joe Klein, “Pssst! Who's Behind The Decline Of Politics? [Consultants.]”, *Time*, April 17, 2006.

⁹ Joe Klein, *Politics Lost* (Doubleday Broadway Publishing Group, New York, 2006).

Table 5.4

Problems of Professionalization in Conservation Groups

- Many of the people who work for [conservation] groups today are not conservationists but technicians
 - Until the mid-1970s, the route to a job with a [conservation] group was by proving oneself first as a volunteer
 - Conservation groups look for potential employees who will fit smoothly into the cubbyholes of their particular organization
 - Fewer and fewer staff members of conservation groups are outdoorspersons
 - Staff members of conservation groups today often are career-oriented
 - Many people working for [conservation] groups today have a higher loyalty to the political process than to conservation
 - The viability of the group itself has become more important than the conservation mission of the group
 - Efficient operation has become the main concern of [conservation] groups [rather than effectiveness]
 - Professional staff are frequently unfamiliar [and uninterested] with the intellectual discussions going on in the movement
 - There is a growing breach between grassroots volunteer activists and professionals

Quoted from *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*, 1991.¹⁰ Additions are bracketed.

¹⁰ Dave Foreman, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior* (Harmony/Crown, NY, 1991), 201-207.

Top staff of big conservation groups nowadays often have less of a conservation commitment than the members—and the public face of the group. Some leaders have moved away from a conservation viewpoint to jump into the larger political world of progressivism and the Democratic Party. Conservation and environmentalism have become too small of a pond for them. Even if they once were Nature conservationists, they have become more enviro-resourcist as they have leapt into the bigger puddle. Others have never been conservationists but were always environmentalists. As their organizations have moved to work partly on public lands and wildlife issues, they have kept their environmentalist outlook and value system. Other groups have hired high-powered individuals from outside the conservation movement for decision-making and policy-setting staff, and these folks have a resourcist outlook and are trained to cut deals and compromise. Oftentimes they are hired for their fundraising skills. Finally, conservation and environmental groups were a place to find jobs for many Clinton administration staffers after the election of Bush Junior in 2000 and for congressional staffers with the defeat of more Democrats. Some of these folks fit in and have been useful, others, however, are part of the problem I am talking about.

Now, through the influence of funders and consultants, we are seeing folks from outside hired to run grassroots conservation groups (there are notable exceptions!). Too many executive directors of local, state, and regional groups now have some experience in management and fundraising from other social-change groups but lack the fire in the belly for wilderness—believe me, I know from assessing and interviewing candidates for executive director positions for several groups I've worked with. Quite a few, I fear, are not even part of Leopold's tribe of those who cannot live without wild things. Such executive directors, however, direct policy and public relations for their groups because of

their positions. Biocentric conservation gets shoved aside for enviro-resourcism. Not only do such group directors work with enviro-resourcists in foundations, consulting groups, and in politics, they play musical chairs in employment between them. Wilderness old-timers have also told me stories on which I base this charge.

Unfortunately, under the goad of organizational effectiveness, we see the same trends in how members of boards of directors of small wilderness and wildlife groups are selected. A long-time western wilderness campaigner tells me that the board of the wilderness group he founded is shifting to folks with no wilderness background or passion. We hear from our funders and consultants that our boards need to be diverse and should have slots for the wealthy, even if such folks don't have fire in the belly (some do and are great board members). Sooner or later, conservation group boards get watered down to resemble nonprofit community boards. Steve Capra, the sturdy executive director of the New Mexico Wilderness Alliance, brags about his board of directors: "Other boards want to play it safe—unlike the NMWA board." He looks nervously at the boards of similar groups that rein-in the executive director and staff. The Alliance has quite a diverse board, but all are deeply committed to wilderness conservation. We push Steve and the staff to be tough and they are happy to be pushed.

One of the reasons for the milquetoast messages from conservation group staff is that fewer and fewer of them know wilderness. One of the best of the Washington, D.C., conservationists writes me, "Even within the conservation movement there are too few people, including those in leadership positions, who come from the ranks of avid backpackers, river runners, horsepackers, hunters, anglers, backcountry skiers, etc. And it is my opinion that it has begun to show. 'Just knowing that it's there....' does not form the foundation of a strong

movement. A commitment to 'progressive politics' doesn't either. Direct experience and knowledge of the wild does."

I'm looking at a multipage advertisement for *Backpacker* magazine. One page reads, "Our editors log hundreds of days on the trail each year furiously testing the latest gear in the most adverse weather and trail conditions." I'd like to see membership and donation pitches from conservation groups reading, "Our staff and board members log hundreds of days on the trail each year seeking the wisdom and inspiration of the wilderness in the most adverse weather and trail conditions."

Now, if you've felt yourself grinding your teeth and bristling your neck hairs while you've read the above, thinking that I'm unfairly tarring parts of the conservation movement and putting down lots of good, hard-working conservationists, relax. Remember that I am talking about trends, and some not all. There are boatloads of exceptions.

The social-change, enviro-resourcist influence on the conservation movement pressures conservationists to pander to nonconservation publics, to emphasize the value of conservation for people, to shy away from talking about Nature for its own sake. In general, the messages being pushed by enviro-resourcists are:

- Talk about people and their concerns
- Downplay Nature for its own sake
- Wilderness areas attract economic growth in adjacent counties
- Nature provides "ecosystem services," such as clean water
- Doom and gloom must be avoided—Cassandra should be retired
- Ignore biology
- Don't worry; be happy

Clearly, some of these messages can be useful in furthering conservation goals. But if used alone without acknowledging that we need to protect Nature for its own sake, they are harmful. I will further discuss the problems of emphasizing utilitarian arguments for conservation in Chapter 18.