

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1998

Grassroots of the Desert: An Analysis of the Roles of the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance in the Debate over Wilderness Designation of Bureau of Land Management Lands in Southern Utah

Amy E. Brennan
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Forest Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brennan, Amy E., "Grassroots of the Desert: An Analysis of the Roles of the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance in the Debate over Wilderness Designation of Bureau of Land Management Lands in Southern Utah" (1998). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6557.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6557>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



GRASSROOTS OF THE DESERT: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLES OF THE
UTAH WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION AND THE SOUTHERN UTAH
WILDERNESS ALLIANCE IN THE DEBATE OVER WILDERNESS
DESIGNATION OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
LANDS IN SOUTHERN UTAH

by

Amy E. Brennan

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Forest Resources

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1998

Copyright © Amy E. Brennan 1998

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Grassroots of the Desert: The Roles of the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance in the Debate over Wilderness Designation of Bureau of Land Management Lands in Southern Utah

by

Amy E. Brennan, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1998

Major Professor: Dr. Joanna Endter-Wada
Department: Forest Resources

The battle over federal Wilderness¹ designation of Bureau of Land Management lands in southern Utah has entered its third decade. Throughout this lengthy debate numerous stakeholders have maintained involvement, including members of Utah's conservation community. Two of the most prominent wilderness advocacy groups in Utah are notable not only for their sustained involvement with the issue, but also for their divergent positions on how to resolve this public land dispute. This research examines those two organizations, the Utah Wilderness Association and the

¹ A concerted effort is made throughout this text to distinguish between Wilderness, the Congressionally-mandated entity, and wilderness, a general interpretation of the quality of a landscape.

Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, through an analysis of their respective structural, organizational, philosophical, and tactical perspectives.

Ultimately, the background of each organization's leadership, their organizational structures, their ability to mobilize resources, and their distinctive wilderness philosophies offer an understanding of how each organization perceived its mission and its ability to provide a construct for resolution of the Utah Wilderness debate.

(205 pages)

DEDICATION

For Granny and Pop,

for instilling in me a love and respect for Nature.

and

For Wister,

the little canine who entered my life just as this project began.

You are one of the Earth's most beautiful creatures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude to all of my committee members, Drs. Joanna Endter-Wada, James J. Kennedy, and Lori Hunter. Their support and assistance were critical to the development and completion of this project. Furthermore, the input, insight, and inspiration offered by all of the interviewees are what truly made this work possible. I thank each of them for all that they have contributed to this document.

I also extend my love and appreciation to my family and friends for all that they have done in shaping my ability to pursue my dreams. Their support and encouragement have been powerfully present throughout this work.

Finally, I offer my thanks to all the spirited peoples fighting for wilderness---without each of them this paper would have no meaning.

Amy E. Brennan

PREFACE

As I reentered academia in October 1996 to pursue a master's degree at Utah State University, I hastily tried to familiarize myself with the campus and the culture. Having just spent two years exploring the Tetons and Jackson Hole, Wyoming, I felt most comfortable as I made my way to the Outdoor Recreation Center (ORC). As I walked toward the doors of the ORC, I was greeted by a blaze yellow poster, plastered with bold black symbols spelling out, "5.7 *Wild* UTAH." It was a striking image, but I had not a clue what it meant. Accepting my naiveté, I posed this question to one of the workers at the ORC, "So what does that sign mean, anyway?" He replied that it was about wilderness, Utah wilderness--the designation of lands in the southern Utah redrock country.

There it was, the answer. Well, not exactly. "5.7 *Wild* UTAH" is about wilderness in southern Utah, but it is also about the people who are fighting for the protection of this land. Controversy over the issue is intense, the land is vast, and the people fighting for designation are numerous. In the spirit of public lands protection we owe much to those who laid out a vision of natural space for posterity. With continued energy and fortitude, the visions of early conservationists, now posthumously referenced, carry forth.

It is with a degree of irony that I think back to my initial exposure to the Wilderness debate in Utah, based on an encounter with a blaze yellow poster. Today, my understanding has been enhanced through some

tremendous encounters with the land and with the people who desire to protect it. In addition, I have a keen interest in the overall environmental movement and the roles of conservation groups in facilitating social and political transformations. Graduate coursework allowed me to examine these issues to a limited extent. However, through this thesis research more in-depth explorations and discoveries were made.

Before continuing, it is essential that I present my personal research disclaimer. Although I never attained membership status with the Utah Wilderness Association, nor am I presently a formal affiliate of the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, it is important that readers and examiners of this document understand that I am not an entirely dispassionate observer of this very significant battle for Wilderness in southern Utah. I offer this bias to you early and forthrightly. It was my privilege and my desire to have the opportunity to interact with and to study the organizations and people whose passions for places and concerns for the future of all things wild connected with my own sense of place and affinity for nature. With that point made, I offer to you a very poignant history, a portrait of environmental leadership in Utah, and a potential prognosis for the future of Bureau of Land Management Wilderness in this state.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	45
IV. WILDERNESS IN UTAH.....	62
V. UTAH WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION	80
VI. SOUTHERN UTAH WILDERNESS ALLIANCE	100
VII. AN ANALYSIS OF WILDERNESS ADVOCACY IN UTAH.....	119
VIII. CONCLUSION	143
REFERENCES	153
APPENDICES.....	164
APPENDIX A. LIST OF PRIMARY DATA SOURCES	165
APPENDIX B. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES.....	171
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEWEE CORRESPONDENCE.....	173
APPENDIX D. INTERVIEW PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS.....	177
APPENDIX E. UTAH WILDERNESS CHRONOLOGY.....	189

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Profile of UWA and SUWA leaders	57
2	Organizational and structural dichotomies of UWA and SUWA	121
3	Ideological and philosophical dichotomies of UWA and SUWA	129
4	Organizational perspectives of UWA and SUWA on the Utah BLM Wilderness debate	133

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The battle over federal Wilderness designation in Utah has entered its third decade. Throughout the processes of inventorying, proposing, and designating regions of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands as Wilderness, numerous environmental groups and conservation organizations have taken an active role in support of protecting the wildlands of Utah's desert regions. This thesis will examine two prominent conservation groups, tracing their leadership, involvement, inceptions, positions, and visions for the future of Wilderness in the state of Utah. The Utah Wilderness Association (UWA) and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) have been selected for examination based on their dominant roles and their very distinct approaches for advocating the protection of Utah Wilderness. A comparative analysis depicting the structural, philosophical, and tactical differences between these two organizations is offered as a means to further understand the intractability of the BLM Wilderness debate and to examine a portion of Utah's conservation community.

Focus and Purpose of Study

The major focus of this research is to examine reasons why the two most prominent environmental groups advocating Wilderness designation on Utah BLM lands chose such different approaches in working toward the

attainment of its official designation in southern Utah. Given the tenacity of state anti-environmental and anti-Wilderness forces, it appears that cohesion among all pro-Wilderness groups would be essential. Thus, the major research question to be addressed in this work is:

Why have the two most prominent wilderness advocacy groups in the state of Utah, the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, taken such divergent positions and advocated different strategies for resolving the debate over Wilderness designation of Bureau of Land Management lands in southern Utah?

The following related research questions are also addressed:

1. What were the factors leading to the formation of each organization?
2. How can we characterize their leadership?
3. How has each organization assessed the national, state, and local political landscapes in relation to this issue?
4. How are the missions of each organization defined and translated into particular strategies employed?
5. What were the factors that led to the major schism between UWA and SUWA in their approaches and tactics to Utah Wilderness designation?
6. What is and has been the role of conservation-environmental organizations in setting the agenda for the way Wilderness may be designated in Utah?

The major research expectation is:

Based on the backgrounds of their leadership, their organizational structures, their ability to mobilize resources, and their distinct wilderness philosophies, the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance advocate different positions and utilize different strategies for attaining federally-designated Wilderness for the Bureau of Land Management lands of southern Utah.

Finally, the primary research objectives are as follows:

1. To trace the roles, tactics, and trends of UWA and SUWA throughout their organizational histories, paying specific attention to their commonalities and differences.
2. To explore the personal histories of some of the key leaders and strategists of UWA and SUWA.
3. To examine UWA's and SUWA's philosophical viewpoints on wilderness.
4. To provide an understanding of how each group read the political landscape, assessed the anti-Wilderness forces, and interpreted their own abilities throughout the debate over Wilderness designation of Utah BLM lands.

Contributions of Study

By presenting the organizational histories and the structural and philosophical differences between UWA and SUWA, this research will provide an examination of the BLM Wilderness debate in Utah.

Furthermore, due to the nature of most non-profit organizations, there is often little time and few resources with which to examine the organization itself. Given the complexity of the issue and the exhaustive struggles to attain Congressionally-designated Wilderness protection for these lands, the people fighting for Wilderness within these organizations have probably not had sufficient time to reflect on their own organizational histories. Important insights can be gleaned from an understanding of the historical underpinnings of each organization and their interactions with each other. Therefore, one of the critical contributions of this study will be to present these histories and to provide an analysis of the commonalties and diversity within Utah's environmental community, specifically as it pertains to SUWA and UWA.

Outline of Study

Chapter II provides a review of the literature. Understanding the Utah Wilderness issue requires knowledge of the BLM and the legislation that officially recognizes Wilderness as one of this agency's management directives, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976. To further explore the idea of wilderness, it is beneficial to examine wilderness

philosophies and the leaders who espoused them. Furthermore, given that the emphasis is on Utah wilderness, it is also helpful to contrast Utah's Wilderness designation quandary with that of other states, namely Alaska, Arizona, and California. A more recent and significant development in Utah public lands debates concerns the designation of the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument and its Wilderness impacts. Another vital aspect to providing a context for this battle is to understand the impacts of Western regional cultural values on land use and protection. A background of the environmental movement is offered, as well as insight into the greater array of grassroots and national environmental organizations, with a focus on their leadership. It is useful to analyze UWA and SUWA in the framework of social movement theory and resource mobilization by organizations. Finally, literature is reviewed that offers a context for understanding how organizations such as UWA and SUWA contribute to policy formation, through an analysis of policy theory.

The research design, methodology, and protocol are provided in Chapter III to substantiate the validity of the research and the subsequent theories and understandings provided further in this text. This chapter also offers a profile of the overall process for conducting the key informant interviews.

Chapter IV provides an overview of the Utah BLM Wilderness issue by chronicling the circumstances of the inventory process from inception to the present day. Here, specific attention is paid to the legislative and litigative

elements that have framed the debate. This chapter also provides a timeline containing key state and federal actions, along with dates pertinent to both UWA and SUWA. This chronology offers an overall construct for temporal understanding of the progression of the Utah BLM Wilderness battle.

Chapter V specifically focuses on UWA's organizational inception, structure, and philosophy. It provides both a history and a context for understanding the tactical approaches of this group. Similarly, Chapter VI explores the same aspects of SUWA.

Chapter VII provides an analysis of the key informant responses integrated with other sources of primary data. A thorough overview of the distinct structural, philosophical, and tactical differences between each group is presented. Contrasts and similarities in terms of how each group exercised environmental leadership are also explored based on data from interviews with individual leaders of each organization.

Chapter VIII presents suggestions for further analysis of the BLM Wilderness debate and of UWA and SUWA. Finally, conclusions are drawn about the roles of UWA and SUWA in the BLM Wilderness battle and the implications for the future of this yet unresolved land dispute.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an overview of areas of greatest pertinence to framing an understanding of wilderness, from both legislative and philosophical standpoints. Furthermore, it highlights some of the history of the BLM and its corresponding organic decree, thereby offering background on the authority this agency was given to address the issue of Wilderness designation in southern Utah. The BLM has its own distinctive culture and history. Likewise, the western United States and particularly the state of Utah are distinct. This literature review will highlight some Western perceptions of public lands and the desert landscape.

In addition to providing an understanding of the laws, agency, and the lands under discussion, it is critical to this research to have a working understanding of the people and organizations responsible for advocating protection of the land. Subsequent chapters will focus exclusively on the groups under consideration in this study, UWA and SUWA. To provide a more complete context for evaluation, a brief background of the environmental movement and the role of social movement organizations in it, especially as they pertain to the policy process, will be presented. Since this research involves significant contact with the leadership of each organization, it is informative to highlight characteristics of environmental leaders as well.

It is also important to this discussion to offer analyses of other states' Wilderness battles in contrast to the debate in Utah. There also exists a small, but growing, body of literature that emphasizes collaborative, community-centered efforts as a means of creating workable and sustainable outcomes to controversies over public lands. This literature is noted in this review, but will ultimately be the focal point of later discussions. It is hoped that the following perusal of the literature will offer readers a context for understanding the history presented in this thesis and the arguments put forth.

The Concepts of Wilderness and *wilderness*

Congressionally-mandated Wilderness has been part of public land law since September 1964, with the passage of the Wilderness Act. This piece of legislation established a National Wilderness Preservation System "in order to assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition" (Wilderness Act of 1964). The Wilderness Act went through 66 iterations, accumulated 16,000 pages of testimony, and had a series of 18 public hearings from the time that Senator Hubert Humphrey introduced the bill in 1957, until its passage in 1964 (Petulla 1980; Zakin 1993; Matz 1994b; Rousch 1994). Allin (1982) notes that cooperation and communication among preservationist groups was key

to the success of the Wilderness bill. Although it was an impressive and sweeping law, it included only federal lands managed by the National Park Service, National Forest Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and excluded lands administered by the BLM, the agency responsible for overseeing more land than any other land management agency in the United States (DiSilvestro 1993).

It took over eight years of thoughtful re-writes by Howard Zahniser and others to create the Wilderness Act, however concepts of wilderness were well-formulated prior to the 1960s. Pepper (1996) and Oelschlaeger (1991) both provide a deep and comprehensive view of nature and humankind's relationship to it, spanning from the Paleolithic period through the 20th century. Pepper (1996, 3) discusses the multiple political ideological dimensions of wilderness and notes that there is "no one, objective, monolithic truth about society-nature/environment relationships." For both Nash (1982) and Pepper (1996), wilderness is seen as a place of dynamic, violent, disruptive, and fiercely competitive forces as well as a place of balance, harmony, and order. Nash (1982) also contends that wilderness was the basic ingredient of civilization, for from the raw materials of the physical wilderness Americans built a civilization.

Casey (1995) offers insight into the ecological philosophies of Henry David Thoreau, Aldo Leopold, and Wendell Berry. The biographies and visions of wilderness set forth by Bob Marshall, John Muir, Sigurd Olson, Calvin Rutstrum, Robert Service, and Henry David Thoreau are outlined by

Vickery (1986). These individuals are responsible for many ideas seminal to the Wilderness preservation movement. Fox (1985) also offers a deeper look at Muir's connections with the land and his personal wilderness philosophy. For both John Muir and Bob Marshall their philosophies guided two of the most renowned conservation organizations still active today, the Sierra Club and The Wilderness Society, respectively. These "wilderness visionaries," as Vickery (1986, ix) classifies them, each developed powerful connections with the natural world, acknowledging the ecological, aesthetic, and spiritual values found in connecting, experiencing, and knowing a landscape and the processes occurring within it.

Visions of wilderness by more contemporary writers are based upon its power as a place. Williams (1996, 120) states, "[W]ilderness is not a belief or a dogma. It is a place." Williams further refers to this place as "where you can find your wild heart again" (Glick 1995b, 15). Contrary to this enduring notion, Cronon (1996) offers the theory that wilderness is merely a cultural construction. He argues that there is nothing natural about the concept of wilderness. Tucker (1982), who defines environmentalism as the "politics of the aristocracy," sees wilderness areas as essentially parks for the upper-middle class. He views Wilderness designation as a way of sequestering land for the enjoyment of a small minority who can afford the wilderness experience (Rubin 1994). Finally, the literal definition of wilderness, given its etymological roots as "wild-deor-ness," refers to the place of wild beasts (Nash 1982, 2).

Grumbine (1994) and Turner (1996) attempt to delineate the tension between wilderness and wildness. Turner (1996) presents the tension as one of seeing wilderness as a property and wildness as a quality. Turner's concept of these distinctive terms partially evolved in relation to his understanding of the heavily quoted phrase from Henry David Thoreau's essay, "Walking," which reads: "In Wildness is the preservation of the world."

Baldwin (1972) comments that wilderness is an elusive and ambiguous term, not easily defined. Grumbine (1994, 227) indicates that "ideas and images of wilderness in North America appear to be evolving toward some yet unknown configuration." The concept of ever-evolving wilderness ideas is essential to the ensuing discussion, and it involves the acceptance of multiple wilderness philosophies (Weingart 1985). Continuing to formulate our own connections or perceptions of wilderness is critical to enhanced personal understandings of wilderness and land protection. However, in terms of defining wilderness politically and legally, it seems that the Wilderness Act is our strongest and most accepted attempt yet.

The above overview of wilderness definitions offers a foundation for a theme that will be carried throughout this document. The theme is simply that there are multiple viewpoints on what wilderness is. The Wilderness Act offers some cohesiveness in defining such a place; however, it must be acknowledged that the values affiliated with these landscapes are very powerful and very individual.

Bureau of Land Management

The acronym BLM is often pejoratively quipped as meaning the Bureau of Livestock and Mining. This federal land management agency received its organic act, a mandate for managing its lands for multiple use and for assessing the Wilderness qualities of those lands, over a decade after the Wilderness Act was enacted (DiSilvestro 1993). President Truman created the BLM, which was formed in 1946 through an executive decree merging the General Land Office and the U.S. Grazing Service, making it widely viewed as an agency highly permissive toward miners and ranchers, its chief constituency groups (Haverfield 1976; Drabelle 1978; Kraft 1996). Sabatier (1975) provides a framework for understanding "cliente capture" by examining the technical, legal, and political resources within the sphere of regulatory agencies, including the BLM. Clarke and McCool (1985) illustrate that each agency has its own distinctive origins, characteristics, constituencies and decision-making styles.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 did not provide directives for the BLM, but in the same year the Classification and Multiple Use Act mandated that the BLM classify all its lands either for disposal to private ownership or for interim public holding, explicitly recognizing wilderness protection as a valid reason for federal retention (Foster 1976). The Classification and Multiple Use Act placed emphasis on primitive area designation for recreation purposes, but not for wilderness preservation exclusively (Foster 1976). The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 "formally ended the 200 year old

policy of disposing of the public domain, repealed more than 2,000 antiquated public land laws, amended the 1934 Taylor Grazing Act, and mandated wilderness reviews for all roadless BLM lands with wilderness characteristics," giving the BLM full multiple-use authority (Kraft 1996, 141).

Of high significance to wilderness conservationists, Section 603 of the FLPMA directed the BLM to assess its lands for Wilderness potential and to manage Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) in the interim at a level that would protect the wilderness values of the land (Shanks 1978). The shifts in the BLM's management directives and duties were substantial, but meeting the demands of a thorough Wilderness review required not only a change in agency mindset, but also an increase in staff and funding. In 1976 the BLM had 470 million acres of land under its jurisdiction and in need of assessment, but only 17 new staff were hired to assist in meeting the needs of BLM's new mandates (Shanks 1978). Nearly two decades later, after a series of land disposals and transfers, approximately 177 million acres of the 272 million acres managed by the BLM are in the 10 western states---Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming, with about 40% of Utah's land area under the agency's jurisdiction (DiSilvestro 1993; Kriz 1996).

The Desert Lands and Western Orientation

BLM lands in the Western United States may largely be typified as desert, given their significant aridity. The uniqueness of the desert landscape

replete with cliffs, canyons, buttes, arches, and mesas may dutifully be qualified as Wilderness given the Congressional definition:

[An] area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and confined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. (Wilderness Act of 1964; see Appendix A)

But, perceptively, the lack of vast and dense forests and high alpine lakes, also considered "rock and ice" areas, makes the desert regions less familiar as a Wilderness landscape, though no less deserving. The belated entry of the BLM into Wilderness management may very well be due to the perception of its lands as "wastelands" (Lambert 1974; Allin 1982; Reisner, 1986; Stegner 1994; Zwinger 1996). Furthermore, the long history of unfettered and substantially subsidized use of public lands may have created the expectation that such benefits would continue indefinitely (Kraft 1996).

Kemmis (1998, 4) asserts that in the Rocky Mountain West, more than any other region of the country, all politics are fundamentally "geopolitics." Perceptions of the desert landscape have certainly shaped the agency's relation to the land and the public's notion of wilderness, but the debate over Wilderness in the West is also significantly shaped by Westerner's attitudes toward the federal government. Given that so much of the West is in federal

ownership, including over two-thirds of Utah's lands, there exists some hostility toward increased federal authority and intervention (Zwinger 1996). Wilderness designation is commonly seen as a "locking up" of the land, preventing significant use possibilities and development potentials. There are some exclusions to the types of activities permissible on these lands, but acceptable uses include grazing, mining (based on pre-existing claims), and a variety of recreational activities.

The animosity toward government control and deeply entrenched sentiments for private property rights and access to public lands and resources (e.g., mineral deposits, forests, rangelands, and rivers) set the foundation for the Sagebrush Rebellion and subsequent proliferation of Wise Use groups throughout the West (Kaufman 1994; Brick 1995). Matheson (1986) notes that, in general, the public attitude in Utah seemed to support the Sagebrush Rebellion concept. In public lands states, the Wise Use contingency can be a powerful voice, as noted by Helvarg (1994, 10), "In the West, Wise Use has been primarily about protecting industrial and agricultural access to public lands and waters at below-market costs, with the primary emphasis on timber, mining, and grazing."

In Utah, thousands of years of geologic processes have given the land structural definition and the status of being an internationally unique landscape. But aside from open space articulated with water-carved and wind-sculpted formations, the desert regions of Utah also harbor extensive discovered and potential oil and gas fields, uranium-bearing rocks, and low

sulfur-producing coal seams (Carter 1992). These resources may be abundant throughout particular areas within the Colorado Plateau, but accessing them can be ecologically destructive, and presently may not be economically viable. However, it is the hope of many communities adjacent to Wilderness Study Areas and of developers that economic gains will one day be reaped in these regions. Wilderness designation is considered one of the greatest impediments to potential financial rewards by many residents of these communities. Furthermore, when assessing the political intransigence of many public lands battles in the West, records of the Federal Election Commission show that many Western congressional representatives are heavily financed by campaign money from oil and gas corporations, mining and logging entities, developers, and agricultural growers (Lacayo 1995).

Some national studies of environmental attitudes indicate a stronger level of interest in resource preservation in the West as compared with other regions of the country (Hays 1991). The attitudes and culture of Westerners are often regionally generalized and stereotyped, but Utah must also be looked at separately, for its religious foundations offer some insight into the land ethics of this state. Flores (1985, 174) argues:

Early Mormonism, it is clear, did possess the democratic and communal impulses valued by environmentalists and the centralization and support necessary to carry out a land ethic agricultural program, even while "remaking" the Wasatch Front.

Alternatively, Donald Snow (1980, 5) suggests that "in the [modern] Mormon mind the earth as we know it is a temporary state of affairs, soon to be

cleansed 'in the twinkling of an eye' by the redeemer." Mormonism represents the dominant religious paradigm in Utah and has shaped the landscape orientations of the majority of the citizenry, yet many current researchers indicate that Utah and the West are experiencing expanded urbanization and an influx of "lifestyle refugees" and, consequently, a political transformation (Kraft 1996, 134). Some authors argue that the new migrants have created a more environmentally-oriented electorate and created a new regional environmental movement that has more vigorously challenged the previously dominant commodity-based economic orientation (Hays 1991; Kraft 1996). Hays (1991, 238) has deemed this the "new environmental West" as a result of the changing demography, although a caveat must be inserted, for a stronger and broader environmental ethos does not necessarily translate into Wilderness support.

Freudenburg's (1991) work examines rural and urban differences in environmental concern, noting that farmers and ranchers have higher levels of environmental concerns relative to other rural residents. Wilderness areas in Utah would be adjacent to rural communities, but the population of this state is considerably urban. Studies like Freudenburg's may be helpful for understanding the attitudes and concerns of some Utahns based on the rural-urban dichotomy within the state. Rudzitis and Johansen (1989) present findings from a national study that focus on the concerns, attitudes, and orientations of newcomers and long-term residents in Wilderness counties (i.e., counties that contain or are adjacent to federally- designated Wilderness).

They suggest that Wilderness designation is important in the migration decisions of newcomers, and in the livelihood of long-term residents.

The Environmental Movement

According to Nash (1965, x), "in the closing decades of the nineteenth century the appreciation of wilderness, which was previously confined to a small group of intellectuals, broadened to include increasing numbers of American people." Modavi (1991) characterizes the emergence of the conservation movement from the 1870s to the 1970s, noting that the early to mid-nineteenth century movement was largely an unorganized amalgamation of artists, poets, philosophers, writers, and naturalists. The early social movement concerning wilderness was heavily characterized by two main strains of thought, conservationism or wise-use and preservationism (Albrecht 1976; Adler 1995). The dominance of these ideologies as paradigms for assessing humans' relationship to the land and natural resources continued for many decades. Initially, conservation¹ connoted a philosophy of wise resource use, often couched in Gifford Pinchot's phrase, "the greatest good for the greatest number." Alternatively, preservationism refers to a philosophy that advocates the protection of wildlands in, or near, their natural state for their own sake.

¹ Today, the term conservation is not so strictly defined within the movement and is used as an enveloping term to refer to the organizations espousing land protection and ecological health. Throughout this text all references made to conservation should be interpreted as the broader definition provided here.

Rapid population growth, urbanization, enhanced scientific knowledge, increased industrialization, heightened threats of the nuclear age, significant increases in outdoor recreation, and other post-WWII changes set the stage for another context for viewing this relationship. The earlier paradigms of conservationism and preservationism coalesced and expanded into new areas of environmental concern, heavily focused on threats to the quality of human life, leading to a new term---environmentalism (Dubasek 1990; Dunlap and Mertig 1992). Under the environmental rubric fall a number of discourses or more philosophically-honed orientations to the natural world, including: deep ecology, political ecology, ecofeminism, conservationism, preservationism, biocentrism, and ecocentrism (Oelschlaeger 1991; Brulle 1996).

The original publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962, which brought wide public attention to the consequences of pesticide proliferation on humans and its impacts on the health of the natural environment, helped lead to the birth of the modern environmental movement (Paehlke 1989; Dowie 1995). Dowie (1995, 1) attributes Carson with bringing the word environment, "an all-inclusive category comprised of both human and natural habitats," into common usage.

Mitchell et al. (1992) characterize the movement by first- and second-generation issues. They delineate first-generation issues as involving threats to particular areas or species, and second-generation issues as involving consequences that may be delayed or subtle and their causes difficult to prove.

Because of the preceding distinction, some people cite the conception of the Environmental Defense Fund as the critical, yet arbitrary, demarcation for the birth of environmentalism (Dunlap and Mertig 1992). The Environmental Defense Fund, at the time of its founding, was a membership organization dominated by scientists and active in litigation (Mitchell et al. 1992).

Many environmental historians argue that the first annual Earth Day, April 22, 1970, epitomizes the onset of a new orientation in our relation with the environment by broadening the spectrum of issues typically addressed by conservationists and popularizing the movement, which led to great increases in the support base of environmental groups and the creation of more organizations (Paehlke 1989; Vig and Kraft 1990; Dunlap and Mertig 1992; Shabecoff 1993; Zakin 1993). Hays (1985) considers Earth Day as much a result as a cause, for it served as an acknowledgment of years of conservation concern and a symbol of credibility for the growing environmental movement. Gottlieb (1993b, 1995) cautions that although Earth Day may be a convenient historical marker between the earlier conservation epoch, where debates took place over forest lands, national parks, recreation resources, and resource development, and the current environmental era where environmental hazards and pollution dominate contemporary policy agendas, it creates an historical divide, which disguises a crucial connection between pollution and the loss of wilderness. For example, Paehlke (1989) suggests that the onset of environmentalism forced wilderness to take a subordinate position in the spectrum of ecological concern. "The new

concern about pollution was immediate, basic, urban; it even crossed class boundaries. Not everyone has the time to appreciate wilderness, nature-at-a-distance. But, everyone eats, drinks, and breathes" (Paehlke 1989, 21). Hays (1985), however, argues that wilderness was an enduring and fundamental issue throughout the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, sustaining interest and prompting membership growth in the largest environmental organizations. Dowie (1995, 174) asserts that traditional environmentalists need to broaden their concept of environment beyond wilderness and aesthetics to include "the place you live, the place you work, the place you play," often the phrase used by environmentalists of color and environmental justice advocates.

In summary, after WWII there was diversification within the conservation-environmental movement and a rise in the number and types of people acknowledging that the natural environment is worth protecting. The stages of modern environmentalism have primarily been dictated by the socioeconomic climate of the times, promoting waves of growth and stagnation. Following a lull of involvement in the 1970s, heavily related to the energy crisis, the 1980s represented a period of revitalization for the movement, often considered a knee-jerk reaction to the conservative agenda of the Ronald Reagan administration and Interior Secretary James Watt. Dunlap and Mertig (1992) cite other reasons for the resurgence of environmentalism in the 1980s, including an awareness of new environmental problems, increasing threats of old problems, and the institutionalization of environmental science within academia, government

and churches, all of which granted increasing saliency to the decline in environmental quality and associated health risks.

Downs' (1972) theory of the "issue-attention cycle" is often referenced in connection with environmental issues. The dynamics of the cycle consist of five stages: (1) pre-problem; (2) alarmed discovery and euphoric enthusiasm; (3) realizing the cost of significant progress; (4) gradual decline of intense public interest; and (5) the post-problem. The applicability of the issue-attention cycle to specific environmental problems may very well be functional, but it is doubtful that the environmental movement will advance to the post-problem stage in the foreseeable future because of the ambiguity of environmental issues and the difficult and complex task of improving the environment (Downs 1972). Dunlap and Mertig (1992) contend that diversity within the environmental movement is its greatest strength, but they caution that diversity may be limiting to the extent that it causes in-fighting and fragmentation among groups.

Easterbrook (1995, 370) points to the success of environmentalism as a movement and to the increased access to the U.S. Congress and to state legislatures that environmental leaders now enjoy:

By the 1960s there were half a dozen important environmental groups in the Western nations; by the 1980s, two dozen. By 1990 environmentalism had grown into one of the leading lobby interests of North America and Western Europe, in national as well as local governments, and into perhaps the most effective media relations entity ever.

Others concur that, as a movement, environmentalists have been extraordinarily and atypically successful in attracting and sustaining interest in their cause; yet, in relation to accomplishing the goals of protecting and improving environmental quality, the modern movement has not been nearly as effective (Dunlap 1992; Dunlap and Mertig 1992). On a less optimistic note, Glick (1995a, 70) proposes that the movement has lost some of its clout:

For the greens [environmentalists], the past decade has been marked by in-fighting, personality conflicts, questionable strategies, and competition for funding and media attention. In the environmental community the result is a movement that has become less than the sum of its parts.

Similarly, Norton (1991, 206) observes fragmentation within the movement:

Environmentalists have failed to articulate a positive vision for the future; they cannot explain in terms comprehensible to each other or to the public at large what is their positive dream. As is sometimes said, environmentalists are always "against" something...Just as guerrilla warriors with quite different political values can unite to topple a corrupt and unpopular dictatorship, environmentalists, as long as they operate in an opposition role, can find unity in what they are against.

In the case of Utah Wilderness, there is also evidence of fragmentation within the movement. UWA and SUWA have chosen different paths toward resolving the Utah Wilderness issue. The disagreements on proposals and strategies between the two groups are evidence of in-fighting and reflected unfavorably on Utah's conservation community for a time.

Social Movement Organizations and the Policy Process

Social movements abound in our society, addressing civil rights, women's rights, gay liberation, peace, labor relations, and the environment--- to name only a few issues. A social movement is "a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represent preferences for changing some element of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society" (McCarthy and Zald 1977, 275). As described above, the environmental movement is considered one of the most pervasive and successful social movements of the 20th century. Easterbrook (1995) attributes the phenomenal organizing success within the movement to the power of ecological concerns and the hard labors of the people in the movement.

Selznick (1948, 26) considers organizations as formal structures that "represent rationally ordered instruments for the achievement of stated goals." The organizations of interest to this study may be conveniently classified within the modern environmental movement, representing the enduring tradition of wilderness advocacy. Thus, it is important to understand SUWA and UWA in the framework of social movement organizations and resource mobilization theory, which provide a basis for analyzing the ability of social movement organizations to attain their goals (Gale 1986). The mechanisms social movement groups use to mobilize resources and acquire a critical mass of supporters are the foci of resource mobilization theory. Another venue for evaluating groups is through the

theory of conflict functionalism, which asserts that groups define themselves by struggling with other groups and that "attracting" enemies may help maintain or increase group cohesion (Coser 1956, 104; Walker 1991).

A solid opponent can do more to unify a group and heal its splits than any other factor....But even if the enemy is not so blatant, it is the perceived and not the real opposition that is important. Movements that neither perceive nor experience opposition find it difficult to maintain the degree of commitment necessary for a viable, active organization. (Freeman 1977, 187).

One goal of the resource mobilization task is to convert adherents (i.e., individuals and organizations that believe in the goals of the movement) into constituents (i.e., those providing resources for the social movement organizations) and to maintain constituent involvement (McCarthy and Zald 1977). Another objective of social movement organizations is to convert non-adherents to adherents. Walker (1983) contends that beyond the tactics employed by leaders to attract and sustain membership, the maintenance of an organization is more heavily dependent on the success of group leaders in securing funds from outside their membership. In order for an organization to truly have an impact, a threshold of mobilization must be achieved. Kamieniecki et al. (1995) list three ingredients critical to attaining this threshold: (1) resource mobilization (i.e., mobilizing financial resources, expertise, and social networks); (2) cognitive transformation (i.e., the development of a political consciousness that defines the issue as a problem that can be solved through political means); and (3) charismatic leadership.

Social movement organizations and pressure groups often seek to influence government policy (Useem and Zald 1982). In the realm of environmentalism, policy implementation is largely pursued as a means of achieving organizational goals in the form of resource protection. Most environmental problems require some social or behavioral changes; therefore, since the beginning of the environmental movement, the concerns and actions of environmental groups have emphasized transformations in public policy. Kraft (1996, 11) defines environmental policy as

...a diversity of governmental actions that affect or attempt to affect environmental quality or the use of natural resources...it is the aggregate of statutes, regulations, and court precedents, and the attitudes and behaviors of public officials charged with making, implementing, and enforcing them. Policies may be tangible or largely symbolic...not all environmental policies are intended to 'solve' problems. Some are mainly expressive in nature. They articulate environmental values and goals that are intensely held by the public and especially by key interest groups, such as environmentalists.

McCool (1990) expounds on the subgovernment model of policy-making as a means of incorporating interest groups (e.g., environmental groups) into the policy arena. The theory contends that tripartite alliances (also known as policy whirlpools, cozy little triangles, iron triangles, and subsystems) formed between congressional committees or subcommittees, interest groups, and government agencies are all concerned with the same substantive policy (McCool 1990). Environmental groups' involvement in an iron triangle, as a means of influencing policy or program decisions, involves

the acquisition and allocation of organizational resources in the form of capital, expertise, and commitment.

Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993) further explore the policy process through the theoretical lens of the "advocacy coalition approach." The advocacy coalition framework conjointly explores the interactions of competing advocacy coalitions, the effects of stable system parameters, and changes external to the policy subsystem. They explain that an advocacy coalition

...consists of actors from a variety of public and private institutions at all levels of government who share a set of basic beliefs (policy goals plus causal and other perceptions) and who seek to manipulate the rules, budgets, and personnel of government institutions in order to achieve these goals over time. (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993, 5)

The above approaches are two possible ways for assessing the roles of SUWA and UWA in the policy arena. To more thoroughly understand how each organization participates in the policy process it is advantageous to understand the two organizations as structural entities.

As discussed earlier, the environmental movement has greatly diversified over the last half century. According to Zald and Ash (1966, 327):

Social movements manifest themselves, in part, through a wide range of organizations. These organizations are subject to a range of internal and external pressures which affect their viability, their internal structure and processes, and their ultimate success in attaining goals.

Diversification within the environmental movement required a new palette of environmental organizations. Popular notions of environmental

organizations are virtually synonymous with The Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, National Audubon Society, Environmental Defense Fund, and National Wildlife Federation---just a few of the organizations affiliated under the rubric of the "Group of 10." This title was given to 10 of the dominant environmental organizations whose leaders met over dinner, in January 1981, to discuss a collective strategy for dealing with the upcoming assault on environmental legislation brought on by the Ronald Reagan administration (Alley et al. 1995; Dowie 1995). These very popular and highly visible organizations continue to be dominant forces within environmentalism; however, diversification has led to a plethora of small, home-grown organizations, collectively classified as grassroots groups.

One trend in the environmental movement is the proliferation of grassroots groups. Grassroots is an ambiguous term---to some, grassroots plainly refers to those who live in an affected community, but the term may also be used to describe 10 to 20,000 small community organizations found throughout the world, often assembled to address pollution and environmental health issues, with many piloted by women ("An Amicus forum on grassroots and national groups" 1995). Lichterman (1996, 38) defines grassroots as simply as "bottom-up organizing." Mark Dowie, author of *Losing Ground*, sees grassroots groups as an invigorating force in environmentalism ("An Amicus forum on grassroots and national groups" 1995). Community empowerment and citizen participation in grassroots community organizing are means of assessing the efficacy of the grassroots

approach (Perkins et al. 1996). Strictly volunteer-based organizations are often considered grassroots as well. The two wilderness advocacy groups in this study possess some grassroots qualities, especially in their ability to organize public sentiment through letter-writing campaigns.

Various levels of organization and orientation, and numerous forms of environmental ideologies create an eclectic mix of environmental social movement organizations, including: grassroots, regional, national, and global; lobbying, legal, direct-action, and educational; and mainstream and radical groups. These organizations may include any combination of preservationists, deep ecologists, political ecologists, ecofeminists, and environmental justice advocates. The ideologies, methodologies, geographic scopes, issue orientations, and leadership constructions of each individual organization truly create a breadth in focus matched by no other social movement (Gifford 1990; Gottlieb 1993b). Although the two organizations of interest in this analysis may be typified as wilderness advocacy groups, delineating some of the other defining characteristics of each organization demands an understanding of the evolution of environmental groups throughout the last 40 years.

The intimate, poetic, and visionary experiences of early environmental leaders prompted hundreds of people to come together as kindred spirits, often philosophizing about nature and engaging in wilderness ventures. Examining the transition of environmental organizations into the 21st century, Adler (1995, 109) writes:

Environmental organizations have come to bear little resemblance to their predecessor. Once dedicated to conservation and the careful use of natural resources, environmental groups now champion the preservation of Nature. Where old-line conservationists saw themselves as stewards of the natural resources that complemented and supported modern industrial society, today's preservationists display an indifference if not disdain for technology, industrial organizations, and private initiative. And where once groups of hunters and outdoors people determined the activities of local conservation groups, professionals and full-time activists now set the agenda and measure their own success.

The moderately formal and loosely organized alliances of conservationists in the early movement are still evident in a some of today's smaller organizations, but post-WWII conditions that enabled environmentalism to take hold also led to a proliferation of groups and massive organizing, bringing thousands to participate in the cause of conservation.

The mainstreaming of environmentalism was largely aided by the savvy and persuasive approach of direct mail (Mitchell 1989; Dowie 1995; Easterbrook 1995). The success of mass membership recruitment via direct mail is determined by the following factors: (1) the credibility of the group making the appeal and (2) the appeal of the group's grievances (Mitchell 1989). The awe-inspiring qualities of scenic wildlands and the charismatic features of endangered megafauna can have wide and compelling appeal to the masses. Mainstreaming of the groups ensued commensurate with their growth, which led to bureaucratization of the organizations and professionalization of the staffs (Gottlieb, 1993a; Adler 1995). The possibility that growth engenders bureaucracy is of concern to many within the

environmental movement, who think that the spirit and fervor espoused by young organizations may be replaced with more settled and predictable organizations that value their longevity. Alley et al. (1995) assert that grassroots strategies that link with the agendas of national organizations do not necessarily lead toward greater institutionalization and bureaucratization.

With a significant number of environmental laws passed in the late 1960s and early 1970s, numerous environmental groups set up headquarters or branch offices in our nation's capital. Many groups only participate in limited lobbying efforts due to the legal constraints and tax codes affiliated with incorporation under 501(c)(3), which grants organizations non-profit, public foundation status, but most organizations are not deterred from Washington, D.C. (Mitchell 1989; Shabecoff and Heist 1996).

The D.C.-based environmental groups, with millions of dues-paying members and hundreds of professional staffers, including lawyers, lobbyists, and public relations people, use many of the same techniques as the private-sector lobbies. These include computerized mailing lists, direct-mail funding pitches, multi-media advertising, political action committees, and political endorsements...A number of corporations are represented on its [Environmental Defense Fund's] board of directors. Audubon and Sierra [Club] have top-end media arms producing slick mass-circulation magazines, books, films, and video documentaries. Greenpeace has a national door-to-door canvassing network of a thousand volunteers knocking on forty thousand doors a night, making it the largest operation of its kind outside the Girl Scouts' annual cookie sale. (Helvarg 1994, 29)

There is no question that a reliance on Washington, D.C.-based political strategies has significantly shaped the modern environmental movement.

Brock Evans, former chief lobbyist for the Sierra Club, said:

We must be there, because it is Congress that ultimately decides which areas shall be logged and which shall remain wild; it is the EPA that promulgates the vital air and water pollution regulations; and it is the President himself and his aides who, by a phone call, can often determine the fate of a bill in Congress or a policy in the bureaucracy. (Mitchell 1989, 99)

The professionalization of environmental groups' staffs often includes having scientists, accountants, and attorneys, leading to what Snow (1991, 25) calls "a cult of expertise." Litigation is one of several strategies available to social movement organizations and their adversaries (Barkan 1980). Utilizing the courts as a forum for advancing or adjudicating an organization's cause has become a substantial instrument in the toolchest of environmentalists.

An early milestone in preservation policy was the effort launched by David Brower and the Sierra Club to save Dinosaur National Monument from inundation by the Echo Park Dam project (Allin 1982; Gottlieb 1993b). The national campaign formulated in response to the dam proposal brought American conservation and preservation organizations together as no other issue had before and set tactical precedents that shaped many of the approaches used by environmental groups in the coming decades (Harvey 1991). The effort to save Echo Park was one of the most effective and carefully orchestrated battles in conservation history. Echo Park took the conservation movement from acting defensively to aggressive initiation (Fox 1985). Conservationists, journalists, and photographers were exposed to Echo Park through rafting trips down the Green River and Dinosaur National

Monument became a place known throughout the nation. Effectively galvanizing much of the popular media to publicize its cause and promoting one of its many trademark exhibit-format books, the Sierra Club set the strategic agenda for future conservation groups. As described by Brower (1995, 35), "visual ammunition," in the form of coffee-table books, slide shows, or websites, is one of the most powerful weapons in the conservationists' arsenal, especially when dealing with charismatic megafauna or wilderness landscapes.

Media attention can be crucial to the success and survival of an environmental organization, or any type of social movement organization for that matter. Some environmental concerns are triggered by personal experiences, but many concerns tend to be media-driven (O'Riordan 1995).

The mass media [print and broadcast news] represent a potential mechanism for utilizing an establishment institution to fulfill non-establishment goals: communicating with movement followers, reaching out to potential recruits, neutralizing would-be opponents, and confusing or otherwise immobilizing committed opponents. (Molotch 1977, 71)

Others also acknowledge the critical role media play in the ability of organizations to communicate their efforts, and note that today's environmentalists are part of the "post-journalism" world, operating in a hyper-mediated environment (Pierce et al. 1992, 125).

There are concerns over the divide between mainstream and grassroots organizations, but environmental groups are also notable for building coalitions to fight for specific issues (Shabecoff and Heist 1996). Coalition-

building can be a key strategic move in successfully achieving public policy objectives (Stevenson and Greenberg 1998).

Environmental groups work to increase their power by forming alliances with other interest groups. Sometimes they establish *coalitions* with the clear intent to secure passage of specific legislation. But environmental groups will just as often cultivate informal networks of groups to trade information and share ideas on related policy agendas. (Adler 1995, 72)

Contemporary advocacy tactics include litigation, informational campaigns, White House and Congressional lobbying, participation in administrative agency proceedings, and grassroots letter-writing campaigns (Mitchell 1989). With the exception of litigation, these tactics are largely carried over from the earlier conservation movement.

The passion of the cause and the drive of the leadership can have powerful impacts on the direction and sustainability of an organization, but money can still be the decisive resource for a non-profit group. To be effective in a subgovernment, a stable and secure source of funding can be critical (McCool 1990). Medberry (1995) asserts that environmental campaigns run on money. Typical funding sources for most non-profit environmental organizations include some combination of the following: membership dues, individual contributions, foundation grants, sale of goods, federal grants, corporate gifts, and other sources (Snow 1991). Much of the tension that exists among environmental organizations is the result of competing for the same dollars to gain public attention and support (Yearley 1993).

Environmental Leadership

Throughout this literature review, the environmental movement has been looked at in the context of overall social movements and in terms of the conservation-environmental groups that comprise that movement. To best understand the specific groups, it is important to characterize their leadership.

Burns (1978) considers leaders as persons with certain purposes or motives, mobilizing resources in order to arouse, engage, and satisfy the needs of followers. Environmental leadership is a distinct category of leadership, encompassing any activity involving the management, use, or protection of natural resources (Foster 1993). Most environmental leaders possess some combination of the following qualities and skills: ethics and personal values; communication; management; conflict assessment and resolution; ability to influence legislation and policy---and, inevitably, fiscal development, or fundraising (Gordon and Berry 1993). Some of the greatest stress on organizations and leaders is the pressure to attain and maintain funding (Snow 1991; Adler 1995).

Furthermore, environmental leadership is dependent on a context, which includes: geographic location, variability in the natural environment, and organizational culture (Gordon and Berry 1993). Environmental leadership may also be evaluated at either the individual or organizational levels (Flannery and May 1994).

Fox (1985) classifies early conservationists (pre-environmentalism) as radical amateurs and not very well organized. According to Fox (1985, 227),

these conservationists took up the fight "expecting to pay, not to be paid." In a more contemporary context, Kuric and van Hook (1989, 1) assert that public interest workers "see their jobs as the places where they can meld their individual talents with their political beliefs and personal values." Although paid positions in environmental work have proliferated, overall the movement is replete with underpaid positions, often filled by overqualified individuals.

Other people who have characterized mainstream groups note that the leadership and conceptual framework of these organizations is typically white and male-dominated (Gottlieb 1993a; Dowie 1995). Furthering the notion of the "male preserve," Gottlieb (1993a, 213) writes:

The need and desire to experience wilderness, particularly through hunting and exploring as well as mountaineering, skiing, and fishing, were also associated with images of "manliness," as Theodore Roosevelt, the foremost champion of the masculine definition of the wilderness experience, often put it.

Although Mohai (1992) does not focus exclusively on environmental leaders, he argues that even though women indicate somewhat greater concern for the environment, women's rates of environmental activism are considerably lower than those for men. Mohai (1985) also refutes the notion that environmental values are upper-middle-class values, based on research illustrating that environmental activism may be linked to elites, but the link between environmental concern and upper-middle-class values is not evident.

Related Work

Much of the research done in relation to environmental organizations either highlights a single organization and its agenda and abilities, given a certain political climate, leadership network, issue focus, and tactical plan, or evaluates the niche of select organizations within the overall movement. While relying on the insights offered by such research, this particular study examines two unique organizations, emphasizing their individual structures and ideologies to analyze why each group chose to pursue different strategies on the specific issue of BLM Wilderness in Utah.

Brulle (1996) asserts that, in the United States, environmental groups are key actors in the process of social change. Although their importance is recognized, the study of environmental organizations remains underdeveloped. He examined 44 leading environmental organizations through the use of discourse analysis, linking these groups to the overall environmental movement and providing a system of classification based on a framework of discourses, including the following: manifest destiny, conservation, preservation, ecocentrism, political ecology, deep ecology, and ecofeminism. To distinguish these separate discursive frames he identifies the key texts in the development of the frame, lists the defining social movement events surrounding each frame, and provides examples of movement organizations that fit within each discourse.

Alley et al. (1995) apply the "resource-mobilization" model, advanced by McCarthy and Zald (1977), to examine the historical transformation of Alabamians for a Clean Environment (ACE), a grassroots organization formed to close down the nation's largest hazardous waste landfill. They assert that the institutionalization of certain environmental groups (e.g., the "Group of Ten") has alienated some grassroots efforts at the community level. Their examination of ACE's activities shows that the organization assumed a marginal position in waste politics at the local level while developing alliances with national organizations.

The "resource-mobilization" model may be applied in an examination of SUWA and UWA to analyze how each organization obtains the resources necessary to pursue its objectives. According to McCarthy and Zald (1977, 1):

The resource mobilization approach emphasizes both societal support and constraint of social movement phenomena. It examines the variety of resources that must be mobilized, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements upon external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements.

Lichterman (1996, 34), through extensive ethnographic study, examines the "personalized politics"² of individuals connected to the U.S. Greens movement, analyzing the way people become politicized in the name of a broad public good and exploring how various environmental activists pursue their commitments to activism. Similar to the underpinnings of the research

² Lichterman (1996, 34) defines "personalized politics" as a commitment that combines a concern for broad public issues with an insistence that each individual activist is a locus of political responsibility and efficacy outside as well as inside activist organizations.

presented in this thesis, Lichterman is fascinated and intrigued by those who define themselves as publicly engaged activists, especially in the name of the environment. He advances his research by going beyond the research methodology of intensive interviewing, and engages with the subjects of his study as a participant-observer. Lichterman (1996, 149) also provides a means of analyzing his study population by examining their "lifeways," which he defines as the overall public and private involvements in work, family, and political life within one's biography. Through his research he contrasts the "personalized politics" and individualism in the mainly white environmental groups with an African-American group representing a more community-centered culture. Ultimately, he asserts that "a multicultural society needs to honor diverse sources of public commitment" (Lichterman 1996, 230).

Norris and Cable (1994) examine the lifecycle of a social movement organization opposed to the pollution of a river by a paper mill. They employed multiple, in-depth, semi-structured interview sessions with key members of the organization and also engaged in participation-observation research, focusing heavily on the relationship of elites and non-elites in community mobilization. They found that elites resisted grassroots membership in order to control the movement goals and to protect their own economic interests and that internal conflict within an elite-sponsored organization may lead to new grassroots organizations.

Pierce et al. (1992) examine the role of interest groups in the context of environmental policy, specifically focusing on the complexity of policy questions pursuant to new scientific discoveries and rapidly changing technology. Through extensive surveying of Ontario-based and Michigan-based environmental organizations, they provide a composite of the organizations, compiling organizational profiles and an analysis of structural and organizational attributes. In formulating the organizational profile, they included such variables as number of paid staff, size of annual budget, number of volunteers, number of members, percentage of membership dues in overall budget, external funding sources, geopolitical affiliations, and tax-exempt status. To assess the organizational attributes of each group, they categorized the attributes as follows: (1) how the organization informs its members (e.g., publish newsletters, hold meetings, issue special reports, conduct short courses, produce videos or films, and prepare stories for media); (2) types of research employed by the organization (e.g., scientific/technical, legal, political, and economic); and (3) the number of sources used by the organization to compile its information (e.g., organizational affiliates, other environmental organizations, scientists or academic experts, lawyers, elected officials and staff, and non-elected government personnel) (Pierce et al. 1992). Ultimately, they suggest that the key to interest group activity is the communication of policy-relevant technical knowledge and information. Although UWA and SUWA do not deal as readily with highly technical scientific concerns, these organizations

do serve as conduits for disseminating policy-related information to the public and political figures.

Salazar (1996) presents data from a 1989 survey of seventy-three environmental groups in the state of Washington. Her analysis highlights groups' structural characteristics, choice of political activities, and use of political resources in order to evaluate systematic differences between grassroots groups and institutionalized organizations within the state. She contrasts Washington state with the national trend of a grassroots-mainstream divide in the environmental movement. In differentiating among three types of political resources, mobilization resources, expertise, and organizational assets, she contends that grassroots groups heavily rely on mobilization.

Snow (1991) provides the most applicable and fundamentally useful background for this research, although the scale of his 1989 study was considerably wider, encompassing over 500 conservation leaders throughout the country. The magnitude of examination is different, given that this particular study looks at only two organizations in-depth, SUWA and UWA. The defining difference between Snow's research and the study presented in this document is that the *Conservation Leadership Project*, conducted by Snow, focuses exclusively on people and organizations, not issues. The emphasis of this work, too, is on the organizations and their leaders, but it uses the Utah BLM Wilderness debate as a venue for understanding the fundamental differences between each organization's structure and

philosophy. *Inside the Environmental Movement* is, quite simply, the authoritative text on the people and organizations that make the environmental movement the social force that it is heralded to be. The single drawback of Snow's work is that it is now dated, having been conducted almost a decade ago.

Findings from the *Conservation Leadership Project* suggest that the "conservation-environmental movement is fraught with xenophobia and internecine strife" (Snow 1991, xxxi). He found that environmental leaders are often undersupported, based on limited financial resources and poorly trained staff. In addition, the data from his study indicate that even though many organizations proclaim that they are membership-based, few effectively employ strategies to empower and activate their members. He also notes that mainstream conservation-environmental groups have failed to adequately incorporate people of color, the rural poor, and the politically and economically disenfranchised in their work. Based on these challenges, the *Conservation Leadership Project* calls for the establishment of new, decentralized training centers created to assist conservation leaders.

Snow (1991) very effectively characterizes the organizations involved in the movement and creates comprehensive portraits of the staffs, volunteers, and leaders of the nation's environmental groups. The level of detail achieved by Snow is not matched in the forthcoming discussion, but his work offers many possibilities for future research on SUWA and UWA, or other environmental organizations in Utah. By applying his national

model to the state of Utah, Utah's conservation community could be more thoroughly profiled.

The diversity of philosophical orientations among environmentalists has been offered above, and Snow (1991) maintains that not only are the ideologies of environmental groups very different, but from an operational perspective, environmental groups also are very diverse. Snow (1991, 14) distinguishes 11 different kinds of organizations within the movement. His characterization of the state-based or regional advocacy group appears to align most closely with UWA. SUWA, in its earlier days, could also be classified similarly, but given its present operation, it is most appropriately classified as a small national membership group. Overall, Snow (1991, 140) poses these questions:

Given its resources and its methods of operation, what can any given conservation group effectively achieve with respect to the issues it attempts to resolve? Given the collective resources of the many groups working on environmental issues, what can the movement achieve? It's easy to attack environmentalists on their failures, and just as easy to obscure or negate their many successes.

The research presented in this thesis explores the resources and methods of operation of UWA and SUWA. Their attempts to attain Wilderness designation for Utah BLM lands cannot yet be deemed successes or failures, for the debate endures. What the future holds for these lands and these organizations is indeterminate, but speculations on the future of this environmental policy will be offered.

Options for the Future

Although not focusing exclusively on wilderness issues, John (1994) presents practical examples of new approaches to environmental politics and policy that have emerged at the state and local levels. He contends that we are stepping into a new era of environmental policy as an increasingly information-based society, confronting new issues with new tools (John 1994). John's central thesis is that we must engage in a new method of organizing environmental politics and policy---civic environmentalism.

The central idea animating civic environmentalism is that in some cases, communities and states will organize on their own to protect the environment, without being forced to do so by the federal government....Civic environmentalism is essentially a bottom-up approach to environmental protection. (John 1994, 7).

Similarly, this theme runs throughout *Reclaiming the native home of hope* (Keiter 1998), a collection of essays compiled from two symposiums sponsored by the University of Utah College of Law's Wallace Stegner Center for Land, Resources, and the Environment. These essays focus on examples and propositions of functional positions and processes for dealing with environmental issues from a more collaborative standpoint in order to achieve ecologically and socially sustainable outcomes.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The preceding literature review highlighted secondary sources that serve as background for examining the roles of UWA and SUWA in the BLM Wilderness debate. The research conducted for this thesis made use of two primary data sources: archival data and key informant interview data. This chapter explains these two data sets.

Archival Data Sources

The literature and documentation found in Appendix A served as primary data sources for construction of the organizational histories found in Chapters V and VI. The Utah State University Special Collections archives many of the documents pertinent to this discussion, including federal agency and state-level committee reports and citizen groups' documents. Since UWA went into hibernation, nearly all of its organizational documentation is accessible through the Utah State University archives. Given SUWA's present activity, most of its historical documents and organization-specific materials are found in its Salt Lake City office. Archival records and other pertinent organization-specific documents were obtained and used throughout this study, but the principal research component and the source

of the most immensely rich data came from conducting numerous key informant interviews.

Sampling Design and Identification of Interviewees

Interviewees were selectively chosen through examination of the literature concerning Utah wilderness and in consultation with UWA's founder, Dick Carter, and SUWA's current executive director, Mike Matz (see Appendix B). The non-probability, purposive sampling technique used in this study is essential and appropriate due to the historical nature of the research. Interview candidates were selected with respect to their longevity with one of the wilderness advocacy organizations, their integral tie to that organization's strategy formulation, their leadership position, or in many cases, a combination of all of these attributes. Supplemental key informants were selected based on recommendations from the original core sample. This informal snowball technique was extremely beneficial in providing names of individuals not readily affiliated with the debate or the organizations, but who maintain integral roles in behind-the-scenes positions. These individuals often had lengthy historical involvement with the BLM Wilderness battle in Utah, unique encounters with each organization, familiarization with the policy process, a broader interpretation of wilderness battles, or some combination of all of these traits. The addition of several key

informants who are internal to the debate, but external to SUWA and UWA, provided support for information obtained from individuals within these organizations, as well as substantial insight due to their unique perspectives.

As mentioned above, many of the key informants willingly suggested the names of other individuals for me to contact and a comprehensive list was kept with this supplemental information. A true snowball approach would have widened the spectrum of respondents, but certain time and financial constraints on this research limited expansion of the study. Continued investigation may have offered some additional perspectives, but I consider the body of key informants to include most of the critical insiders to this discussion.

Because both organizations have been in existence for over a decade and because UWA's status of hibernation makes it actively defunct, accessing some of the key informants was not as easy as just going to their headquarters. Again, through the assistance of Dick Carter, Mike Matz, and the Internet, contact information was obtained for all but one of the potential interviewees.

An introductory letter explaining my background and interests, the nature of the research, and the purpose of the study was sent to each potential interview candidate in late January 1998 to solicit their assistance and participation in the interview process (see Appendix C). Approximately one

week later all candidates were contacted via telephone or e-mail to confirm receipt of the letter and to schedule an interview.

Nearly all informants appeared interested and willing to participate in this study. Of the original list of 19 interview candidates, I was unable to contact one person, two people were not available for interviews due to time constraints, and two individuals were out of the country during the interviewing period. Based on the loss of these potential informants, other interviewees were added to replace their area of expertise, when possible.

Prior to conducting this study, I was concerned that informants may not want to engage in this study for some of the following reasons. First, the interview format is lengthy and I acknowledged that the interview candidates are all very involved people with many commitments to career, family, and activism. Secondly, there was the possibility that some of the informants would fail to see the utility of this type of research. I was asked on a number of occasions if I, in fact, knew that UWA was defunct. Due to this organization's status of hibernation, I faced the chance of confronting those who might not understand the value of analyzing different approaches to the Wilderness debate because UWA's position is no longer actively represented. Thirdly, some interviewees could be reasonably concerned about how this work would be used or what might be published in the future. There were those who were too busy or too distant to be involved in this study.

Overwhelmingly people did see the value of this research and many of them were intrigued that someone who was not "one of them" was actually interested in exploring the histories of both UWA and SUWA. Regarding the third concern about the use or future publication of this work, I was questioned by a few individuals and absolutely interrogated by one person. I explained that the information would be used in this master's thesis and, as such, would be a public document. A summary of the research results will also be made available to those interviewees who requested a copy of it.

For the most part, interviewees' hesitance or reservation to participate quickly dissipated during the introductory discussion when project goals were restated and clarified and when questions were answered. On only one occasion did the concerns of the interviewee persist throughout the interview. The nature of that person's concern stemmed primarily from my affiliation with Utah State University. In the context of environmental studies and research related to Wilderness, this interviewee thought that Utah State University had released studies that were less than favorably received by environmentalists. I was cognizant of some of the wilderness research that has been conducted by people affiliated with this institution, but I was not aware of the considerable animosity some individuals harbor toward this university as a result of it. Overall, I felt that respondents were candid and honest in their responses, although I must acknowledge the

concerns that some individuals maintain for research from this institution, especially as it pertains to Wilderness.

Survey Design and Procedures

The survey instrument was designed to elicit both individual and organizational histories via face-to-face format. The questions were administered under a set of procedures and protocols established to evoke thorough responses about the organizations and the debate BLM Wilderness in Utah (see Appendix D). A series of questions was asked covering the following broad categories: personal background; personal involvement in wilderness and environmental issues; organizational evolution; stakeholder relations; interorganizational (SUWA/UWA) relations; future speculations; and personal and organizational environmental ideologies. Questions were predominately open-ended, allowing for detail, richness, and self-expression in response. The questions required substantial recall on behalf of the respondents in explaining the history of both the Wilderness debate and their respective organization. Attitudinal, informational, behavioral, attribute-focused, and belief-oriented questions were included.

Personal background questions were asked to gain a better understanding of the respondents' education, leisure activities, place of birth, age, occupational history, and affiliations with government agencies and

other environmental organizations. Questions concerning the respondent's personal involvement in wilderness and environmental issues were asked in an effort to explore common threads or unique distinctions among the factors that influenced the respondent to become actively involved in such issues.

To trace the organizational histories of both UWA and SUWA, questions were asked that probed significant events contributing to the organizations' formation and development, as well as tactical and critical organizational assessments. Questions pertaining to stakeholder relations asked the respondents to assess their respective organization's relationships with Wise-Use advocates, Utah county officials, industry representatives, BLM employees, local citizens in adjacent communities, national environmental organizations, and political figures from the national, state, and local arenas. Media relations were also probed in this section.

The specific relations between UWA and SUWA were explored in a subsequent segment of the interview. Another section was devoted to the respondents' predictions about the future of their organization and their prospective outlook for the Utah Wilderness debate. The executive leaders of each organization were provided with a sheet defining a spectrum of environmental ideologies. They were then asked to choose the ideology that most represented themselves and their respective organization.

Modifications to the overall survey instrument, prepared for SUWA and UWA affiliates, were made for administration to the non-affiliated respondents. Non-affiliation simply means that the individual never had a staff or board member position with either UWA or SUWA. Most of the questions pertaining to organizational evolution, ideological orientation, and personal involvement were eliminated to streamline the inquiry process, giving focus to stakeholder relations and SUWA and UWA interactions.

The selection of this type of interviewing process enabled me to obtain some very rich and detailed historical accounts of the organizations' developments. Given that much of these organizations' histories is only attainable through analysis of archival documents and review of regional media exposure, such intensive key informant interviewing filled many of the gaps left by those sources. The personal backgrounds and motivations of each groups' leaders can have a powerful influence on the directions, tactics, and motives of the organizations. Thus, the methodology presented allows for an exploration of the motivations and philosophies of these leaders.

Ideally, interviews were conducted face-to-face. However, due to the geographic distribution of some interviewees, this particular interview strategy was adapted to an open-ended phone interview format for those interviewees who resided beyond a reasonable travel distance. Respondents were asked to allot approximately two hours to adequately participate in the

interview; however, those individuals not affiliated with UWA and SUWA were advised that less time would probably be sufficient.

All interviews for this project were conducted by the author; thus there is consistency across all interviews in terms of instructions, clarifications, and recording of responses. Almost all of the face-to-face interviews were recorded via the use of audiotape, unless the location was un conducive to such means or the respondent elected not to have the interview tape-recorded. Hand-written notes were also taken throughout each interview.

All interviewees were reminded of their right to refuse participation in this research, and if they chose to participate they were asked to supply verbal consent for the use of their comments and insights in the final thesis document. The interviews are not anonymous unless the respondent requested partial or complete "off-the-record" status. Comments interviewees requested be stricken from the record are either included without being attributed to that interviewee or are not used in this document, depending on the interviewee's wishes. A guarantee of full anonymity may have prompted responses more candid than those received, given the relatively small pool of respondents and the richness of their responses, but I felt it was necessary to give interviewees full credit for their insights, reflections, analyses, and participation. To provide added credibility to the

research, it was deemed appropriate to be able to reference their interview as a source of primary information.

My personal background and the purpose of this project were addressed in the introductory letter, but these aspects were again emphasized at the beginning of each interview. Respondents were asked if they had any questions or concerns prior to participating in this research. The interview was typically conducted in the order presented in the protocols, although there were occasions when a different sequence was followed or questions were omitted due to time constraints, the particular tone or emphasis of the interview, or acknowledgment of the interviewee's particular expertise or involvement in the debate and the organizations. In most cases, even if specific questions were not formally asked, answers were obtained through explanations or comments made in other parts of the interview.

Following the completion of all interviews, candidates were personally and sincerely thanked for their contributions to this effort to explore the organizations so integrally connected to the BLM Wilderness debate in Utah. All candidates received a written thank-you letter, again offering appreciation for their time and participation and also reminding them that further reflections or comments would be entirely welcome (see Appendix C).

Throughout the course of the formal interviewing process, which lasted from February 3, 1998 through March 10, 1998, I maintained connection

with a number of interviewees via e-mail. This particular medium served as a fairly speedy conduit for establishing meetings and obtaining clarifications.

Interview Overview

Overall, a total of 23 interviews were conducted and 38 hours were logged in the process of actively engaging in the interviews. Interviews ranged in length from 30 minutes to 3 hours and 10 minutes. The average interview lasted 1 hour and 39 minutes, with 57% of all interviews lasting an hour and a half or longer.

Fourteen interviews were administered over the telephone and nine were conducted face-to-face. Presently, 11 of the 23 respondents reside in Utah. Nearly all of the non-phone interviews were held in Salt Lake City, Utah, and one interview took place in Logan, Utah. Respondents contacted by phone included individuals in Washington, D.C.; Seattle, Washington; Portland, Oregon; Missoula, Montana; Denver, Colorado; Riverside, California; Moscow, Idaho; and other areas of Utah.

Seventeen of the interviewees are men and six are women. Seven of the interviewees are affiliated with SUWA, four individuals were with UWA, and 12 respondents have affiliations with the debate in a capacity external to these organizations. However, at least five of the non-affiliated participants are now or had been actively involved in the Utah Wilderness

Coalition. There were no women interviewed in connection with UWA, two were from SUWA, and four were from the non-affiliated faction. The gender make-up and ethnicity of the leaders of UWA and SUWA is consistent with the literature on mainstream environmental groups, which are characterized as typically white and male-dominated (Gottlieb 1993a; Dowie 1995).

Non-affiliated respondents included the following: the legislative director for Rep. Maurice Hinchey (D-NY); the deputy director of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget for the State of Utah; the former senior project coordinator for Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000; a professional mediator, staff director for the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands; a national journalist; the executive editor of *Chronicle of Community*; and several past and present leaders of the Utah Wilderness Coalition. Typically these interviews were focused toward the individual's specific area of expertise, resulting in interviews that were slightly less lengthy than those with leaders from SUWA and UWA, although that was not always the case.

Certain biographical information was not obtained for all participants, but characteristics such as age, education, place of birth, and career history were obtained from all UWA and SUWA respondents. Table 1 summarizes some of these characteristics as they pertain to the leaders of each organization.

Table 1

Profile of UWA and SUWA leaders

	UWA Leaders	SUWA Leaders
AGE	39-54 (mean = 45)	35-64 (mean = 47)
PLACE OF BIRTH	Utah	Out-of-state
LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES	Outdoor activities	Outdoor activities
EDUCATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BA/BS from College of Natural Resources at Utah State University• 1 law degree	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• BA/BS in natural resources discipline from a large western university• 2 law degrees
GOVERNMENT AGENCY EMPLOYMENT	Seasonal: National Forest Service, National Park Service, and Bureau of Land Management	Seasonal: Fish and Wildlife Service, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Interior, and state level appointments
INVOLVEMENT WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS	Minimal: Carter was a representative for The Wilderness Society prior to UWA's formation	Extensive: Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, and National Parks and Conservation Association

The 11 interviewees with past or present staff or board member connections with either UWA or SUWA range in age from 35 to 64, with the average age being 47. Nearly all have at least a bachelor's degree with the exception of two individuals who did not complete four years of study at a college or university. Most of these leaders received degrees from major western universities, including the University of New Mexico, University of Colorado, and Utah State University. Three individuals also hold degrees in law and most pursued an undergraduate major of study in a natural resources discipline.

Many respondents had work experience with a government agency at either the state or federal level. Most of this work consists of seasonal employment with one or more of the following federal agencies: National Forest Service, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Corps of Engineers. As far as past or current employment with another environmental organization, many SUWA respondents have considerable experience with Sierra Club and The Wilderness Society. Alternatively, those interviewees representing UWA had little or no experience with the major national environmental groups, with the exception of Dick Carter's earlier connection with The Wilderness Society.

Only three of the respondents are native Utahns, all formerly with UWA. All respondents regarded some type of outdoor activity as a means of expending leisure time, including hiking, kayaking, biking, rafting, and exploring the desert regions of Utah and other areas of the state.

A number of respondents first began affiliations with their organization as a member or volunteer. Notably, a love of the land brought most of these people into involvement with the organizations. Respondents also expressed that there was a great degree of excitement in working with relatively newly established environmental organizations, and there was also a sense of significant camaraderie among the members of each individual organization.

The preceding profile does reveal a number of similarities among the leaders of each organization as far as certain sociodemographic attributes and some particular motivations and activities. Later chapters will provide a more in-depth analysis of the greater philosophical and structural divergence between the organizations.

Study Limitations

This section describes a few of the major limitations of this study. The first limitation is that the interview data were all collected at a single point in time, winter 1998. Because much of the information is historical, the fact that

data were obtained during this constrained period is not of significant concern, but it did force individuals to engage in substantial exercises of recall to adequately portray the history outlined in this document. Fortunately, archival data served as both a supplement and clarifying source for the organizations' histories.

Secondly, another limitation is the relatively small number of key informants interviewed. The particular interviewees who participated in this project represented well the key leadership within each organization and, as interviews ensued, there was consistency in response to a great number of questions. Thus, it appears that the select group of interview candidates was representative and more than sufficient for the focus of this study. However, there are other individuals with substantial insight and history with these organizations. As previously mentioned, a list of the names of these individuals, as recommended by key informants, was collected.

Lastly, although not a major limitation, consistency in interview format may have enhanced the data. Due to constraints on time and financial sources available to conduct this study, the majority of interviews were conducted via telephone. The preferable format for interviewing was face-to-face, but I noticed no less engagement in the process or general enthusiasm in response by those interviewed via telephone.

Overall, although these limitations are recognized, I do not feel that any of the data presented in this document have been jeopardized due to the above constraints.

CHAPTER IV

WILDERNESS IN UTAH

Now in its third decade, the dispute over Wilderness designation in Utah has been marked by a long and extensive history of court battles, legislative decisions, political maneuverings, and conservationist involvement (see Appendix E). To clarify the atmosphere that Utah's wilderness advocates have worked under and also framed themselves, it is useful to put the debate in historical context. A more thorough analysis might examine environmental attitudes throughout Utah's history, but the most useful starting point for constructing a chronology of the battle for redrock Wilderness in Utah is the 1976 passage of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act

Throughout most of the BLM's early history, environmental groups spent little time addressing this agency's issues. With growth in recreation use on BLM lands, the creation of some national parks from BLM lands, the increased popularity of the desert Southwest, and expanded opportunities for the environmental community to exercise its voice in the courts, environmental groups began to devote more resources to BLM issues (Greeno 1990). As increased membership and budgets enabled a proliferation of environmental organizations, environmental interest groups lobbied for

an organic act for the BLM with strong conservation provisions (Greeno 1990). The 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act served as the legal doctrine to enforce multiple use management by the agency, and included direction to inventory BLM lands for Wilderness qualities.

Inventory and Appeal

The Wilderness review in Utah did not begin until 1978 and it was comprised of three stages: (1) a "quick" initial inventory to omit lands clearly lacking Wilderness values; (2) an intensive inventory to demarcate Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs); and (3) an evaluation of suitability and manageability relative to other uses to bring about a final agency recommendation (Carter 1992). At the time of the initial inventory, Utah was the only state in the nation that had no wilderness designations (Matheson 1986).

Following the initial inventory, 17 million acres of the 22 million acres under the BLM's jurisdiction in Utah were omitted from consideration. Next, the second phase of inventory ensued, establishing Wilderness Study Areas. Both stages of the review process have been criticized, with the BLM accused of performing inadequate surveys, changing data accumulated by field staff, and illegally manipulating the process to give preferential treatment to special interests and lands with development potential (Wheeler 1985a, 1985b; Jones 1991; Stegner 1994; Torrey 1997). In 1979, Utah's small environmental community responded to what they believed was an

inadequate review with the formation of UWA, Utah's first statewide environmental organization. Shabecoff (1993) notes that today every decision involving disposal or use of public lands is scrutinized by grassroots groups. The situation was no different for Utah in 1979, and UWA immediately went to work—addressing flaws in the BLM's inventory.

An inadequate process on the federal level was a major concern to Utah's conservationists, but anti-environmental sentiments on the state and county levels in the early 1980s also represented a formidable obstacle for environmentalists attempting to rectify a poor process. Grand County and other regions of southern Utah represented a hotbed of the Sagebrush Rebellion and county commissioners attempted to bulldoze within Wilderness Study Areas (Manning 1995). Attempts to create roads are symbolic of efforts by anti-Wilderness forces to disqualify lands suitable for federal designation. In 1980 Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-UT) presented legislation calling for the return of all National Forest Service and BLM lands to the states (Stegner 1998). Further elimination of Wilderness quality lands by the BLM prompted UWA and 13 other conservation groups to take their concerns to the BLM's adjudication board, the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA), where they launched a 1,400-page omnibus appeal covering almost one million acres on 29 units (Wheeler 1985a; Carter 1992). In 1981, this represented the largest appeal in the IBLA's history. By 1983, the IBLA released its findings, ordering a reinventory of 88% of the acreage under appeal and adding 560,000 acres to Wilderness Study Area status. Eventually,

the BLM determined that 3.2 million acres were suitable as WSAs. The significance of WSA status is that during the interim, before designation is legislated at the Congressional level, WSAs are managed as de facto Wilderness, essentially protecting those areas until they are legally designated.

Utah Wilderness Act of 1984

While waiting for a ruling on the appeal, UWA diligently helped to assemble a Wilderness bill for National Forest lands in Utah. The mandate to evaluate the Wilderness qualities of National Forest lands came over a decade earlier with the passage of the Wilderness Act of 1964. Typically lands had been designated using an area-by-area approach, but procedural changes occurred in the late 1970s, after the ruling in an influential lawsuit, *California v. Bergland*. In that case, the court decided that site-specific environmental-impact statements were required before a roadless area could be developed and that the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE) II did not fulfill this requirement (Zakin 1993). The ramifications of this lawsuit and the result of Congress becoming saturated with numerous bills based on the area-by-area approach led to the process of passing statewide (omnibus) Wilderness bills. This new approach to Wilderness bills often allowed for "hard release" language, which excludes Wilderness-quality areas from being considered for future designation after a bill is passed. Zakin (1993, 96) notes that the new system of designation had several disadvantages:

Environmentalists were often forced to negotiate on the basis of overall acreage instead of on the merits of individual areas. Even worse, the price for passing virtually every bill was something called "release language"...the days when a lobbyist could patiently let political consensus ripen around each wilderness area were over. It was the antithesis of the slow, strategic [Howard] Zahniser style; now everything was on the block...the change to hard-fought statewide bills became inevitable as wilderness issues attained a higher profile.

With few other conservationists active in Utah, the Utah Wilderness Act became law in September 1984, with considerable assistance from UWA. The bill designated 750,000 acres as Wilderness of the three million acres of roadless land identified by the Forest Service (Wheeler 1985a). UWA viewed this designation as a core of Wilderness in Utah that could be built on in the future.

New Voices for Canyon Country

The Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance formalized its existence in December 1983 and was propelled to action through a "visceral mix of gorgeous country, death threats, and the unwavering support of just about every desert rat living in redrock Utah," according to Del Smith, SUWA's first paid staff member (SUWA Newsletter, XV(1) Spring 1998, 5; see Appendix A). The organization was also formed in response to what it considered a woefully inadequate Forest Service Wilderness bill for Utah. SUWA members immediately began to convene conferences with other environmental organizations such as The Wilderness Society, Sierra Club,

and the National Parks and Conservation Association in an effort to hammer out a proposal for BLM Wilderness.

At the same time, UWA was busily preparing its own proposal for Utah's BLM lands, anticipating a BLM recommendation for Wilderness in the not-too-distant future. The year 1985 proved to be significant and defining for Utah's conservationists. UWA, SUWA, and an array of other national and regional conservation groups gathered numerous times throughout the first half of 1985 to develop a united proposal on BLM Wilderness. By the summer of 1985, it was evident that Utah's environmentalists could only agree not to agree. UWA was anxious to present a proposal before the BLM released its recommendations and was unwilling to consider a few areas that other conservationists wanted included in the proposal.

At that time, lack of a unified front among Utah's environmentalists created a sense that Utah's environmental community was dysfunctional, and the in-fighting among these groups led to poor portrayals of the environmentalists' cause in the media. From the inability to attain consensus between UWA and the other conservation organizations, two distinct proposals and philosophies evolved on BLM Wilderness. In March 1985, UWA released a 3.8-million-acre proposal and in July 1985, SUWA and a few other groups announced their 5,032,900-acre proposal. EarthFirst! offered yet another Utah Wilderness proposal in 1985, for approximately 16 million acres, which included some Forest Service, National Park, state, and private lands as well (Foreman 1985; Wheeler 1986). Representing the other

extreme, the Utah State Legislature initially advocated a no-wilderness position (Ginger and Mohai 1993).

The distinction between UWA and Utah's other conservation groups became even more pronounced in October 1985, when SUWA helped found the Utah Wilderness Coalition, an umbrella organization of national, regional, and local member groups in support of the 5-million-acre proposal.¹ The formation of the Utah Wilderness Coalition brought together a network of activists and resources ready to nationalize the issue.

Finally, in mid-1986 the BLM released its Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with a recommendation of 1.9 million acres of Wilderness. The small amount of acreage recommended for designation by Utah's dominant federal land management agency prompted Utah Wilderness Coalition members to engage in their own inventory of BLM lands. This intensive investigation led to the 1990 publication of *Wilderness at the Edge: A Citizen Proposal to Protect Utah's Canyons and Deserts*. This 400-page documentation of 42 proposed Wilderness areas in Utah's Basin and Range and Colorado Plateau regions is based on a decade of fieldwork, including thousands of hours hiking through or flying over wild country, and is the basis for proposed federal legislation, HR 1500, entitled "America's Redrock Wilderness Act" (Bergman 1995).

¹ Today, the Utah Wilderness Coalition advocates a 5.7-million-acre proposal, which is expected to increase by June 1998.

Finding a Voice in Washington, D.C.

Former Rep. Wayne Owens (D-UT) took the Utah Wilderness Coalition's work to Congress and introduced HR 1500, "Utah BLM Wilderness Act of 1989," a proposal advocating 5.1 million acres of Wilderness protection for Utah BLM lands. In January 1991, new proposals for Wilderness designation were put forth. The BLM released its final recommendation amounting to 1,975,219 million acres and the Utah State Legislature adopted a 1.4-million-acre resolution for granting Wilderness status to BLM lands. In spring of the same year, Rep. Owens reintroduced HR 1500. By mid-1992 President George Bush had also taken a position on Utah's canyon country and asked Congress to designate less than 2 million acres of Wilderness.

Rep. Wayne Owens remained the champion of Utah Wilderness for the Utah Wilderness Coalition until his failed reelection bid for a U.S. Senate seat in the fall of 1992 forced the Utah Wilderness Coalition to find another sponsor for the legislation. Rep. Maurice Hinchey (D-NY) was responsible for reintroducing HR 1500 in 1993, changing the title to "America's Redrock Wilderness Act," a bill covering 5.7 million acres of BLM lands.

A County Speaks

Throughout the 1990s there has been tremendous momentum in gaining attention for Utah Wilderness on the national front. Considerable posturing over various proposals by conservation groups and politicians

shaped perceptions and influenced the level of debate by polarizing positions. In 1993, the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000, a non-profit network of Utah community leaders founded to address critical long-term issues confronting Utahns' quality of life, decided to address Utah's Wilderness dilemma. The Community and Wild Lands Futures Project, an outgrowth of Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000, set to work on a pilot project with Emery County. This was an attempt to utilize a consensus-building, community-based approach for attaining a vision for the San Rafael Swell region and a proposal for federal land protection. The project initially attracted a variety of stakeholders, including ranchers, recreationists, environmentalists, local politicians, and state-level elected officials (including Utah's Governor Mike Leavitt). UWA and Utah Wilderness Coalition affiliates were all involved during the initial stages of the process, but eventually the national environmental groups and SUWA pulled out, announcing that there was no utility in working at that level. UWA continued its involvement throughout the entire lifespan of the project, convinced that local input and consensus processes were the best vehicles for achieving Wilderness protection.

Although significant levels of mistrust existed among stakeholders at the beginning of the Emery County project, valuable collaboration and communication eventually resulted. However, the Emery County project faced difficulties midway through the effort, based not on the departure of a

portion of the environmental constituents who were once involved, but on the considerable and unforeseen shift in the national political landscape.

Back to Washington, D.C.

Following the November 1994 elections, the majority party in Congress turned Republican for the first time in 40 years. This was a critical concern to environmentalists across the nation, not just to Utah's "wilderness warriors"² (Pope 1997). The House of Representatives' Natural Resources Committee omitted "Natural" from its name, and Rep. Jim Hansen (R-UT) was selected to chair its subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. Notably, Rep. Hansen boasts a perfect zero rating from the League of Conservation Voters (Viehman 1995). Based on these national political realignments, Utah's state officials, who were participants in the Community and Wild Lands Futures Project, also chose to pursue their interests in a different arena.

In January 1995, UWA presented Governor Mike Leavitt and the Utah congressional delegation with a revised proposal, advocating almost 3 million acres for BLM Wilderness protection. Meanwhile, the Utah delegation began to fast-track a minimal-acreage Wilderness bill through Congress since they perceived a window of opportunity to exist. The Utah Wilderness Coalition hired a full-time grassroots coordinator, Liz McCoy, and

² The term "wilderness warriors" is often used to refer to members of SUWA and supporters of the Utah Wilderness Coalition's Citizens' Proposal (HR 1500).

SUWA embarked on an extensive national media campaign to counter the efforts of the Utah delegation.

On June 6, 1995, Rep. Hansen introduced a 1.8-million-acre proposal in the U.S. House of Representatives, bill HR 1745, entitled "Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995" (Beneson 1995; Nyhan 1995; O'Connell 1995; Rauber 1995; Williams 1995). Senators Hatch and Bennett offered a companion bill, S. 884, in the U.S. Senate. Public hearings organized by Utah's congressional delegation were held throughout the state of Utah and conservationists organized their own hearings as well. The voices in favor of the Citizens' Proposal (HR 1500) were loud and numerous, but HR 1745 still passed out of committee (Glick 1995b; Wheeler 1995). On December 14, 1995, *USA Today* and other national publications ran editorials denouncing HR 1745, which contained "hard release" language, denial of federal reserved water rights, and a host of other special management provisions contrary to the standards established in the Wilderness Act (Gorte 1995). That same day, Rep. Hansen pulled HR 1745 from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. Although HR 1500 still has not made it that far, Utah's conservationists hail the squashing of the "bad" bill (HR 1745) as a victory and note that it is much easier to stop a bad bill than it is to pass a good one.

By early 1996, S. 884 still remained in the Senate, and Utah's senators delicately tried to insert the legislation into HR 1296, the omnibus parks bill (Freedman 1996). Senator Bradley (D-NJ) used his filibuster powers to prevent its inclusion. Ironically, at nearly the same time, UWA was closing

its doors and discontinuing its operative status. In May 1997, additional support for HR 1500, "America's Redrock Wilderness Act," came from Sen. Durbin (D-IL), who introduced S. 773, HR 1500's companion legislation in the Senate.

Amidst all the posturing over minimum and maximum acreage, even Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt announced his belief that at least 5 million acres of Wilderness exist in Utah. To prove this he initiated a reinventory of BLM lands. Contemporaneously, the Utah Wilderness Coalition decided to resurvey lands included in its proposal. The Utah Wilderness Coalition reinventory may be released in June 1998; however, the Department of Interior's reevaluation of Utah BLM lands was quickly halted by the Utah Association of Counties through a court injunction issued in November 1996. Recently, in March 1998, this injunction was overturned by the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. This may mean that the lands eliminated during the first BLM inventory will be reassessed for their Wilderness potential.

A Monumental Moment

In what is undoubtedly one of the most monumental moments in the history of southern Utah, President Clinton (ironically, standing at the south rim of the Grand Canyon in Arizona) designated 1.7 million acres of Utah's canyon country as the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument. On September 18, 1996, using Presidential power under the Antiquities Act of 1906, Clinton shocked politicians and conservationists alike. Sen. Orrin

Hatch called it "the mother of all land grabs" (Glick 1996, 61). Bill Howell, executive director of the Utah Association of Local Governments, deemed it "the most arrogant gesture I have seen in my life" (Kluger 1997, 65). Mike Matz, executive director of SUWA, called the President's move "gutsy" and acknowledged that it was a great surprise (Glick 1996, 61).

Although the Monument is not a proxy for Wilderness, the process of designation through Presidential proclamation may be illustrative of how future federal land decisions will be handled. Many people are pleased with the land's new status, but a considerable number of rural Utahns and Utah politicians are infuriated with the process of designation (Glick 1996).

However, Barber and Clark (1998, 105) assert that the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument "should be a showcase for cooperative and innovative regional planning and management" and "a model for future state and federal partnerships in other multi-jurisdictional contexts."

State of Change

The management plans for the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument may be indicative of future change for administration of our public lands. Another element of change within Utah is its demographic character. During 1996, Utah's population surpassed the 2 million mark, with much of this growth attributed to a steady trend of net in-migration coupled with a rise in birthrates (Barber 1997). Utah has become primarily an urban state. Its rural areas are often considered to be in the throes of a profound

population diversification, with many new arrivals desiring to protect the open space that attracted them to Utah (Satchell 1995).

Throughout the Wilderness debate there has also been proliferation of organizations committed to environmental and natural resource protection issues. There has been relative consistency in the opposition of state-level leaders to extensive Wilderness designation, and changes in the national political landscape prompted them to pursue legislative avenues formerly less accessible, given the transition of the U.S. Congress to a Republican majority.

The land in question has not undergone any profound changes over the past few decades, yet it continues to reflect eons of sculpting from erosive agents and shaping from sedimentation and tectonic shifts. The natural forces of change throughout the grand scope of geologic time have made the Colorado Plateau the international treasure it is today. Many of the most apparent alterations of the landscape are the results of questionable applications of Revised Statute 2477³ (RS 2477), an 1866 law which granted "right-of-way for the construction of highways over public land, not reserved for public uses," are contemporary reminders of change. Despite the breadth of land under consideration for legal protection, Wilderness as an entity is increasingly scarce. Wallace Stegner once said, "Utah looks as sturdy as the rock of ages but it is actually as fragile as a flower"

³ FLPMA repealed RS 2477, but valid claims prior to 1976 were grandfathered in.

(SUWA Newsletter, VIII(2) Summer 1991, 20; see Appendix A).

Wilderness Precedents

Wilderness designations in Alaska, California, and Arizona are particularly relevant precedents for Utah. To offer some perspective on the case for Utah's Wilderness, it is insightful to know that New Hampshire actually has a higher percentage of Wilderness land than Utah; Florida and Minnesota both have more designated Wilderness than Utah despite fewer total acres under federal jurisdiction; and Utah ranks last among the Western states in the number of acres federally designated as Wilderness (Matz 1994a; Viehman 1995).

Wilderness designation of federal lands is often more the exception than the rule. Federal land protection can take a variety of forms, including National Parks, National Forests, National Monuments, and National Wildlife Refuges. The qualifications and conditions necessary for federal Wilderness designation are typically more stringent and specific than all other levels of land classification, making Wilderness less often used for land protection. Some instructive Wilderness precedents have been set forth in other states. However, these cases are largely the results of varying social, political, and economic contexts. They do not offer a model or prognosis for how the debate will play out in Utah, yet they are meaningful in understanding the tactical positions of some of Utah's conservationists.

Alaska

The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) of 1980 brought 104.3 million acres into the federal land conservation system, with over half of them protected as Wilderness (Zakin 1993). The size is legitimately startling relative to the 5.7 million acres sought in Utah's Citizens' Proposal.

Mike Matz, past chair of the Alaska Coalition and present executive director of SUWA, points out four elements of similarity between Utah and Alaska: (1) both have very conservative representation in the Senate; (2) both have local officials and citizens who disdain federal presence; (3) both have state governments geared toward promoting resource extraction industries; and (4) both have an extensive wilderness resource (SUWA Newsletter, XI(1) Winter/Spring 1994; see Appendix A).

The most significant point with ANILCA is how it was passed. There is an unspoken rule in Congress of giving deference to the "home state," particularly in the Senate. Many interviewees agreed that senatorial adherence to this tacit custom can be a major impediment to passing legislation. According to Darrell Knuffke, a SUWA board member, in the case of ANILCA, Alaska's senators were opposed to its passage, the rules of deference were broken, and the Alaska delegation was essentially "rolled." Some environmentalists in Utah hope a similar scenario will occur in Utah,

since the likelihood that Utah's congressional delegation will support a very comprehensive Wilderness bill is slim.

California

In what has been deemed a victory for desert lands, the California Desert Protection Act (CDPA) of 1994 represents the largest single Wilderness designation since ANILCA. It protected nearly 7.5 million acres of land as Wilderness, 3,587,395 acres of which are on BLM-managed lands, and elevated three key areas to National Park status, in total covering nearly one-fourth of California's land mass (Cranston 1986; Byrnes 1994). After years without resolution, similar to Utah's experience, the fortunes of CDPA changed with a shift in California's political landscape, a result of the 1992 election of Senators Diane Feinstein (D-CA) and Barbara Boxer (D-CA), who are largely responsible for carrying forth the vision of former Sen. Alan Cranston (Camia 1994). Cranston introduced CDPA in 1986, largely based on the California Desert Conservation Area, an expanse of 12.5 million acres designated by Congress in 1976 (McWherter 1983; Reisner 1986; Darlington 1989). It took exactly eight years, eight months, and two days from the time of Cranston's initial introduction of CDPA before President Clinton made it law on October 31, 1994 (Watkins 1994).

The key to passage of the California Desert Protection Act was a change in that state's delegation, which could offer lessons or guidance for Utah's Wilderness dilemma. Interviewees often referred to the circumstances that

enabled Wilderness protection for a substantial portion of California's desert lands, noting that a change in the make-up of the Utah delegation may benefit the cause of Utah's wilderness advocates.

Arizona

Finally, Arizona offers another state's informative Wilderness experience. Similar to the expansive and well-documented Citizens' Wilderness proposal offered by the Utah Wilderness Coalition, the Arizona Wilderness Coalition also set forth a citizens' proposal, advocating 4.1 million acres of BLM and National Wildlife Refuge lands for Wilderness designation. The agencies recommended roughly 2.6 million acres and Arizona's congressional delegation put forth a bill for about 2.4 million acres (SUWA Newsletter, VII(3) Fall 1990; see Appendix A). Little is heard of this particular wilderness battle because it was largely a state-level fight. Due to Sen. Morris Udall's political stature and the respect for him as an environmentalist, there was little involvement by U.S. congressional representatives from other states. Essentially, within Arizona some conciliations were made and the Arizona Wilderness Coalition did not attain the extent of protection it initially sought. Given that UWA desires to pursue resolution of the debate over BLM Wilderness at the state level, Arizona's experience may be illustrative of how a state level battle might play out.

CHAPTER V

UTAH WILDERNESS ASSOCIATION

Birth of the Utah Wilderness Association

In late spring of 1979, under a large cottonwood tree in Dick Carter's backyard in Salt Lake City, a small group of "heady, passionate conservationists," as Carter describes them, gathered to share their interests and concerns about Utah's wildlands. There were about 10 to 15 individuals present and by the end of the evening each had contributed about \$100 to the cause of starting Utah's first statewide conservation organization. Given the economic climate of the late 1970s, the contributions allowed a real start for the inchoate group, providing it with enough money to establish an office and continue running for at least another few months.

Carter, UWA's founder and coordinator for its entire lifespan, had just left The Wilderness Society as the Utah-Nevada representative. His not-so-amiable departure from this national environmental organization left him with a disillusionment of Washington, D.C.-based environmental groups and with a typewriter. He desired to pursue work in Utah, used the "borrowed" piece of office equipment, and set out to recruit others to UWA's cause.

Prior to organizing UWA, Carter had done seasonal stints with the Forest Service and decided that his convictions and training in natural resources would not be fostered in the bureaucratic setting of a public land management agency. So, he set out to work with The Wilderness Society as

the Utah-Nevada field representative, making him the first paid environmentalist in the state of Utah. He was responsible for soliciting comments, generating public involvement, and even testifying before Congress, at field hearings, and at BLM oversight hearings.

Eventually Carter was asked to move to Washington, D.C., where he spent six months as a policy analyst for The Wilderness Society. Yearning to return to his home state and acknowledging the importance of the public land inventories taking place in Utah, Carter decided against an extended stay in Washington, D.C. His tenure with The Wilderness Society began with enthusiasm, but the situation changed in November 1978 with the hiring of Bill Turnage as executive director of the organization. Under Turnage's leadership, The Wilderness Society went through a massive restructuring, resulting in the firing and departure of many representatives and the consolidation and closure of numerous field offices. Dave Foreman (founder of EarthFirst!), Bart Koehler (leader of the Southeast Alaska Conservation Council), and other conservationists also were discouraged with The Wilderness Society's restructuring and rebelled against the bureaucratized culture that the organization came to embrace by leaving to start or become part of other environmental groups (Zakin 1993).

Turnage provided Carter with the choice of extending his stay in Washington, D.C. to lobby the U.S. House of Representatives on the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act or not remaining with the organization at all. Carter chose the latter option. The dismissal of Carter led

the Wasatch Mountain Club to respond "It's like amputating the heart of wilderness in Utah. Carter has been the center of action here" (Schimpf 1979, 1). But, Turnage noted that "Dick [Carter] has such a strong commitment to Utah and being totally independent that he can't fit in this organization" (Schimpf 1979, 5).

Perhaps Turnage was right. Carter's commitment to Utah continues to play a substantial role in the protection of land and wildlife in this state. Furthermore, the independence cited by Turnage may also have played out in Carter's future affiliations with conservation-environmental organizations---admittedly, Carter almost only joins organizations that he has started (he later founded the High Uintas Preservation Council). Carter's disenchantment with one of the "Group of Ten" environmental organizations, his willingness to take a chance on building an environmental organization in a state fairly hostile to the cause of conservation, and his deep love for Utah's natural diversity have all shaped the course of UWA's existence and became the sources of some of the most fundamental differences among Utah's conservation organizations.

On December 13, 1979, UWA was officially incorporated. It received seed money in the form of a \$5,000 gift from a Colorado couple. The founding of UWA came in the midst of the Roadless Area Review and Evaluation II process and at the beginning of BLM's Utah inventory. These were the issues that guided the organization's early history.

Throughout UWA's formative years there were many naysayers. UWA was told that a statewide conservation organization in Utah would never endure. However, Carter had a vision, an unwavering conviction, and a strong affiliation with Utah (given that he is an Utah native), all of which led him to feeling that starting UWA was natural. The pessimism and doubt of other conservationists prompted UWA's leadership to pursue its mission and to attempt to prove to the naysayers that a statewide conservation organization was not only viable, but necessary.

Mission

UWA's philosophy is well encapsulated in its mission statement:

Imagine...alpine lakes encircled by 12,000 foot ridgelines...slot canyons, brick red and shoulder-wide...sweeping desert ranges, stalked by mountain lions...all the richness and beauty of wild Utah.

The Utah Wilderness Association is dedicated to the preservation of Utah's wilderness, public lands, and the flora and fauna dependent upon them. Our membership, areas of activity, organizational control and funding are Utah-based.

We value diversity in the assessment and use of public land as well as in natural systems. We believe the preservation of wilderness and the economic well-being of people are both elements of sound public land policy. We believe the two are not necessarily in conflict.

We advocate land and wildlife management policies that protect the biological diversity, ecological systems, and cultural resources that make our public lands unique. We work with local communities, elected officials, public agencies, and concerned citizens striving to establish policies which reflect a land and life ethic critical to our planet.

We provide detailed technical analysis of and make recommendations on specific public resource and land management issues. We publish a newsletter discussing issues which affect Utah's public lands and wildlife; host educational

seminars, field trips and workshops; and promote grassroots activism.

We seek solutions to preservation and land use issues which serve all interests, for we all are part of an ecosystem. (*UWA Review*, 12(4) July/August 1992, 5; see Appendix A)

This mission statement highlights the defining characteristics of UWA. They are as follows: (1) a dedication to the flora and fauna of Utah's lands; (2) Utah-based membership and funding; (3) advocacy for the protection of biodiversity and ecological systems; (4) the willingness to work with other stakeholders; and (5) an acknowledgment that humans and wild creatures are all part of an ecosystem. The approach of UWA to dealing with natural resource issues in Utah is clearly in line with its mission. The connections between practical application and the philosophical directives of UWA, as stated in its mission, will be explored by looking at this organization's culture, structure, and history.

Organizational Culture

Leadership

UWA held its first fundraiser at the University of Utah in October 1979, with Gary Snyder and Edward Abbey as guest speakers. Not long afterward, in April 1980, UWA hosted its first annual Rendezvous. This event brought 350 people together to celebrate UWA's efforts, and even brought Senator Jake Garn (R-UT) into contact with the environmentalists, as he was one of the featured speakers at the function. Furthermore, this early festivity led George

Nickas and Gary Macfarlane into what would become career affiliations with UWA.

Nickas, a native of Price, Utah, began as a volunteer with the organization in 1980 and eventually took positions as board member and assistant coordinator. Similarly, Macfarlane, another Utah native, contributed to UWA as a volunteer, a board member, and as the second paid staff member. Carter, Nickas, and Macfarlane share Utah roots, collegial ties (all are graduates of the College of Natural Resources at Utah State University), experience working with federal agencies, and genuine desires to protect wild places and processes.

As staff members of UWA, Carter, Nickas, and Macfarlane each served on the board of directors. The model of decision-making within UWA was consensus-based (a model UWA hoped to translate into the forum of external decision-making about wilderness issues), but the board was staff-dominated, making it difficult for non-staff board members to take significant responsibility for recruitment and issue-related strategies. Past UWA board member Jon Veranth expressed his confidence in the staff and his sense of the vigor and viability of the organization based on "the outstanding technical competence the full-time UWA staff brings to issues and UWA's record of maintaining dialogue with a broad spectrum of the various groups" (*UWA Review*, 10(3) May/June 1990, 5; see Appendix A).

Membership and Recruitment

UWA received its initial seed money from a Colorado couple, but for the remainder of its existence the organization's financial support mainly came from membership dues and individual contributions. With moderate fluctuation, the members of UWA were 90% Utahn, with approximately 70% of Utah members from the Wasatch Front region and about 20-30% from the Cache Valley area. The largely northern Utahn constituency is reflective of UWA's base of operations, which was in Salt Lake City. Although detailed demographic characterizations of the membership were not kept for this group, UWA leaders described the membership as a predominately white, middle-class, and middle-age support network of husbands and wives. According to Carter, the membership appears to have aged with the staff and UWA failed to significantly attract younger conservationists to its cause. The lack of a strong younger constituency left UWA with fewer options for transitioning to new leadership at the time the organization went into hibernation. Given its predominately Utah-based membership, Carter speculates that UWA probably had a larger proportion of Latter-day Saint constituents than other environmental organizations, like SUWA, which has a smaller percentage of Utah members.

Initial membership numbers barely exceeded 10, but by the early 1990s UWA had a very committed and responsive membership network numbering over 1,000 people. The organization grew more than a hundred-fold from the time of its inception, but UWA made a very conscious effort to

keep its membership within the range of 1,000 to 1,500 members in an effort to sustain an active network of volunteers and not merely check-writers. The notion that bigger is better was never acknowledged by UWA leaders.

UWA's primary recruitment tactics came in the form of educational and organization-sponsored events, such as seminars, conferences, annual fundraisers, slide presentations, and backcountry and river group excursions. UWA began an annual poetry contest in 1985, as another venue for people to engage their minds in wilderness. UWA deemed the use of direct mail to be inconsistent with its goal of maintaining a moderately small, but active membership. Members received UWA's bi-monthly publication, *UWA Review*, as well as other issue alert notices and occasional fundraising appeals. Recruitment via these approaches was slow, but created a very supportive membership with annual renewal rates about 75%.

Funding

From its earliest days, UWA decided that its financial support would come almost exclusively from its members. Although a few small grants were received from companies such as Recreational Equipment Inc. (REI) to pursue some early issues, UWA believed that pursuing foundation money would detract from issue-work and might cause the organization to lose some purity. A monthly donor program and some individual contributions accounted for roughly 80% of revenues. The other 20% came largely from sales of T-shirts, tote bags, and calendars, as well as monies received from

UWA's annual Desolation Canyon river trips. The restriction of revenue to the above sources defined the size of the salaries and the extent of staff benefits, which was relatively and consistently low. Annual revenue throughout the 1980s ranged from \$40,000 to \$50,000. In the 1990s, revenues increased, ranging from \$50,000 in the early 1990s to nearly \$80,000 by 1996.

Internal and External Changes

Internally, UWA's capacity changed greatly when Macfarlane was hired, expanding its staff to two. According to Carter, this addition took UWA from being a Wasatch group to a Utah group. Philosophically, as described by Macfarlane, UWA evolved from an organization born of the 1970s wilderness movement to espousing a strange mix of communitarianism (i.e., a focus on community-based involvement and decision-making) with a visionary view. Further evolution of UWA involved greater staff-domination in all realms of the organization and on the board of directors.

Externally, being involved so significantly with the passage of the 1984 Utah Wilderness Act, UWA's staff had an opportunity to hone their political skills. In addition, following that bill's passage, the issue-focus of UWA broadened from its initial attention on BLM and Forest Service Wilderness issues. UWA began to take on predator issues and wildlife concerns as an extension of its overall wilderness philosophy, acknowledging that wilderness issues were not restricted only to identifying unroaded lands for

Wilderness designation, according to Carter. Furthermore, following the birth of SUWA and the Utah Wilderness Coalition, UWA became much more isolated within the Utah wilderness movement because of its position on BLM Wilderness.

Strengths and Weaknesses

George Nickas conveniently typified all of UWA's strengths as having the dual charge of being the organization's weaknesses as well. The ramifications of being a staff-based organization are considered both benefits and costs. The lack of an internal bureaucratic network enabled the staff to quickly and adequately respond to the issues at hand. Additionally, the staff doing the issue work was very knowledgeable, experienced, and introspective, but the staff-domination that UWA experienced, especially given the longevity and consistency of the staff involved, may have caused the organization to be less energetic over time. UWA leaders note that the staff's high level of expertise may have deterred some other people from becoming involved with the organization.

Similarly, UWA's cynicism about foundation grants can also be seen as both an organizational strength and weakness. By not devoting time to fundraising activities of that magnitude, UWA's staff was able to direct their energies to issues. But, UWA's "perennially poor fundraising," as described by Nickas, inhibited the organization from eventually moving forward and attracting other professional conservationists to join its efforts. Wayne

McCormack, former UWA legal counsel and board member, did not agree with UWA's member-based approach to fundraising. He acknowledged that it was difficult to survive financially without going after foundation grants.

Macfarlane cited UWA's flexibility in a similar vein. The organization's willingness to engage in conversations and efforts with those perceived as anti-wilderness forces was a benefit as well as a cost to the organization. By advocating a consensus-based approach, UWA had an openness to dealing with other stakeholders, but this particular willingness and flexibility created a sense of mistrust of UWA among other conservation groups in the state.

Other stated weaknesses from Carter, Nickas, and Macfarlane include UWA's fixation on bringing about a resolution to the issues addressed by the organization and the group's slow response to changing times. Carter describes UWA as an organization that evolved out of the Vietnam War/social movement era, which largely dictated the mode of thinking and political strategies employed by the organization. "UWA evolved in the era when groups and individuals came to the political table acting socially and civilly, not divisively like the present-day model of drawing the line in the sand," according to Carter. Because UWA became institutionalized in this earlier paradigm, it became difficult for it to adapt. Essentially, Carter says, "UWA became a dinosaur."

There are other points of strength to highlight as well. UWA's leaders felt that they understood the politics and culture of Utah given their

upbringing within the state. Furthermore, UWA never thought there was a perfectly right answer, so it was always willing to expand the discussion, according to UWA leaders.

Issues

Formed in the midst of the BLM inventory and RARE II, UWA was active, from its inception, in leading the preparation of a 1,400-page appeal to the Interior Board of Land Appeals in an effort to correct what it believed were severe flaws inherent in the BLM inventory. This 1981 appeal led to the reinventorying of almost 90% of the 925,000 acres appealed.

UWA's other major focus was to promote and facilitate the passage of a Forest Service Wilderness bill for Utah. On September 28, 1984, President Reagan signed the Utah Wilderness Act into law. The protection of nearly 800,000 acres of Forest Service land as Wilderness was seen as a great success by UWA. According to Margaret Pettis, a UWA founding member and the organization's resident artist:

When UWA established itself in Utah, there was no talk about Wilderness. The delegation was so against protection of public land, nothing was even imagined possible. The designation of Lone Peak changed all that. After a long struggle of educating the new delegation...we actually achieved the impossible: the Utah Wilderness Act of 1984 added Utah to the list of states that could boast a Wilderness base on which to build. (*UWA Review*, 9(3) May/June 1989, 7; see Appendix A)

This accomplishment was tempered by UWA's acknowledgment that its goal was to get a core of Wilderness in Utah, fully acknowledging that the initial acreage did not represent the potential. The leaders of UWA felt compelled

to either initiate the designation of a Wilderness system in Utah or settle for no Wilderness at all. Given the very limited amount of environmental support within the state at the time of passage, UWA felt that they fought for what was possible given the local political climate and the conservative make-up of the Utah delegation.

Following this perceived victory with the Forest Service Wilderness lands, UWA anticipated the much awaited BLM Environmental Impact Statement. UWA swiftly moved to prepare its own BLM proposal and was anxious to publicize it before the release of the BLM's recommendations. By now UWA was working in a context of increased environmental presence in Utah. SUWA and the Utah Wilderness Coalition had recently formed and many of the national environmental organizations had set up offices and representation in Utah to avoid a potential replay of what they saw as a disparaging Forest Service Wilderness designation occurring on BLM lands.

UWA acted quickly and in early 1985 it released "Defending the Desert," a proposal for BLM Wilderness. The proposal encompassed 3.8 million acres of BLM lands in southern Utah and was offered as "ground-checked, researched, and credible wilderness on the scale envisioned by Aldo Leopold and Robert Marshall" (*UWA Review*, 5(3) May/June 1985, 1; see Appendix A). The 3.8-million-acre proposal was based on five key elements: (1) rather than submitting a massive statewide bill, legislation should be pursued based on smaller regions; (2) the time is now (there was strong public support for wilderness and wildlife); (3) no region is more important than

any other; (4) it is essential to find common ground with local officials and residents (it is ignorant to ignore them); and (5) commitment should be based on long-term care of the land (*UWA Review*, 8(2) March/April 1988; see Appendix A). UWA then awaited the release of the BLM's statewide Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which did not appear until May 1986. The 1.9-million-acre Wilderness recommendation submitted by the BLM prompted a thorough response by environmentalists, including a 250-page area-by-area, issue-by-issue analysis prepared by UWA.

In 1988, after Rep. Wayne Owens introduced HR 1500 in the U.S. House of Representatives, UWA responded by thanking Rep. Owens for moving the Wilderness discussion from the administrative venue to the legislative front, which would allow proceedings for eventual designation. In a letter to Rep. Owens, dated November 21, 1988, Dick Carter wrote: "[No] organization supports movement on wilderness legislation or your vigorous defense of wilderness more than UWA, as you well know" (*UWA Review*, 9(1) January/February 1989, 1; see Appendix A).

George Nickas offered other concerns about Rep. Owens' bill:

[The] bill [should] not heighten the animosity and polarization that the wilderness issue has generated in Utah. UWA rejects the notion that the bill should be introduced, but not actively pursued for four to five years. Intransigence on a "maximum acreage position" may only serve to strengthen the resolve of the "no more wilderness" forces and drive traditionally "neutral" parties into the no wilderness camp. Ultimately, this will make the designation of substantial BLM Wilderness less likely. (*UWA Review*, 9(1) January/February 1989, 1; see Appendix A)

After the BLM released its final recommendation of 1,975,219 acres in 1991 and following the introduction of both Rep. Hansen's and Rep. Owens' wilderness bills, UWA again wrote to Owens:

[P]ositioning around 5.1 or 0 is not a sign of success or dialogue. We support the need to end an us vs. them mentality. UWA has no fear of initiating discussions with opponents of wilderness. (*UWA Review*, 11(1) January/February 1991, 2; see Appendix A)

The above sentiments resound throughout UWA's literature, which reiterates that a no-compromise position on the part of some Wilderness proponents is equally as exclusive as the no-Wilderness position of some other groups. This understanding is the reason UWA decided not to advocate a maximum/minimum approach and alternatively attempted to engage in consensus-building processes, involving multiple entities, especially local interests. Even though UWA chose an alternative process espousing a community-centered vision, it did, for a time, endorse HR 1500 in 1991. Around the same time, UWA applied for membership in the Utah Wilderness Coalition, but was denied. UWA supported the Coalition's position on the protection of 5.1 million acres, but wanted to continue to work toward resolution through consensus-based processes. The Coalition members wanted UWA's full cooperation and commitment to both the Coalition's view on the amount of land that should be designated and how it should be designated, but UWA would not support the strategies of the other organizations.

Throughout the battles of the late 1980s over BLM Wilderness, UWA broadened its wilderness and wildness activities to include issues concerning wildlife, predators, and grazing. Where UWA had formerly held the lead position on BLM Wilderness issues, SUWA and the Utah Wilderness Coalition were now in the forefront and UWA took the leadership role on Utah wildlife issues. UWA was largely responsible for the 1989 Wildlife Manifesto, a proposition for non-hunting wildlife reserves, and worked fervently on debates over predator control, sandhill crane hunting, cougar hounding, and a host of issues dealing with black bears, bighorn sheep, mountain goats, and other Utah wildlife.

UWA's continued involvement in trying to bring resolution to the BLM Wilderness issue came in the form of its involvement with the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000 endeavors initiated in 1991. UWA maintained active involvement and investment in the projects of this group, especially the Emery County Pilot Project, started in 1993, called "Community and Wild Lands Futures." To UWA, the Project 2000 process represented hope for a consensus-based approach to Wilderness designation within Utah. The decision of national conservation groups to withdraw from the project and pursue their objectives in Washington, D.C. left UWA as the sole organization representing the conservation community throughout the process. This was a comfortable position for UWA, in some ways, because UWA believed that the decision-making for BLM Wilderness would be done

in Utah and not in Washington, D.C. UWA was encouraged by the progress made in Emery County, but ultimately, Dick Carter wrote:

[W]ilderness, because it is a congressional allocation, may not be the best place to seek a consensus-based solution, particularly because the decision-makers showed only passing interest/support (and later non-support) for the process (timing factor) and were never willing to say a "consensus-based solution" would be accepted as part and parcel of their legislation. Possibly, a fourth issue of consequence is the fact that wilderness has become an incredible political icon (it has always been a crucially important biological and cultural icon). Years of fear mongering by wilderness opponents and "don't-cross-this-line-in-the-sand" rhetoric by environmentalists have done little to assist this valuable discussion. It has become an institutional political icon, making it difficult to discuss even after three years of facilitated dialogue. (*Community and Wild Lands Futures* 1995, 20; see Appendix A)

The 1994 realignment of the majority party in the U.S. Congress led to 1995 becoming one of the most critical and active years for Wilderness in Utah. The transition to Republican control of the legislative branch of federal government was largely responsible for the termination of the Emery County project. The arena of action had shifted from regionally-based consensus-building to aggressive activity in Washington, D.C., where the Utah delegation was preparing to push HR 1745. In what would be one of UWA's last efforts to counter a minimal acreage approach, they submitted a 2.95-million-acre proposal to Governor Leavitt and the Utah delegation, based on the principles of conservation biology and shaped to reflect the political and social context defining the debate surrounding Wilderness allocation and designation (*UWA Review*, 14(3) May/June 1995; see Appendix A). But, the

Utah delegation was narrowly focused on its own agenda and dismissed UWA's proposal.

Tactics

Throughout most of UWA's lifespan, the organization was considered by state and county political officials to be credible and knowledgeable on public lands and wildlife issues. UWA consistently used this status to be an active and involved participant in decision-making forums on these issues and often initiated these discussions. The public perception of UWA as Utah's "reasonable" environmental organization granted this group's leaders access to some of Utah's politicians and decision-makers and admittance to some counties, whose citizens maintain a hostile stance on Wilderness designation. UWA also established credibility with many state-level BLM officials.

Because of UWA's determination to facilitate resolution of the BLM Wilderness debate in a consensus-based forum and its respectable relationships with other stakeholders, the organization was able to initiate dialogue in arenas where other environmentalists never engaged. As time went on, UWA maintained many of these relationships and continued its policy of interaction and inclusion, but organizationally it had lost a strong presence in the battle over BLM Wilderness.

The collaborative approach was UWA's dominant tactic for addressing issues, but the organization also employed other means of effecting change

and engaging its network of activists. UWA encouraged grassroots activism, prompting its members to attend public meetings and to become aggressive letter-writers. Furthermore, UWA was no stranger to litigation and engaged in numerous appeals to counter agency policies and recommendations.

Although UWA did not employ any staff attorneys, pro bono legal assistance was often available to the organization, allowing it to maintain visibility in litigative venues.

Media presence for UWA was mainly limited to regional coverage and overall seemed to fairly represent the organization, its leadership, and its involvement in issues. Nationally, UWA had little play in media outlets.

Hibernation

In February of 1995, Dick Carter announced his desire and need for a sabbatical from his almost 16-year tenure as UWA's coordinator. Having been with the organization from its conception under the cottonwood tree in his backyard and through every moment of its development, this was a profound decision for Carter to make. Following Carter's announcement, Nickas also chose to end his active affiliation with UWA. Macfarlane departed in late 1993 to pursue other interests. Thus UWA was left in an awkward position, having lost the ability to transition responsibilities to other staff members since they were all gone. The possibility of maintaining a viable and active organization was attempted, but required a significant fundraising effort in order to competitively attract a career conservationist to

fill the shoes of Carter, who had been earning roughly \$15,000 per year at the height of his career as UWA's coordinator. The ability to successfully raise enough money to support a reasonable director's salary within a feasible timeframe was not attainable, leading UWA to select the metaphor of hibernation and allow itself to go into slumber indefinitely.

Presently, UWA maintains a core board of directors, a slight budget, and a phone number, but does no active issue work. Nickas has moved on to a position with Wilderness Watch in Missoula, Montana, where he works on issues related to already designated Wilderness areas. Not long after UWA officially closed its doors in March 1996, Carter founded another organization, the High Uintas Preservation Council, continuing his efforts to protect Utah's wildlands.

The possibility of UWA emerging from its state of slumber is rather dubious. Dick Carter noted in a radio interview in April 1996 that "UWA was born in the 1970s, it lived in the 1980s, but I'm not sure it was ready for the 1990s." Reflecting on UWA's origins, Macfarlane thought UWA was never meant to be a long-term sustainable organization. Nickas provided the following analogy, "Dick Carter is to UWA what Jerry Garcia was to the Grateful Dead---you just couldn't really go on without him."

CHAPTER VI

SOUTHERN UTAH WILDERNESS ALLIANCE

**Birth of the Southern Utah
Wilderness Alliance**

As described by Darrell Knuffke, vice-president of regional conservation at The Wilderness Society and SUWA board member, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance started out of the back of a pick-up truck. In early organizational solicitations, SUWA defined itself as "a fledgling conservation organization that began around a lonely desert campfire." In what may be SUWA's first newsletter, a crude and candid 11x17 informational sheet possibly dated January 1984, SUWA was said to comprise a "dozen wily southern Utah fanatics who believe the time is rapidly approaching when all of us must expend the maximum effort to help preserve as much wilderness in the Colorado Plateau as possible." Regardless of its exact inception, it is clear that SUWA, presently Utah's largest environmental group, had rather humble beginnings.

In 1981 Clive Kincaid was hired by the Sierra Club to spend a few weeks investigating alleged Wilderness inventory abuses in Utah. He ended up spending \$5,000 of his own money and an entire year uncovering dozens of Federal Land Policy and Management Act violations (Udall 1988). Prior to his extensive excursions into the redrock country to verify the BLM's inventory in Utah, Kincaid had actually directed some of the agency's initial Wilderness inventories in other areas of the Southwest. Thus, Kincaid was familiar with

the process and with the agency, but he was not a "career BLM-er," according to Terri Martin, former Rocky Mountain regional representative for the National Parks and Conservation Association. As Kincaid fell more deeply in love with the landscape of southern Utah and became more aware and appalled at what he believed was a corrupt process, he stated, "We [the American public] have been the victims of ineptitude or deception, and the price has been a heavy one" (*SUWA Newsletter*, IX(2) Summer 1992, 7; see Appendix A). Kincaid's denouncement of the inventory stemmed from considerable research illustrating that in too many areas the BLM had adjusted boundaries and cut out land to accommodate potential grazing, mining, or industrial development.

Kincaid's infuriation with a process gone bad was shared by some other "desert rats," notably Robert Weed and Grant Johnson. These three individuals founded SUWA in late 1983, but it was Kincaid who led the organization for the next five years. Brant Calkin, who was largely responsible for introducing Kincaid to Utah, notes that SUWA's earliest accommodations amounted to a post office box in Escalante, with work done out of Kincaid's stone cabin,¹ adjacent to a Wilderness Study Area. By the summer of 1984 SUWA established an office in Boulder, Utah.

¹ Eventually, in 1987, BLM alleged that Kincaid's house was partially inside the Steep Creek Wilderness Study Area as a result of a "minor adjustment" in official boundaries.

Mission

The Preamble to SUWA's Articles of Incorporation defines the organization as a nonprofit corporation that

...believes that a greater understanding of the region is needed to assist our state and our society in educating the American public about this special heritage and fast vanishing resource [the Colorado Plateau]. This is particularly pertinent in Utah since it contains among the least Congressionally designated wilderness of all the western states, yet possesses millions of acres of undeveloped lands that eminently qualify for wilderness protection.

The people of Utah and the nation must realize that the further preservation of significant portions of the Colorado Plateau is a worthy national goal. To accomplish this task the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance presently incorporates. (SUWA Newsletter, Issue No. 11, Fall 1986, 2; see Appendix A)

This preamble, set forth on December 12, 1983, has been a guide throughout the SUWA's almost 15-year history. SUWA's mission statement also lends greater articulation and clarification to the organization's goals:

The mission of the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance is the preservation of the outstanding wildlands at the heart of the Colorado Plateau, and the management of these lands in their natural state for the benefit of all Americans.

The Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance promotes local and national recognition of the region's unique character through research and public education; supports both administrative and legislative initiatives to permanently protect Colorado Plateau wildlands within the National Park and National Wilderness Preservation system or by other protective designations where appropriate; builds support for such initiatives on both the local and national level; and, provides leadership within the environmental movement through uncompromising advocacy for wilderness preservation. (SUWA Newsletter, XIV(4) Winter 1997, 2; see Appendix A)

SUWA has consistently been the single organization with the sole focus of attaining what it sees as the highest level of protection for the lands of the

Colorado Plateau, federal Wilderness designation. Furthermore, other defining points of the SUWA's vision are to: (1) provide a national voice for these lands; (2) support legal (especially federal) means of protection; and (3) promote uncompromising advocacy for wilderness.

Organizational Culture

Leadership

As SUWA's founder and first executive director, Clive Kincaid laid the foundation for this organization to be an expanded voice for southern Utah's canyon country. According to a number of people who knew Kincaid at the time SUWA was forming, the voice he provided must have been a powerful one. He is described as bombastic, aggressive, visionary, and charismatic. Having previously worked for the BLM, he is attributed with having a bureaucratic lens, enabling him to understand agency processes, but not a bureaucratic character.

By spring 1988, Kincaid decided that the time had come to relinquish his title of executive director, passing it on to another zealous desert lover, Brant Calkin. Zakin (1993, 52) describes Calkin as "a legendary southwestern environmentalist." Calkin is indisputably a career conservationist, having served as national president of the Sierra Club, as a Southwest Sierra Club representative, and as a volunteer, activist, and natural resource professional and consultant in New Mexico. His vast experience with Sierra Club issues ranging from opposition to the proposed dams in the Grand Canyon to

support for preservation of California's redwoods, earned him the Sierra Club's highest honor, the John Muir Award. Under Calkin's leadership, with aid from the associate executive director, Susan Tixier, the once fledgling organization became a national force in Wilderness preservation.

Figuratively, if Kincaid laid the foundation, then Calkin built the house!

By 1993 Tixier and Calkin decided that they wanted to pursue other interests and Mike Matz was named to replace the outgoing directors. Matz, also an experienced Sierra Club activist with background in Alaska and Washington, D.C., has piloted SUWA since September 1993. He is credited with possessing significant political savvy, given his Beltway experience. Early in his tenure as executive director he was described by Karl Cates (1997) as being the "behind-the-scenes" administrative leader, leaving Ken Rait, former SUWA issues director, with the role of spokesperson and soundbite extraordinaire. Matz is also credited with "Alaska-izing" the issue. His extensive experience in dealing with Wilderness issues in Alaska is considered a boon to the fight in Utah, especially since SUWA desires to see a "rolling" of the delegation in the fight for canyon country, much like the one that occurred over the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980. To continue figuratively, with the house built, Matz, along with an impressive staff and a very dedicated membership, created expansive additions to a home recognized throughout the national conservation community.

Zald and Ash (1966, 338) contend that "the success or failure of a movement organization can be highly dependent on the qualities and commitment of the leadership cadre and the tactics they use." Although SUWA now has its third executive director, it appears that there is consistency in the tactical approach its leaders have used to bring national attention to Utah's canyon country, to build the organization's support network, and to espouse an uncompromising position for the protection of wilderness.

The position of executive director remains a pivotal element in designing the future directions of the organization; however, SUWA's board of directors is equally as guiding. The board of directors has had many credible and notable figures, including: Wayne Owens, former Democratic congressman from Utah's urban 2nd district; Ted Wilson, former Salt Lake City mayor; Jim Baca, former BLM director and current mayor of Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Terry Tempest Williams, distinguished writer and natural historian. Additionally, the involvement of Bert Fingerhut, long-time board member and past chair, is described as serendipitous and instrumental to SUWA's success. Fingerhut provided SUWA with its first sizable donation of \$1,500 in 1986 and has gone on to lend his support in a variety of ways. Overall, the board is an active and engaged contingency of wilderness lovers from across the United States (only 2 of the 15 board members presently live in southern Utah).

SUWA's leadership network is extended to encompass an Advisory Committee, mainly a non-active group of well-experienced conservationists, writers, and professionals who lend further credibility to the organization and occasionally offer input. The Advisory Committee includes David Brower, Martin Litton, Roderick Nash, and James R. Udall, to name only a few members. The support of these individuals, whether active or nominal, lends significant credibility to SUWA's cause and arguably runs counter to the notion that the SUWA is a radical extremist organization.

Membership and Recruitment

From the dozen wily conservationists gathered around a campfire in 1983, SUWA now boasts a membership of over 22,000 people. This impressive proliferation of "wilderness warriors" must be attributed to SUWA's long-time vision and strategy of nationalizing the issue. For many years most of SUWA's members were from Colorado, but today over 50% are Utahns. The membership is responsible for a great deal of the organization's success, according to the group's leaders. They are described as some of the most dedicated, responsive, tenacious, and passionate letter-writers in the conservation community. Although demographic information for this group is sparse, they are typified by leaders of the organization as predominantly white, middle-class, and middle-age.

SUWA abides by the adage of "using every tool in the toolbox" to recruit its members. One of the greatest risks Calkin took at the beginning of

his tenure with SUWA was to embark on a direct mail recruitment campaign. In 1989, 160,000 pieces of SUWA literature and membership information were strategically sent throughout the United States. Given SUWA's financial status at the time, this strategy was one of "sink or swim." Obviously, SUWA remained afloat as evidenced by its substantial growth.

Often the secret weapon of conservationists, visuals, in the form of slideshows, image-filled websites, and glossy picturebooks, are used to attract individuals to the cause of protecting Utah's canyon country. Due to the diversity in form and color found throughout the Colorado Plateau, visual tactics can be extremely compelling. SUWA began its website in 1995 and although not a significant number of people establish membership through this venue yet, the site sees great visitation from interested individuals. To enlarge its base of support within the boundaries of Utah, SUWA began an aggressive canvassing campaign in 1994. Matz notes that there has been a slight shift in SUWA's recruitment focus and acknowledges that support within the state of Utah is increasingly important. Renewal rates for the organization hover around 75%.

SUWA members enjoy a quarterly newsletter, *Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance*, replete with the latest updates on the fate of canyon country, contact information for key decision-makers, profiles of "wilderness warriors," and other articles of interest. Special alerts and updates are sent out as needed and periodic e-mail updates are also a source of information. SUWA sponsors an annual Roundup, an entertaining gathering of

supporters, staff, and board members. Bike trips and hikes are organized to more integrally expose members and interested individuals to the landscape's plight. Additionally, some supporters of the organization carry a SUWA *Mastercard*, with a portion of money for purchases made on the credit card going to the organization.

Funding

The majority of SUWA's financial support comes from individual contributions and membership dues. Some money is attained from sales and fundraising events, but an increasing amount comes from grant-making foundations. For example, the Utah Wilderness Coalition (of which SUWA is a founding and influential member) received over \$73,000 in grants from the Conservation Alliance, an organization of outdoor businesses working to assist conservation efforts. In the 1990s, SUWA's budget exceeded one million dollars---a figure often affiliated with some of the larger, national environmental organizations. Most of the funds go to lobbying efforts and recruitment activities to maintain a vigorous grassroots network. Although staff salaries are not considerable, for a non-profit conservation organization, SUWA is competitive.

Internal and External Changes

Due to Clive Kincaid's previous relationship with the BLM, his initial approach to dealing with the Wilderness issue was to try to fix the agency process. Kincaid did acknowledge that the constituency base needed to be

broadened, so a metropolitan office was opened in Salt Lake City in 1986, providing access to Utah's population center.

The arrival of Brant Calkin marked significant changes in the way issues were approached. Through aggressive recruitment, Calkin built the membership base of the organization. Furthermore, he wanted to move the battle to an arena where he thought some successes were possible---the courtroom. This vision led to the hiring of staff attorneys, marking a significant professionalization of the staff. In an effort to further expand operations, SUWA opened a Washington, D.C. office in 1989. This allowed the organization to establish Beltway presence before it was critically needed. Under Matz's leadership both the membership and staff have continued to grow.

Externally, SUWA's demeanor as the "junkyard dog," always willing to fight, has been sustained throughout its existence. However, the organization is increasingly perceived as mainstream and, with increased political clout and presence, is a nationally recognized force in the arena of BLM Wilderness. Susan Tixier thinks there has been a shift in Americans' attention toward increasing concern for environmental issues and wilderness. The steadily urbanizing trend within Utah and the consistent influx of in-migrants are considered favorable factors for increased pro-environmental sentiment within the state. Although pro-environmental forces have assisted SUWA's growth, as well as good timing and some good fortune, SUWA leaders believe that ironically it has been the continual short-

sightedness and massive entrenchment of the Utah congressional delegation that has served to enhance the level of support for the SUWA's agenda. Ken Rait describes it as "essentially a parody...the Utah delegation's intransigence was the seed of the SUWA's success."

Strengths and Weaknesses

The expertise, passion, and commitment that SUWA's leaders and members bring to the organization are overwhelmingly cited as its core strengths. The issue of attaining Wilderness designation, given the international recognition received by the Colorado Plateau, is also a significant factor in retaining the commitment of both staff and members. Vocal support on the part of celebrities and key politicians, such as Robert Redford, Edward Abbey, and Wayne Owens, has also served SUWA well.

Similar to UWA, many of SUWA's strengths are seen as potential elements of vulnerability or weakness for the organization. Although the considerable growth of SUWA's membership has undoubtedly enhanced the resources now accessible to an organization of its size, there is some concern that the SUWA could be growing too rapidly to maintain the vibrancy of the grassroots network it is so heavily based upon. Its present trajectory of increasing professionalization and nationalization, certainly a strength, causes some people to wonder what will happen to SUWA next. A further concern of one SUWA board member is that the organization may have lost touch with the "Southern Utah" part of its name. In the wake of such a

successful national campaign, SUWA may need to redirect some of its attention to where the land actually is. Additionally, SUWA's inability to compromise based on its idealism can also put the organization in awkward positions, according to Mike Matz.

Issues

SUWA's singularity of focus throughout its existence is also considered a source of tremendous strength for the organization. Its fundamental goal is attaining federally-designated Wilderness status for over 5.7 million acres of BLM lands of the Colorado Plateau. SUWA's earliest activities involved efforts to halt the paving of the Burr Trail and to fight the exclusion of Antone Ridge from the Box-Death Hollow Wilderness.

SUWA does get involved with some public lands battles occurring beyond the scope of the Citizens' proposal, but with implications for BLM lands. It has addressed certain grazing dilemmas, some Forest Service issues, as well as some wildlife concerns. For example, SUWA has petitioned for Endangered Species status for the tiger beetle, addressed some predator control issues, and advocated protection of habitat for the desert tortoise.

In coordination with other conservation interests, SUWA has contested many activities occurring on BLM lands in southern Utah, including the Jeep Jamboree and the Eco-Challenge, an intensive 10-day race that crossed three Wilderness Study Areas (Byrnes 1995). Whether recreation

abuses, issues on contiguous lands, or concerns over habitat, all, directly or indirectly, weigh into the overall mission of protecting the Colorado Plateau.

Tactics

Scott Groene, a long-time SUWA supporter and staff attorney, and presently issues director, explains, "SUWA's approach is basic: protect the land and don't worry who gets mad about it" (Glick 1995a, 75). Although SUWA's Wilderness proposal causes many people to see the organization as radical for advocating more than 5.7 million acres of Wilderness, its approach is decidedly traditional. SUWA does not condone "ecotage" or "monkeywrenching" and prefers to advance its cause in the courts and in the U.S. Congress. SUWA has a stated policy of staying off advisory committees and does not see the utility in approaching the Wilderness issue at the county level, as is evidenced by its withdrawal from the Community and Wild Lands Futures Project. According to Matz, "asking a Utah county to plan for wilderness seems a bit like asking Dr. Kevorkian to implement an intensive care program" (SUWA Newsletter, XI(1) Winter/Spring 1994, 21; see Appendix A). Put another way, by Harvey Halpern, a SUWA Advisory Board member:

The issue of wilderness designation of BLM lands in Utah is an issue for all Americans to decide, not just the 2% of us who happen to live in Utah--who are lucky enough to live in Utah. To shut out 98% of the population from this debate would run counter to the very principles this country was founded on; it would be analogous to allowing the people of Kentucky to do whatever they wanted with all the gold reserves at Fort Knox. (SUWA Newsletter XII(3) Fall 1995, 19; see Appendix A)

Although SUWA had barely organized at the time the Utah Wilderness Act became law, the steps leading to that enactment largely shaped SUWA's tactical strategy. To SUWA, the 1984 bill was viewed as a "release" bill, the result of considerable, blatant, and unnecessary compromising on the part of other conservationists. Based on the perceived conciliation that led to the small amount of Forest Service acreage designated in 1984, SUWA has remained true to its model of uncompromising advocacy, in an effort to avoid a repeat of what occurred then. SUWA's early battles largely resulted in preventing development in areas such as the Kaiparowits and on the Burr Trail. Often such defense of the land led the organization to litigate for settlement or interim protection. Over time SUWA has maintained its watchdog presence, but also has become a significant player in legislative circles. SUWA's lobbying efforts are extensive and effective. In 1995, the organization reported \$500,000 in lobbying expenditures alone (Cates 1997). Presently, HR 1500, "America's Redrock Wilderness Act," enjoys co-sponsorship from 137 members in the U.S. House of Representatives and 11 Senators. The group's successful work inside the Beltway is attributed to Cindy Shogan, SUWA's Washington, D.C. representative. She is described by some SUWA board members as a magnificent political strategist and potentially one of the most effective lobbyists for grassroots causes in Washington, D.C. Although SUWA's political presence has expanded and its support network has proliferated, verifiably successful trends, the verdict is

still out on its ability to attain the extensive federal designation it has been advocating for years.

Early in Calkin's tenure as executive director, he outlined a four-point strategy that included: (1) nationalize the issue, (2) build our organization, (3) defend the land, and (4) promote the alternatives (i.e., introduce people to the non-economic values of the Colorado Plateau). Matz has added to his predecessor's strategic agenda by noting that grassroots activism is at the heart of SUWA's success. His prescription for successful grassroots involvement is: (1) educate, (2) recruit, and (3) turn on the spigots. SUWA's grassroots efforts are not community-based, but consist of national outreach to generate active and engaged supporters to write letters, make phone calls, and participate in other lobbying activities.

Often SUWA seems to be embroiled in battle, but in conjunction with Utah Wilderness Coalition members, much proactive work is presently being done. Over the past few years extensive fieldwork has been done and thorough documentation has been accumulated in an effort to reevaluate the Wilderness potential of Utah BLM lands and ultimately to present a more current proposal due in June 1998.

Although not a stated tactic, much of SUWA's success must be attributed to the predominately anti-Wilderness position of the Utah congressional delegation. According to Coser (1956), groups define themselves by struggling with other groups. The polarization between the positions of the Utah delegation and SUWA is exacerbated in the media, but

the countervailing forces of the delegation and other adversaries have enabled SUWA to maintain the alertness of its membership and attract thousands of people to its cause. Over the past 14 years, SUWA's effectiveness at defending the land has also been revealed by the responses of some southern Utahns, notably: the hanging of Clive Kincaid in effigy in Escalante; the firing of shots at a SUWA member's home; and the sale of T-shirts and bumper stickers in Escalante displaying the slogan 'SUWA SUCKS' (Matz 1994a; Watkins 1996).

Coverage by the media and use of the media to cost-effectively extend the organization's message have also been crucial to SUWA's success. SUWA has had considerable coverage in the popular press, including articles in *Rolling Stone*, *Newsweek*, *Time*, *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *USA Today*. Gifford et al. classified and rated many environmental groups in the September 1990 issue of *Outside*, mentioning SUWA on their "honor roll," as a homegrown, low-budget group that "may be the future of the environmental movement." *Private Eye Weekly*, an independent Utah newspaper, voted SUWA the best local citizen's action group in 1994.

Most SUWA insiders agree that the national press has been much more favorable to the organization's cause than regional reporters. Darrell Knuffke, a former journalist, notes that nationally it is a great story---an entire state, politically, against a tiny organization! On occasion, letters-to-the-editor in some local Utah papers serve as outlets for nasty and vile condemnations of SUWA and its staff.

During SUWA's 1995 campaign to thwart HR 1745, it hired a public relations firm to assist the organization in broadening its message and the outlets for that message. Additionally, Ken Rait and Jim Baca completed an exhaustive series of editorial board visits throughout the country. SUWA's generally favorable presence in newspapers throughout the nation was a critical element for defeating HR 1745. In addition, that type of media exposure gave SUWA even more national recognition.

Utah Wilderness Coalition

Coalition-building is also a tactic of many social movement organizations. The emergence of the Utah Wilderness Coalition in October 1985 has been a powerful force in bringing local, regional, and national resources together to promote the Citizens' Proposal. According to Liz McCoy, the Utah Wilderness Coalition grassroots coordinator, the Coalition has grown from a core of 16 organizations at its inception to over 150 groups today. Many of the members support the Utah Wilderness Coalition in name only and mainly the "senior partners," including SUWA, The Wilderness Society, and Sierra Club, play the most visible and vigorous roles within the group. Organizationally, only SUWA has the singular goal of advocating Wilderness for the Colorado Plateau. Other organizations, especially the nationals, are significantly more multi-issue focused, but leaders from some of these groups profess that Utah Wilderness is high on their agenda. The

Utah Wilderness Coalition does engage in issue work beyond the scope of BLM Wilderness, but passage of the Citizens' Proposal is its primary focus.

Some members of the Utah Wilderness Coalition first presented a Citizens' Proposal for 5,032,900 acres in the summer of 1985. By 1990, the Utah Wilderness Coalition published a 400-page wilderness appraisal, *Wilderness at the Edge*, encompassing thorough documentation for its 5.7-million-acre proposal.

Future

Given the steady growth enjoyed by SUWA, it appears that the organization will continue on its present path over the next few years, focusing on a more current and sensible interpretation of RS 2477, participating in the formation of a management plan for the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument, aggressively preventing "bad" legislation, and enlarging its grassroots network.

Based on the hypothetical situation that HR 1500 could be signed into law tomorrow, SUWA leaders speculated on the implications that success could have for their organization. Scott Groene thought that SUWA should go the way of the Wolf Fund, an organization that dissolved after successfully seeing the reintroduction of the wolf to Yellowstone National Park. Others felt that SUWA might restructure, down-sizing and emerging with a focus on management implementation for the newly designated Wilderness lands, largely becoming a watchdog organization. Susan Tixier thought that SUWA

should reemerge as a wilderness advocacy organization for the four corners states, not just Utah. And Mike Medberry, former Utah representative for The Wilderness Society, states that if a HR 1500 victory occurred tomorrow, the Utah Wilderness Coalition would be partying for five years!

CHAPTER VII

AN ANALYSIS OF WILDERNESS ADVOCACY IN UTAH

The histories outlined in the preceding chapters set the context for analysis and laid the foundation for addressing the major research question, restated below:

Why have the two most prominent wilderness advocacy groups in the state of Utah, the Utah Wilderness Association and the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, taken such divergent positions and advocated different strategies for resolving the debate over Wilderness designation of Bureau of Land Management lands in southern Utah?

Based on an extensive review of the primary and secondary literature, archival data, and key informant interviews, three levels of analysis are used to answer the major research question. First, a comparative analysis is offered of the organizational and structural differences between UWA and SUWA. Secondly, an examination of the two groups' ideological and philosophical differences provides further understanding of the two organizations. Thirdly, by examining each organization's perspectives on BLM Wilderness in Utah, additional distinctions between SUWA and UWA are highlighted.

Based on the responses of key informants, speculations on conditions for the resolution of the Utah Wilderness debate are offered. Finally, this chapter examines the underpinnings that led many of the key informants to

take on careers in conservation, as environmental leaders and wilderness advocates.

Organizational and Structural Dichotomies

Organizational and structural characteristics of UWA and SUWA are detailed in Chapters V and VI, respectively. Table 2 condenses and compares these characteristics by outlining the differences in leadership, membership, funding, and other internal and external distinctions. Consistent with the literature on social movement organizations and resource mobilization theory, the structural and organizational differences discussed below outline the resources available to each organization and each group's fundamental structure to create a context for understanding how each organization facilitates its mission.

Leadership

UWA's leadership, namely Dick Carter, remained consistent throughout its lifespan from 1979 to 1996. Alternatively, SUWA has encountered three stages of leadership, each defined by a different executive director (i.e., Kincaid, Calkin, and Matz). Kamieniecki et al. (1995) contend that charismatic leadership is essential to sustaining a threshold of involvement within a social movement organization. The loss of Dick Carter as UWA's pivotal and formative leader forced the organization into hibernation. With the ability to offer competitive salaries and a passionate

Table 2

Organizational and structural dichotomies of UWA and SUWA

	U W A	S U W A
LEADERSHIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistent: Carter was Coordinator for UWA's entire lifespan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> changed: Kincaid- 1984-88 Calkin- 1988-93 Matz- 1993-present
ROLE OF BOARD	staff-dominated	active and engaged
# OF FULL-TIME STAFF (1995)	3	12
AVERAGE STAFF SALARY (1995)	~\$10,000	\$28,083
# OF MEMBERS (1995)	~1,000	~22,000
MEMBERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> small 90% Utahns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> large and growing over 50% Utahns
RECRUITMENT TACTICS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Word-of-mouth Annual conferences Slide presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct mail Canvassing Slide presentations
ANNUAL REVENUE (1995)	~\$70,000	\$1.53 million
FUNDING SOURCES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80%-members 20%-sales (T-shirts, calendars, river trips) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51%-individual sources 31%-new and renewed membership dues 18%-foundation grants
MEDIA EXPOSURE	regional	national
GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utah Northern Utah-Uintas and the Wasatch Front 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Southern Utah-Colorado Plateau
USE OF INTERNET	no	yes
PUBLICATIONS	<i>UWA Review</i> (bi-monthly newsletter)	<i>SUWA</i> (quarterly newsletter)
WASHINGTON, D.C. PRESENCE	very limited	office and staff
LAWYERS ON STAFF	no	yes
ORGANIZATION-SPONSORED ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Rendezvous River rafting trips Hikes Poetry contests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Roundup Bike trips Hikes

cause, SUWA has effectively transitioned after the retirement of its founder and subsequent leaders.

Another notable distinction is where the leaders of each organization were born and raised. Carter, Nickas, and Macfarlane, the core leadership of UWA, are all native Utahns. It is likely that UWA's perspectives were very much shaped by and based on the political and cultural atmosphere of its leaders' youth and adulthood. UWA leaders are drawn to activism by their love of the Utah's lands and wildlife; however, they are also connected to Utah's people. Alternatively, Brant Calkin spent his formative years in New Mexico and Mike Matz grew up in Minnesota. Although their love for Utah's lands is not lessened for not having grown up in the state, they have the ability to draw on experiences from their out-of-state upbringings, including everything from childhood interpretations to professional career affiliations.

Based on a familiarity with a particular political landscape, UWA elected to pursue its work within the state of Utah. Calkin and Matz possess significant conservation experience from working extensively on the national environmental front as Sierra Club leaders. Throughout their tenures at SUWA they have drawn on this national background and have built a sizable wilderness advocacy campaign for Utah's lands with a national scope.

Membership

UWA deliberately limited its membership, based on some strong organizational convictions. UWA's membership never exceeded 1,500 individuals. For SUWA, a major component of its organizational vision involved substantial growth. Its membership numbers continue to rise and it presently includes about 24,000 members. Similarly, on a different scale, staff size mirrors membership size. UWA never had more than three full-time staffers throughout its existence. At some points during recent years, SUWA has employed as many as 14 staffers. Simply, SUWA's larger staff and membership allow it to mobilize more resources.

Information on the demographic characteristics of each groups' members is difficult to obtain, but it appears that they are relatively similar in being characterized as predominately white, middle-class, and middle-age. UWA's membership was overwhelmingly Utahn. SUWA has greater diversity in state representation among its membership, with just over half being Utahn. Although membership characteristics are not well-established for either organization, the broad descriptions of each group's constituency base appear consistent with the literature that characterizes the environmental movement. Paehlke (1989) asserts that wilderness, in contrast to more recent environmental problems (e.g., pollution and environmental justice issues), is not the type of issue that crosses class boundaries.

Recruitment of members is similar on many levels for the two groups, but the defining difference is SUWA's use of direct mail as a recruitment

tactic. The use of direct mail has significantly aided SUWA in enlarging its membership and represents a recruitment strategy of many large mainstream national environmental groups. UWA and SUWA sponsor similar activities (e.g., outdoor trips and annual gatherings) to promote membership and to involve members. Each group publishes a newsletter to keep members abreast of activities, events, and issues. Furthermore, SUWA also uses the Internet as a mechanism to expand its support network.

Funding

Both organizations rely heavily on their members, through dues and individual contributions, to sustain them financially. SUWA also seeks foundation grants to supplement its work, whereas UWA selectively chose not to pursue such financial contributions. The result of having a small membership base, which provided the majority of funding for UWA, made annual revenue relatively small for this organization, compared with the over one-million-dollar budget of SUWA. Throughout the literature on the environmental movement and social movement organizations, financial support is offered as one of the key elements to sustaining a threshold of mobilization and for creating an impact (Walker 1983).

Other Distinctions

SUWA's ability to nationalize the issue is apparent in its media coverage, which includes exposure in many popular national publications. SUWA's attention is very narrowly focused on the Colorado Plateau region,

yet its approach is extremely national. In other efforts to expand its presence, SUWA also maintains an office and staff in Washington, D.C. Alternatively, as a Utah-based organization, UWA focused on wilderness and wildlife issues within the state, often with particular emphasis on the Uintas, but with critical involvement in southern Utah issues as well. UWA's geographic scope allowed for mainly regional coverage by the press.

Overall, direct mail recruitment, a fairly sizable budget, Washington, D.C. presence, and national media coverage are all attributes of many of the major national environmental groups. In this case, they describe some of SUWA's organizational and structural characteristics as well. Although SUWA has not yet achieved its goal of Wilderness protection for the Colorado Plateau, according to the literature on social movement organizations, it has clearly mobilized resources to attain a critical mass of supporters throughout the nation and in the U.S. Congress. UWA selectively chose not to follow the trends of many national organizations and was able to maintain functional operations for almost two decades, but ultimately financial constraints limited the organization's ability to transition after the loss of its core leadership.

Ideological and Philosophical Dichotomies

Most of the organizational and structural differences listed above stem from the very distinctive ideologies and philosophies of each organization. The orientation of each groups' wilderness philosophy must be distinguished

between Wilderness, as a congressionally-mandated entity and wilderness, as a general quality of a landscape. Although most every respondent admitted that the congressional definition of Wilderness has shaped their individual interpretation of what qualifies as wilderness, overall, leaders of SUWA and UWA appear to espouse different emphases in their concepts of wilderness.

UWA leaders stress the importance of biodiversity values in interpreting and experiencing wilderness. They look at wilderness in the framework of ecological systems and have process-oriented perspectives on what constitutes this entity. Furthermore, they often define wilderness using its literal definition, wild-deor-ness, meaning the "place of wild beasts."

Through interviews with leaders from SUWA, concepts of wilderness appear to center on place-oriented perceptions, emphasizing spiritual and aesthetic values. They speak of wilderness as a place that gives definition to society; a place of agoraphobic distances and deafening quiet; and a place of peace and calm, surrounded by the red and dry and the green and wet.

Unquestionably, each organization and all of the respondents are fully aware of the multiple values of wilderness, for the natural and ecological qualities of wilderness were not dismissed by SUWA, nor were the aesthetic and spiritual values of wilderness not acknowledged by UWA. But, organizational literature and certain responses indicate that a distinction like the one provided above is reasonable.

Conceptions of wilderness as a general quality help to clarify how each organization perceives congressionally-designated Wilderness. With an

emphasis on wildness, UWA maintains that Wilderness may be only one piece (a considerable piece) in the overall framework of maintaining wild processes. Alternatively, SUWA's orientation positions it to declare that Wilderness is the highest form of land protection, making all other forms of federal land classification less in contrast.

The above interpretations of wilderness and Wilderness lend considerable understanding to the individual missions and tactics of each organization. Consensus-building approaches, like those advocated by UWA, may not be seen as conciliatory if the objective is to attain a piece of the puzzle. If one is after the whole pie, as SUWA is, then clearly the national approach they have chosen may be more functional in attaining what they see as the highest form of land protection, Wilderness designation.

The dominant organizational ideology¹ with which leaders of each organization identify further indicates that the overall philosophy of each group is decidedly different. Carter typifies UWA as an organization based on biocentrism. Biocentrism is founded on an understanding that natural systems are the basis for all organic existence, and therefore possess intrinsic value (Brulle 1996; Oelschlaeger 1991). Matz describes SUWA as an organization built on a preservationist ideology. Preservationism is based on a recognition that human actions can impair the ability of natural systems to

¹Ideologies included: resourcism, conservationism, preservationism, biocentrism, political ecology, and ecofeminism. All definitions were obtained from Brulle (1996) and Oelschlaeger (1991). See Appendix D for the complete list of definitions used in the interviews.

maintain themselves and that wilderness and wildlife are important components in both the physical and spiritual life of humans (Brulle 1996; Oelschlaeger 1991). Their ideological distinctions are further indication that UWA and SUWA interpret wilderness differently. UWA's biocentric orientation is consistent with its desire to advocate the protection of biodiversity and ecological systems. SUWA's subscription to the preservationist paradigm is illustrative of the organization's focus on attaining legal protection for the lands of the Colorado Plateau, thereby creating potentially enforceable conditions for long-term management and protection of these lands from certain deleterious influences of humans.

These ideologies have significantly shaped the issue foci and emphases of each organization. The preservationist slant of SUWA is an effective orientation for continuing its singular fixation on southern Utah Wilderness. The biocentric paradigm associated with UWA is a functional philosophy for the multi-issue focus of this organization, which centers heavily on the components and sustenance of natural systems and ecological processes.

Table 3 provides a synopsis of the ideological and philosophical dichotomies of each organization.

Organizational Perspectives on the Bureau of Land Management Wilderness Debate

By building on the structural and philosophical distinctions between the two organizations, a clearer understanding of their divergent strategies on

Table 3

Ideological and philosophical dichotomies of UWA and SUWA

	U W A	S U W A
CONCEPT OF WILDERNESS	a piece of the puzzle	the highest form of land protection
CONCEPT OF <i>w</i>ILDERNESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • process-oriented (biodiversity values) • “place of wild beasts” (wild-deor-ness) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • place-oriented (spiritual and aesthetic values)
DOMINANT ORGANIZATIONAL IDEOLOGY	biocentrism	preservationism
MISSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • statewide advocacy for protection of Utah lands • protection of biodiversity • work with other stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national advocacy for protection of the wilderness qualities of the Colorado Plateau • supports administrative and legislative initiatives for attaining protection • uncompromising advocacy
ISSUE FOCI	multiple	singular
ISSUE EMPHASIS	wilderness----->wildlife	southern Utah Wilderness
TACTICS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consensus-building within Utah • litigation • education • lobbying • grassroots organizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • build national campaign and maintain Beltway (Washington, D.C.) presence • litigation • education • lobbying • grassroots organizing

BLM Wilderness emerge. Although UWA did not attain all the acreage it sought in the 1984 battle over Wilderness on National Forest Service lands in Utah, its involvement in achieving some Wilderness for Utah was considered a success by the organization. UWA worked with state-level officials to negotiate the 1984 bill, which eventually met with federal approval. UWA believed it was possible to work within the state to address more public lands issues and to eventually get even more Wilderness in Utah. SUWA formed slightly before the Utah Wilderness Act of 1984 was becoming law. Although it had no involvement with the 1984 bill, SUWA's disgust with the 1984 process prompted it to seek an alternative arena for BLM Wilderness designation. In the halls of Congress, where Wilderness bills actually get signed, SUWA feels it has a fighting chance.

Both organizations offered separate proposals for BLM Wilderness in 1985. Although substantial research went into both proposals, they became known only by their numbers. Utah's conservationists were split under the flags of UWA's 3.8-million-acre proposal and the 5.1-million-acre proposal offered by SUWA. The larger acreage number eventually rose to 5.7 million acres and became the mantra of the "wilderness warriors" of the Utah Wilderness Coalition. A bigger number made them appear to have a radical position and approach. Alternatively, the 3.8-million-acre proposal advocated by UWA was the more moderate position and UWA gained the public perception of being a group of reasonable conservationists. Large numbers coupled with SUWA's willingness to battle its adversaries at every

turn, in court and in the media, earned it the distinction of being the "junkyard dog," always ready to jump into the fight. Based purely on acreage numbers as the positional definition for each group, SUWA appeared to be the more radical organization of the two groups.

With positions clearly outlined, the process of attaining Wilderness began. SUWA, working on the national level, stuck with conventional approaches---building a critical mass of wilderness supporters and lobbying the U.S. Congress. Because over half of the lands in the Citizens' Proposal are protected as de facto Wilderness, SUWA is content with the interim protection of the land, which gives it time to develop more support within Congress.

The Community and Wild Lands Futures Project in Emery County served as UWA's venue for continuing its work within the state and for attempting to bring resolution to some portion of the Utah Wilderness debate. The Community and Wild Lands Futures Project functioned well based on UWA's organizational convictions, but it was a process that had no clear models or firm precedents. Some participants in this project indicate that there are trends of increased local involvement and decision-making on public lands and environmental issues, but examples of effective consensus-building on a Wilderness debate of this magnitude are nonexistent. As described by Susan Carpenter, mediator for the Emery County Pilot Project, it was truly an innovative and creative process. Thus, although SUWA

represents the more radical organization at a substantive level, from a procedural standpoint UWA may be seen as the more radical group.

Finally, the September 1996 proclamation by President Clinton allows another lens through which to observe Utah's Wilderness debate. The process of designating the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument has been ridiculed and scorned by many local citizens and state officials because they were decidedly and utterly kept out of the process. Although UWA was no longer functional at the time of this Presidential decree, Dick Carter admits that the poor course taken by Clinton, by excluding local and state input, may very well represent the way the BLM Wilderness issue will be resolved. Although Monument designation did not grant the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument the highest level of land protection, in the form of Wilderness designation, to SUWA it represented slight vindication and recognition that administrative forces in Washington, D.C. were listening to the organization's message.

An overview of organizational perspectives on the BLM Wilderness debate is provided in Table 4.

Interorganizational Relations

Personality clashes were definitely an element of early UWA and SUWA leader relations. The fundamental differences between the groups lend understanding to the source of heated exchanges. But now, over 10 years after the groups' original inability to unify on a BLM Wilderness proposal,

Table 4

Organizational perspectives of UWA and SUWA on the Utah BLM Wilderness debate

	U W A	S U W A
POSITION	moderate	radical
PROCESS/APPROACH	non-traditional/radical	traditional/pragmatic
PRESENCE ON ISSUE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • early: first and forefront organization • later: overshadowed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • early: steadily gained credibility • today: the dominant organization
ORIENTATION	solution-focused	presently content with status quo while waiting for changes in the political climate
PUBLIC PERCEPTION	reasonable	junkyard dog --> mainstream
NATIONAL POLITICAL LANDSCAPE	some support ---> more polarized	favorable transition-- possible to make progress here
STATE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE	workable ---> formidable	anti-wilderness-- no allies in this arena since Owens
LOCAL POLITICAL LANDSCAPE	variable from county to county	improving--local governments have gone from supporting nothing to supporting something
ARENA OF RESOLUTION	Utah	Washington, D.C. (Congress)
1984 UTAH WILDERNESS ACT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • success • foundation for future Wilderness designation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure • 'release' bill
GRAND STAIRCASE ESCALANTE NATIONAL MONUMENT DESIGNATION	poor process, but defined the way the BLM Wilderness issue will be resolved	supportive, but it created a perception that the Monument is a proxy for Wilderness and it is NOT!

there appears to be a notable level of respect between the individuals of each organization, despite continued debate over processes and positions.

Essentially, as SUWA grew to become the dominant organization on BLM Wilderness, UWA was overshadowed on this issue. As the organizations evolved, UWA became more heavily involved in wildlife and predator issues and was basically ignored by SUWA and the rest of the Utah Wilderness Coalition.

Roles

Leaders of SUWA describe their organization as the most unyielding proponent of wilderness. To UWA, SUWA appears to have only defined the issue without making efforts to truly solve it. And, to others familiar with the debate, but not connected to either organization, SUWA is considered everything from narrow, acrimonious, and adversarial to a shrewd, savvy, and sophisticated leader on wilderness.

On the issue of BLM Wilderness, UWA defines itself as the organization responsible for trying to solve the debate by engaging in a visionary approach. Overwhelmingly, SUWA leaders view UWA's role in BLM Wilderness issue as insignificant. Others involved with the debate characterize UWA as everything from a group of patriarchal regional conservationists to true believers, willing to come to the table and see a larger solution set.

The different proposals and positions set forth by each organization are largely a result of different political understandings. Perhaps Wayne McCormack best encapsulated the groups' differences when he said, "The Utah Wilderness Coalition has a vision of what the land should look like and UWA has a vision of what the process should look like!" Overall, UWA and SUWA experienced some poor press in 1985 when the groups decided to pursue different strategies. As noted by Mike Medberry, the portrayal of infighting in the media hurts the movement in general. But overall, leaders from both SUWA and UWA seem to agree that failure to unite on a common proposal and process has not hurt the advancement of Wilderness designation. Susan Tixier professes that it is a rather misguided notion to think that we all have to agree, for sometimes well-articulated differences create the energy to move the process forward.

Another UWA?

Doubtful. Although a number of respondents indicated a need and desire to see the space left by UWA's hibernation filled, the prospect of any present organization doing so is dubious. The Grand Canyon Trust (GCT) was often cited as the organization that espouses philosophies most similar to UWA, based on its communitarian orientation. But, GCT is a member of the Utah Wilderness Coalition and its geographic scope makes it most concentrated on the issues of the Grand Canyon. It is quite unlikely that GCT will emerge as the next UWA. Additionally, SUWA's dominance on the

BLM Wilderness issue would make it difficult for any new group not connected to the Utah Wilderness Coalition vision, to establish itself and obtain funding. Therefore, in the present context, the emergence of a new organization promoting consensus-building alternatives would require substantial perseverance and considerable financial backing.

Although many agree that there is room for another voice, some speculate that it will not be one mimicking UWA's. Groene, Matz, and Tixier all agree that the voice that emerges may actually be one more radical, more extreme, and more unyielding than SUWA's. Interestingly, from a positional standpoint, that might put SUWA in UWA's vacant spot.

Looking Back and Projecting Forward

In assessing what the dominant factors are that have produced such an intractable debate over the last couple of decades, many agree that a poor inventory process has had considerable impact. Furthermore, most SUWA leaders attribute the lack of Wilderness designation of Utah BLM lands to the untiring opposition of the Utah delegation and the tacit Senatorial rule that prevents Senators from opposing their colleagues on state-specific legislation. UWA leaders cite the deep entrenchment of both the Utah delegation and the Utah Wilderness Coalition as a major factor inhibiting Wilderness designation. Others make the point that wilderness is a very emotional issue, accentuating personal ties to the land. The emotional level of the debate also lessens the ability to look at more objective considerations. Thus, the

stalemate over BLM Wilderness in Utah persists and resolution could be on a distant time horizon.

How much time? There was little agreement on a temporal frame for resolution of this debate. Allen Freemyer, staff director for the House of Representatives Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, speculated that the BLM Wilderness issue in Utah would be solved within the next four years. His optimism was unmatched by other key informants, many of whom suggested that it would be another generation or more before the debate is resolved. Freemyer noted that the limited resources of the Departments of Interior and Justice will be the impetus for resolution. He also thinks that Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt would like to leave a legacy of having resolved the Utah Wilderness issue. He surprisingly asserts that up to 3 million acres of BLM Wilderness in Utah would be acceptable---a shocking statement from a staffer for Rep. Jim Hansen's subcommittee.

Some SUWA leaders think resolution to this issue will come within the next 10 years, but many others suggested a much longer time frame. A change in the make-up of the Utah delegation is considered the most pivotal factor in bringing about conditions for resolution. A shift in the delegation is largely what aided the passage of the California Desert Protection Act in 1994. Additionally, many SUWA leaders feel that by continually enlarging the tide of Wilderness support throughout the nation and specifically in Congress, a "rolling" of the Utah delegation is possible, in the style of the 1980 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

UWA leaders mainly agree that resolution of this issue does not appear to be on the short-term horizon. They think a shift in the Utah delegation could make conditions more favorable for passing Wilderness legislation. They firmly believe that there must be support within the state and highly doubt any possibility of an Alaska replay. Many others also agree that there is slim likelihood of "rolling" the delegation. Despite his firm anti-Wilderness position, Senator Hatch has wide popularity and a level of respectability among his peers that Alaska's Senators did not have in 1980, according to Jim Catlin, a Utah Wilderness Coalition leader. Most respondents conceded that overriding Senator Hatch would be a significant feat. Also, as noted by Susan Carpenter, Alaska is considered the "gem" of our public lands and a different public perception exists of the land in this noncontiguous state, where Wilderness is the rule and not the exception.

Furthermore, both UWA and SUWA contend that Wilderness needs to be an election-level issue. Utahns, specifically, do not typically vote based on the Wilderness stance of politicians. Thus, a groundswell of public support needs to build within Utah and throughout the nation, which would be reflective of the pro-Wilderness sentiments readily cited in public opinion polls.

Career Conservationists

Why Utah?

When leaders were asked to describe their thoughts on being wilderness advocates in the state of Utah, responses varied, but a distinguishable theme emerged. To most it just makes sense to protect the places they love. The tremendous value of what is at stake and the desire to leave a healthy legacy of wildlands for future generations are also compelling forces motivating this activism. Ken Rait described his experience as "a great privilege." Others noted that there is an almost perverse satisfaction in working within a state where there is such a strong anti-environmental political climate. Polarization of the debate over Utah's Wilderness issue is frustrating to many of these conservationists, yet camaraderie among many wilderness advocates sustains their enthusiasm. With the Wilderness resource in the United States rapidly diminishing, Utah still contains a considerable amount of wild space, so to these activists, it is their paramount conviction to protect the places that are left.

Influences

For most wilderness visionaries and lovers of nature, there is often a story behind their vision and their love---a force, an influence, a defining exposure, or multiple experiences. Reflections on what those motivations are can be personally powerful and can also be a source of inspiration to others. Many of the conservationists interviewed for this project were aware of some

definable moment, a unique wandering, a powerful passage, or a symbolic event that greatly shaped their futures as wilderness advocates. Others were cognizant of collective forces, which positioned them to take on a career in conservation.

The bookshelves of these individuals must be voluminous. It appears that many of the same books are on the shelves of both the leaders of UWA and SUWA. Few of their personal libraries are without works by Aldo Leopold, Edward Abbey, Wallace Stegner, and Terry Tempest Williams. More selectively, one may find works by E.O. Wilson, John Muir, Roderick Nash, Rachel Carson, and Margaret Murie on the reading lists of some SUWA and UWA leaders.

Although writers and literature served to help these individuals articulate and understand some of their own convictions about the natural world and wilderness, the wonder of certain places appears to have solidified these convictions. Inspirational wanderings within Arch Canyon, along the Book Cliffs, and throughout the Colorado Plateau are overwhelmingly cited as forces of great significance in propelling these individuals to activism. Experiences in the Uintas, Adirondacks, Yellowstone, and Sierras have also enabled many of these individuals to develop their personal wilderness philosophies.

In adopting a life of conservation, other conservationists have often served as mentors. People such as Jim Catlin, Dick Carter, and Brant Calkin

were all mentioned in that context. Furthermore, inspirational teachers and professors were also noted for instilling passion within many of these people.

Finally, other forces of influence came in the way of significant events. Here the responses were overwhelmingly personal and profound. Lawson Legate of the Sierra Club noted the power Earth Day 1970 had on prompting him to begin a career of environmental activism. Mike Medberry, former Utah representative for The Wilderness Society, remarked on an influential encounter as a college student, as he watched a California river die under a dam and was witness to a selfless act of civil disobedience when one man tried to stop the dam's closure. He described this as a "ghostly and evil experience," which left an indelible impression. Mike Matz shared an inspirational story of his youth, when as a second-grader, he and a few friends organized a neighborhood petition. At that young age he discovered that it was not necessary to accept things the way they are. And, Ken Rait shared his experience as a new father, noting his desire to see wilderness protected for his daughter and future generations. Gary Macfarlane recalled his first encounter with a pine marten in the Uintas, representing the beginning of a lifetime filled with powerful wilderness experiences.

These passionate reflections and notable influences are telling. They describe some of the key forces that shaped a portion of Utah's conservation community. Finally, it is likely that the intensity of involvement, level of commitment, and passionate leadership of SUWA and UWA leaders may

very well be what shapes the spirits and convictions of future wilderness advocates.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Recommendations for Future Research

Overall, the methodology presented in this work is an appropriate means for understanding the organizational histories and interactions between SUWA and UWA. Although insightful, historic, and pertinent information was obtained through in-depth interviewing of the respective leaders of each organization, future analyses of these groups could be enhanced through a survey of their memberships. Given SUWA's use of direct mail recruitment, it is in an ideal situation to administer such a survey of its constituency. The motivations and demographic characteristics of SUWA's 24,000 members would certainly allow the organization expanded insight into its support network. It would also allow researchers, like myself, to more thoroughly analyze a key component of this group's growth and sustenance, as well as contributing to a broader understanding of wilderness supporters, grassroots involvement, and the environmental movement, especially as it pertains to the state of Utah.

Because member support has been a significant factor in the longevity and strength of both of these organizations, it would be an appropriate supplement to this research to have a more comprehensive understanding of the membership base of each group, providing support or refutation of the

claims and histories presented by the leadership of each organization and by others who have worked closely with these leaders or these organizations.

Of course, with sufficient funding and more time, a longitudinal component could be added to this study, allowing for future insights on the Utah Wilderness battle and the conservation organizations involved. Even though UWA is actively defunct, but formally extant, continued analysis of the sentiments of UWA's former leaders with regard to BLM Wilderness could be pursued. Given that the Utah Wilderness issue does not appear to have any immediate resolutions, the history contained in this analysis should provide a sufficient base for further study of the strategies, tactics, and roles of these organizations in the continuing debate over the future of our public lands. Longitudinal studies could also test the predictions set forth in this 1998 research about the future of the Utah Wilderness debate and the futures of SUWA and UWA.

The focal point of analysis in this study centers on individuals formally or presently connected to either UWA or SUWA. Additional key informants were selected for greater insight into the roles of these organizations and the political intransigence of the Utah Wilderness debate. Future researchers could enhance this work by interviewing additional informants with external connections to these organizations, in an effort to further explain the relationship between SUWA and UWA, as well as their future roles in wilderness advocacy in Utah.

Finally, for future researchers, two plausible and interesting continuations of this research are provided above. A more thorough analysis of the membership component of each organization would enhance organizational understanding. And, a follow-up to this study, using the same or similar questions asked of the same interviewees, could significantly expand the insights explored in this thesis.

Final Insights

The preceding chapters delineate the fundamental reasoning for the divergent strategies and positions of SUWA and UWA in the battle for Wilderness in Utah. The keys to understanding the different approaches of each organization are based on understandings of the backgrounds of each organization's leadership, their distinct organizational structures, their ability to mobilize resources, and their very individual wilderness philosophies. The Utah-based approaches of UWA are largely a result of the leaders being native Utahns coupled with a desire to incorporate local input into a federal designation process. SUWA leaders possess a significant understanding of how to create national recognition for the Colorado Plateau based largely on their experiences with national environmental organizations. The structure of each organization dictates leaders' abilities to mobilize essential organizational resources and to participate in arenas of policy change as participants in the subgovernment model of policy-making and as actors in the advocacy coalition framework (McCool 1990; Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith

1993). Each organization employs distinct methodologies and activities for attaining Wilderness designation and the manner in which each group has combined its resources in the form of expertise, capital, and commitment is illustrative of how they perceive resolution to this ongoing debate.

Perhaps the most powerful distinctions to be made between the two organizations are their distinctive philosophies on wilderness as an entity and Wilderness as a policy prescription. The fundamentally different understandings of wilderness espoused by each organization are the foundation for their structural differences and ultimately for their separate strategies for advocating Wilderness on Utah BLM lands.

Throughout this research and analysis, the differences between UWA and SUWA have been highlighted from structural, organizational, philosophical, and tactical perspectives. Despite the overwhelming dissimilarities between the two organizations, there does exist a very powerful and overriding point of commonality. Although each organization has different conceptions of wilderness and Wilderness, both SUWA and UWA believe in leaving a legacy of protected lands for posterity. This common goal was not enough to bring the organizations together in a functional working relationship throughout the BLM battle, but their shared love for the lands of the canyon country has allowed each organization to build a broader support base for wilderness advocacy throughout the country and within Utah. Their collective impact has been extensive and long term

by lending visibility to the issue and through educating the public about these lands.

Given the diversity of environmental issues of international, national, regional, and local concern today, the diversity of environmental groups, which are organized and willing to deal with a host of challenges concerning the sustenance of the earth, is a sign of the environmental movement's significance and adaptability. The existence of UWA and SUWA is also illustrative of diversity within Utah's wilderness advocacy movement. Early discussions of different proposals and strategies did lead to some in-fighting among UWA and Utah Wilderness Coalition members. This is consistent with some literature that characterizes the environmental movement, contending that diversity may result in in-fighting and fragmentation among groups (Norton 1991; Dunlap and Mertig 1992; Glick 1995a). However, diversity is also a strength within the overarching movement, and in the wilderness advocacy movement in Utah, given that resolution to this issue is expected on a longer-term time horizon, it is important to engage different ideas concerning efforts to solve this debate. Further diversification of the Utah Wilderness issue may involve drawing clearer connections between environmental health issues and loss of wilderness. More recent environmental concerns (e.g., pollution) appear to have more immediate and basic implications as opposed to the appreciation of wilderness, "nature-at-a-distance" (Paehlke 1989, 21). Greater attentiveness to making these types of linkages could broaden the spectrum of support for Utah Wilderness. Other

efforts to enhance support for Wilderness in Utah should consider greater attentiveness to the rural-urban dichotomy within the state to better address the concerns and incorporate the attitudes of newcomers and long-term residents.

Relative to other environmental concerns, Wilderness protection is only one means of addressing the health and future of the environment. In Utah, the planetary significance of the lands at stake has prompted many to join the cause of advocacy for wilderness. Within the spectrum of environmental organizations, leaders of SUWA and UWA represent powerful, passionate, and dedicated models for environmental leadership. It is their deft insight, indelible spirit, and inexorable conviction for the values of wilderness that serve as inspiration for others to become involved in conservation issues, despite the divisive atmosphere of many public lands battles.

Thus, although UWA no longer represents an active organizational entity, value and wisdom can be gained from its participation in the process and the singularity of its leadership in the earliest days of the BLM Wilderness inventory. Ultimately, congressional designation represents only nominal protection of the land. Indisputably, such federal legislation is a powerful acknowledgment of the national value of the land, but it does not represent true protection. True protection comes in the form of on-the-ground management and agency enforcement, not strictly from a delicately

crafted legal document signed by the President of the United States.

According to Mark Dowie:

[T]he nationals have put too much faith in the authority of the federal government to protect the environment. It became evident almost immediately that passing legislation wasn't going to be enough; there had to be an enormous litigative arm of this movement to enforce the legislation. ("An Amicus forum on grassroots and national groups" 1995, 39)

Therefore, in the spirit of seeing the wilderness qualities of BLM Wilderness lands in southern Utah sustained indefinitely, there will clearly need to be an effort to involve adjacent communities in the process of Wilderness management. If, as many environmentalists and others continually assert, the BLM is an agency captured by its chief constituents, miners and ranchers, and largely responsive to the communities that have geographic proximity to its managed lands, then it is wholly conceivable that these constituencies will have a substantial influence in the management of Wilderness. Therefore, interaction with these constituency groups could play a critical role in attaining thorough protection for the BLM lands of the Colorado Plateau, which is espoused as a primary goal of Utah's environmentalists. This proposition is set forth in the spirit of Machlis' (1995, 57) conviction: "The management of protected areas in the 21st century, now so close, is necessarily the management of people." And, as Williams (1996, 120) so passionately asserts:

Wilderness, especially America's redrock wilderness, is not an abstraction. These are real places connected to real communities, where human and "more-than-human" considerations are at stake.

The national attention and concern presently attributed to the issue is a critical step in enlarging recognition for what is at stake and for gaining the attention of national political leaders, who hold positions of influence and decision-making power in the arena of ultimate Wilderness designation, the U.S. Congress. Gaining support in this atmosphere is also very critical. These organizations are not conveniently typified solely under the rubric of "grassroots," yet the ability of UWA and SUWA to generate citizen participation and organize public sentiment for the protection of Utah's wildlands is often the result of grassroots activities such as letter-writing campaigns and public participation in other lobbying efforts. The major distinction in each group's grassroots organization is that UWA pursued such strategies at the community level, but SUWA employs grassroots activism through national outreach. Furthermore, given that the land is so vast, the debate over Wilderness designation for Utah's BLM lands is not as confinable as many grassroots issues, which often focus on a definable affected community.

Collaborative problem-solving is often done best at the local level. For this particular issue, the considerable geographic scope coupled with significant mistrust among the constituencies represent formidable, but possibly conquerable, obstacles that must be confronted for the issue to be adequately resolved. There are numerous consensus-building planning efforts throughout the Colorado Plateau that offer encouragement for greater

trust-building among stakeholders and opportunities for new partnerships in public lands management (Barber and Clark 1998).

It is my opinion that to attain thorough and long-term sustainable protection of Utah's canyon country, a combination of the approaches of both UWA and the SUWA will be necessary. Just as there is room for diversity in the overall environmental movement in issue-focus, organizational structure, and tactical style, there is room in Utah's wilderness advocacy movement to embrace a fuller approach for long-term protection.

A number of writers and researchers have noted a change in the focus of environmental policy, including John (1994, xiii):

The vast weight of power, money, and attention to environmental matters---in the media, in academia, and even in groups like the Sierra Club, which have strong local chapters---has long focused on federal-level statutes and regulations. But the focus of environmental policy and politics is changing.

Implications

This research is meant to provide insight into the workings of two of Utah's prominent wilderness advocacy organizations by offering an understanding of the organizational histories and structures of UWA and SUWA. The periscope for analysis is the BLM Wilderness debate in Utah. By using BLM Wilderness as a lens for evaluating the philosophical and tactical underpinnings of each organization, one is able to better understand the organizations as entities and participants in this particularly volatile issue. Furthermore, because of the enduring intractability of the debate, the

alternative approaches of different groups for attaining resolution to Utah's Wilderness issue are offered as a means of outlining what history can tell us and what the future may hold.

Regardless of when some form of resolution to the Utah BLM Wilderness debate is achieved, historians, politicians, concerned citizens, environmentalists, and individuals throughout the world will recall the vast and powerful impact of Utah's key wilderness advocacy organizations, UWA and SUWA. As Marshall (1930, 148), zealous wilderness advocate and explorer, and founder and major benefactor of The Wilderness Society, once said:

There is just one hope of repulsing the tyrannical ambition of civilization to conquer every inch of the whole earth. That hope is the organization of spirited peoples who will fight for the freedom and preservation of wilderness.

Similarly, it seems that Margaret Mead, world renowned anthropologist, would concur with Marshall, as defined in the spirit of this statement: "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has" (Rodes and Rodell 1992, 26).

REFERENCES

- Adler, Jonathan. 1995. *Environmentalism at the crossroads*. Washington DC: Capital Research Center.
- Albrecht, Stan L. 1976. Legacy of the environmental movement. *Environment and Behavior* 8(2): 147-168.
- Alley, Kelly D., Charles E. Faupel and Conner Bailey. 1995. The historical transformation of a grassroots environmental group. *Human Organization* 54(4): 410-416.
- Allin, Craig W. 1982. *The politics of wilderness preservation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- An Amicus forum on grassroots and national groups. 1995. *The Amicus Journal* 17(3): 37-45.
- Baldwin, Donald. 1972. *The quiet revolution*. Boulder, CO: Pruett Publishing Company.
- Barber, Brad T. 1997. *Demographic and economic analysis*. [On-line] Available: <http://www.governor.state.ut.us/dea/press/jan17/jan17.html>.
- Barber Brad T., and Aaron P. Clark. 1998. Reconciling environmental preservation and economic sustainability on Utah's Colorado plateau. In *Reclaiming the native home of hope*, ed. Robert B. Keiter, 98-109. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Barkan, Steven E. 1980. Political trials and resource mobilization: towards an understanding of social movement litigation. *Social Forces* 58(3): 944-961.
- Beneson, Bob. 1995. Utah wilderness designation approved by House panel. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 53(31): 2359.
- Bergman, B.J. 1995. Wilderness of greed. *Sierra* 80(5): 35-36.
- Brick, Phil. 1995. Determined opposition. *Environment* 37(8): 17-41.

- Brower, David R. 1995. *Let the mountains talk, let the rivers run*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Brulle, Robert J. 1996. Environmental discourse and social movement organizations: a historical and rhetorical perspective on the development of U.S. environmental organizations. *Sociological Inquiry* 66(1): 58-83.
- Burns, James M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Byrnes, Patricia. 1994. Congressional roundup, 1993-1994. *Wilderness* 58(207): 4-6.
- Byrnes, Patricia. 1995. Mitsubishi meets the challenge. *Wilderness* 58(209): 6.
- Camia, Catalina. 1994. Senate clears way for bill on desert protection. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 52 (15): 879-881.
- Carter, Dick. 1992. Defending the desert. In *Wilderness issues in the arid lands of the western United States*, eds. Samuel I. Zeveloff and Cyrus M. McKell, 105-116. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.
- Casey, Timothy. 1995. The environmental roots of environmental activism. In *Environmental philosophy and environmental activism*, eds. Don E. Marietta Jr. and Lester Embree, 37-49. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Cates, Karl. 1997. SUWA is elbowing its way into urban Utah mainstream. *Deseret News*, February 9.
- Clarke, Jeane N., and Daniel McCool. 1985. *Staking out the terrain: power differentials among natural resource management agencies*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1956. *The functions of social conflict*. The Free Press.
- Cranston, Alan. 1986. In defense of the desert. *Sierra* 71(6): 40-46.
- Cronon, William. 1996. The trouble with wilderness; or, getting back to the wrong nature. In *Uncommon ground*, ed. William Cronon, 69-90. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

- Darlington, David. 1989. The pastures of class-L heaven. *Sierra* 74(5): 70-73+.
- DiSilvestro, Roger L. 1993. *Reclaiming the last wild places*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Dowie, Mark. 1995. *Losing ground*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Downs, Anthony. 1972. Up and down with ecology. *The Public Interest* 28 (Summer): 38-50.
- Drabelle, Dennis. 1978. Director Gregg on BLM wilderness. *Living Wilderness* 42(141): 22-23.
- Dubasek, Marilyn. 1990. *Wilderness preservation*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Dunlap, Riley E. 1992. Trends in public opinion toward environmental issues: 1965-1990. In *American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990*, eds. Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, 89-116. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Dunlap, Riley E. and Angela G. Mertig. 1992. The evolution of the U.S. environmental movement from 1970 to 1990: an overview. In *American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990*, eds. Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, 1-10. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Easterbrook, Gregg. 1995. *A moment on earth*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Flannery, Brenda L., and Douglas R. May. 1994. Prominent factors influencing environmental activities: application of the Environmental Leadership Model (ELM). *Leadership Quarterly* 5(3/4): 201-221.
- Flores, Dan L. 1985. Agriculture, mountain ecology, and the land ethic: phases of the environmental history of Utah. In *Working the range*, ed. John R. Wunder, 157-186. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, Inc.
- Foreman, Dave. 1985. EF! proposed 16 million acres of BLM wilderness in Utah. *EarthFirst!*, September 22.

- Foster, Charles H.W. 1993. What makes a leader? In *Environmental leadership*, eds. Joyce K. Berry and John C. Gordon, 13-27. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Foster, John D. 1976. Bureau of Land Management primitive areas--are they counterfeit wilderness? *Natural Resources Journal* 16 (3): 621-663.
- Fox, Stephen. 1985. *The American conservation movement*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Freedman, Allan. 1996. With Utah provision gone, senate OKs parks bill. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 54(18): 1220.
- Freeman, Jo. 1977. Resource mobilization and strategy: A model for analyzing social movement organization actions. In *The dynamics of social movements*, eds. Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, 167-190. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Freudenburg, W.R. 1991. Rural-urban differences in environmental concern: a closer look. *Sociological Inquiry* 61(2): 167-198.
- Gale, Richard P. 1986. Social movements and the state. *Sociological Perspectives* 29(2): 202-240.
- Gifford, Bill. 1990. Inside the environmental groups. *Outside* 15(9): 69-84.
- Ginger, Clare and Paul Mohai. 1993. The role of data in the EIS process: evidence from the BLM wilderness review. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 13: 109-139.
- Glick, Daniel. 1995a. Twilight of the greens. *Rolling Stone* 719 (October 19): 69-78+.
- Glick, Daniel. 1995b. A wilderness shell game. *Wilderness* 59(211): 14-17.
- Glick, Daniel. 1996. Monument in the red rock. *Newsweek* 128(14): 61.
- Gordon, John C., and Joyce K. Berry. 1993. Environmental leadership: who and why. In *Environmental leadership*, eds. Joyce K. Berry and John C. Gordon, 3-12. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Gorte, Ross W. 1995. *Wilderness legislation in the 104th Congress*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.cnie.org/nle/leg-13.html>.

- Gottlieb, Robert. 1993a. *Forcing the spring: the transformation of the American environmental movement, 1970-1990*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Gottlieb, Robert. 1993b. Reconstructing environmentalism: complex movements, diverse roots. *Environmental History Review* 14(4): 1-14.
- Gottlieb, Robert. 1995. Beyond NEPA and Earth Day: reconstructing the past and envisioning a future for environmentalism. *Environmental History Review* 19(4): 1-14.
- Greeno, Rod. 1990. Who controls the Bureau of Land Management? *Journal of Energy, Natural Resources and Environmental Law* 11(1).
- Grumbine, R. Edward. 1994. Wildness, wise use, and sustainable development. *Environmental Ethics* 16(3): 227-249.
- Harvey, Mark W.T. 1991. Echo Park, Glen Canyon, and the postwar wilderness movement. *Pacific Historical Review* 15(1): 43-67.
- Haverfield, Linda M.B. 1976. Our largest wilderness resource. *Sierra Club Bulletin* 61(9): 57-60.
- Hays, Samuel. 1985. From conservation to environment: environmental politics in the United States since World War II. In *Environmental history*, ed. Kendall E. Bailes, 198-241. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.
- Hays, Samuel. 1991. The new environmental west. *Journal of Policy History* 3(3): 223-248.
- Helvarg, David. 1994. *The war against the greens*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.
- John, DeWitt. 1994. *Civic environmentalism*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Jones, Lisa. 1991. Utah's canyons cut to the bone. *High Country News* 23(13):1.
- Kamieniecki, Sheldon, S. Duane Coleman, and Robert O. Vos. 1995. The effectiveness of radical environmentalists. In *Ecological resistance movements*, ed. Bron Raymond Taylor, 315-333. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Kaufman, Wallace. 1994. *No turning back*. New York: Basic Books.
- Keiter, Robert B. 1998. *Reclaiming the native home of hope*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Kemmis, Daniel. 1998. A democracy to match its landscape. In *Reclaiming the native home of hope*, ed. Robert B. Keiter, 2-14. Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press.
- Kluger, Jeffrey. 1997. Deep divide. *Time* 149(6): 65-67.
- Kraft, Michael E. 1996. *Environmental policy and politics*. New York: HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Kriz, Margaret. 1996. The wild card. *National Journal* 28(2): 65-69.
- Kuric, Claudia, and Kathy A. vanHook. 1989. *Dancing in the dragon's jaw*. Helena, MT: Northern Rockies Action Group.
- Lacayo, Richard. 1995. This land is whose? *Time* 146(17): 68-71.
- Lambert, Darwin. 1974. Hidden treasures on our lands. *The Environmental Journal* 48(12): 15-20.
- Lichterman, Paul. 1996. *The search for political community: American activists reinventing commitment*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Machlis, Gary E. 1995. Social science and protected areas management: the principles of partnership. In *Expanding Partnerships in Conservation*, ed. Jeffrey A. McNeely, 45-62. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Manning, Elizabeth. 1995. To Save a Utah Canyon, a BLM Ranger Quits and Turns Activist. *High Country News* 27(19):1.
- Marshall, Robert. 1930. The problem of wilderness. *Scientific Monthly* 30: 141-148.
- Matheson, Scott. 1986. *Out of balance*. Salt Lake City, UT: Peregrine Smith Books.
- Matz, Mike. 1994a. Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. *Wild Earth* 4(3): 56-57.

- Matz, Mike. 1994b. Lock it up. *Wild Earth* 4(4): 6-8.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. Resource mobilization and social movements: a partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212-1241.
- McCool, Daniel. 1990. Subgovernments as determinants of political variability. *Political Science Quarterly* 105(2): 269-293.
- McWherter, Mike. 1983. The California desert plan. *Sierra* 68(1): 113-116.
- Medberry, Mike. 1995. Who knows best: grassroots or foundations? *High Country News* 27(20):4.
- Mitchell, Robert C. 1989. From conservation to environmental movement: the development of the modern environmental lobbies. In *Government and environmental politics*, ed. Michael J. Lacey, 81-113. Washington, DC: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Mitchell, Robert C., Angela G. Mertig, and Dunlap, Riley E. 1992. Twenty years of environmental mobilization: trends among national environmental organizations. In *American environmentalism: the U.S. environmental movement, 1970-1990*, eds. Riley E. Dunlap and Angela G. Mertig, 11-26. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Modavi, Neghin. 1991. Environmentalism, state and economy in the United States. *Research in social movements, conflicts and change*, 13: 261-273.
- Mohai, Paul. 1985. Public concern and elite involvement in environmental-conservation issues. *Social Science Quarterly* 66(4): 820-838.
- Mohai, Paul. 1992. Men, women, and the environment: an examination of the gender gap in environmental concern and activism. *Society and Natural Resources* 5(1): 1-19.
- Molotch, Harvey. 1977. Media and movements. In *The dynamics of social movements*, eds. Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy, 71-93. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

- Nash, Roderick. 1965. Introduction. In *John Muir and the Sierra Club*, ed. Holoway R. Jones, x-xiv. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club.
- Nash, Roderick. 1982. *Wilderness and the American mind*. 3d ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Norris, G. Lachelle, and Sherry Cable. 1994. The seeds of protest: from elite initiation to grassroots mobilization. *Sociological Perspectives* 37(2): 247-268.
- Norton, Bryan G. 1991. *Toward unity among environmentalists*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nyhan, Paul. 1995. Utah acres OK'd as wilderness. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* 53(29): 2178.
- O'Connell, Kim. 1995. Minimalist measure imperils Utah lands. *National Parks* 69(9-10): 11-13.
- Oelschlaeger, Max. 1991. *The idea of wilderness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- O'Riordan, Timothy. 1995. Frameworks for choice. *Environment* 37(8): 4-9+.
- Paehlke, Robert C. 1989. *Environmentalism and the future of progressive politics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pepper, David. 1996. *Modern environmentalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Perkins, Douglas D., Barbara B. Brown, and Ralph B. Taylor. 1996. The ecology of empowerment: predicting participation in community organizations. *Journal of Social Issues* 52(1): 85-110.
- Petulla, Joseph M. 1980. *American environmentalism*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Pierce, John C., Mary Ann E. Steger, Brent S. Steel, and Nicholas P. Lovrich. 1992. *Citizens, political communication, and interest groups: environmental organizations in Canada and the United States*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Pope, Carl. 1997. Earth to Congress: The American people are sending you a message--don't mess with the environment. *Sierra* 82(3): 52-57.

- Rauber, Paul. 1995. Eco-thug: James Hansen. *Sierra* 80(6): 35.
- Reisner, Marc. 1986. A decision for the desert. *Wilderness* 50(175): 33-53.
- Rodes, Barbara K., and Rice Rodell. 1992. *A dictionary of environmental quotations*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rousch, Jon. 1994. Thirty years of wilderness. *Wilderness* 58(206): 2-9.
- Rubin, Charles T. 1994. *The green crusade*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rudzitis, Gundars, and Harley E. Johansen. 1989. *How important is wilderness: Results from a national survey*. Paper presented at the 1st North American Interdisciplinary Wilderness Conference, 9-11 February, at Weber State College, Ogden, UT.
- Sabatier, Paul. 1975. Social movements and regulatory agencies: toward a more adequate--and less pessimistic--theory of "cliente capture." *Policy Sciences* 6: 301-342.
- Sabatier, Paul A., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 1993. *Policy change and learning*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.
- Salazar, Debra J. 1996. The mainstream-grassroots divide in the environmental movement: environmental groups in Washington state. *Social Science Quarterly* 77(3): 626-643.
- Satchell, Michael. 1995. The West's last range war. *U.S. News and World Report*, 119(11): 54-57.
- Schimpf, Ann. 1979. Wilderness Society fires key Utah environmentalist. *High Country News* 11(15): 1-4.
- Selznick, Philip. 1948. Foundations of the theory of organization. *American Sociological Review*, 13(1): 25-35.
- Shabecoff, Philip. 1993. *A fierce green fire*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Shabecoff, Philip, and Annette Heist. 1996. Greens versus congress: a play-by-play. *The Amicus Journal* 18(3): 24-30.
- Shanks, Bernard. 1978. The new mission of the BLM. *Living Wilderness*, 42(141): 16-20.

- Snow, Donald. 1980. Squeezing the daylights out of Zion. *High Country News*, 12(14): 5-6.
- Snow, Donald. 1991. *Inside the environmental movement*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Stegner, Page. 1994. Red ledge province. *Sierra* 79(2): 92-101+.
- Stegner, Page. 1998. Forward. In *Reclaiming the native home of hope*, ed. Robert B. Keiter, ix-xi. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press.
- Stevenson, William B., and Danna Greenberg. 1998. *Action and networks: connecting agency to the social structure of interorganizational relations*. Paper submitted to the Organization and Management Theory Division of the Academy of Management for presentation at the 1998 Academy of Management Meetings.
- Torrey, Ricky Shepherd. 1997. *The public lands wilderness review and interim management policy: Policy, politics and procedure*. Thesis, University of Utah College of Law.
- Tucker, William. 1982. *Progress and privilege*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Turner, Jack. 1996. *The abstract wild*. Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press.
- Udall, James R. 1988. The slickrock crusade. *Sierra* 73(2): 38-47.
- Useem, Bert, and Mayer N. Zald. 1982. From pressure group to social movement: organizational dilemmas of the effort to promote nuclear power. *Social Problems* 30(2): 144-156.
- Vickery, Jim dale. 1986. *Wilderness visionaries*. Merriville, IN: ICS Books, Inc.
- Viehman, John. 1995. Utah's last stand. *Backpacker* 23(7): 9-11.
- Vig, Norman J. and Michael E. Kraft. 1990. *Environmental policy in the 1990s*. Washington, DC.: CQ Press.
- Walker, Jack L. 1983. The origins and maintenance of interest groups in America. *The American Political Science Review* 77(2): 390-406.

- Walker, Jack L. 1991. *Mobilizing interest groups in America*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Watkins, T.H. 1994. California dreamin'. *Wilderness* 57(205): 8-10.
- Watkins, T.H. 1995. Desert extraordinaire. *Audubon* 97(2): 42-54.
- Watkins, T.H. 1996. Canyon country crossroads. *Audubon* 98(5): 38-50.
- Weingart, Paul D. 1985. Purity by definition. In *Issues in wilderness management*, ed. Michael Frome, 165-167. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wheeler, Raymond. 1985a. Last stand for the Colorado Plateau. *High Country News* 17(19): 1.
- Wheeler, Raymond. 1985b. Last stand for the Colorado Plateau, Part II. *High Country News* 17(20): 10.
- Wheeler, Raymond. 1986. Utah: A heavy EIS but little wilderness. *High Country News* 18(4): 4.
- Wheeler, Raymond. 1995. Utah hearings misfire. *High Country News* 27(24): 1.
- Williams, Terry Tempest. 1995. A cry for wilderness. *National Parks* 69(11-12): 24-30.
- Williams, Terry Tempest. 1996. A bedrock democracy. *Audubon* 98(3): 120.
- Yearley, Steven. 1993. Standing in for nature: the practicalities of environmental organizations' use of science. In *Environmentalism*, ed. Kay Milton, 59-72. New York: Routledge.
- Zakin, Susan. 1993. *Coyotes and town dogs*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Zald, Mayer N., and Roberta Ash. 1966. Social movement organizations: Growth, decay and change. *Social Forces* 44(3): 327-340.
- Zwinger, Ann. 1996. What good is a desert? *Audubon* 98(2): 40-53+.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. LIST OF PRIMARY DATA SOURCES

PRIMARY DATA SOURCES

GOVERNMENTAL DOCUMENTS

Federal Documents

Utah Statewide Wilderness Study Report

Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, October 1991.

- Vol. I Statewide Overview
- Vol. IIA Summary Analysis of Study Area Recommendations
- Vol. IIB Summary Analysis of study Area Recommendations
- Vol. III Summary Analysis of Study Area recommendations:
Wilderness Study Reports For Study Areas Not Studies in
Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness EIS

Utah BLM Statewide Wilderness Final Environmental Impact Statement

Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, November 1990

- Vol. I. Overview
- Vol. II West-Central Region
- Vol. IIIA South-West Region
- Vol. IIIB South-West Region
- Vol. IV South-Central Region
- Vol. V South-East Region
- Vol. VI East-Central Region
- Vol. VIIA Public Comments
- Vol. VIIB Public Comments
- Vol. VIIC Public Comments

The History and Management of R.S. 2477 Rights-of-Way Claims on Federal and Other Lands. United States Department of the Interior. Report to Congress on R.S. 2477. June 1993.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Public Law 94-579 (October 21, 1976)

Utah Wilderness Act.

Public Law 98-844 (September 28, 1964)

Wilderness Act.

Public Law 88-577 (September 3, 1964)

State Documents

1995 *Utah Wilderness Review and Designation Political Process*
County Commissioners Meeting, February 03, 1995

Table Comparing BLM and County Wilderness Recommendations, April 05, 1995.

Statement by Governor Leavitt Regarding the Wilderness Proposal, July 1995

Review of Selected Wilderness Public Opinion Surveys, July 27, 1995.

CITIZENS GROUPS' DOCUMENTS**Coalition for Utah's Future/ Project 2000**

Community and Wild Lands Futures: A Pilot Project in Emery County, Utah
Compiled by Debra Cox Callister, published by the Coalition for Utah's
Future/Project 2000, September 07, 1995

*Assessment and Recommendation of Mechanisms to Resolve Problems
Relating to School trust Lands in BLM Wilderness.* Edited by Cherie
Shanteau, published by the Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000, October
30, 1992.

*Utah Wilderness Designation? The BLM Lands Controversy: Guide to the
Issue.* By Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000, 1993.

Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

Pamphlet: *Your Public Lands are Threatened...Act Now to Save Utah
Wilderness.* produced by the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance and the
Utah Wilderness Coalition, 1997.

Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance Newsletters

1984 - (no. 1, 2, 5)

1985 - (no. 7, 8)

1986 - Summer, Fall (no. 10, 11)

1987 - Vol. IV (no. 1, 2, 3, 4)

- 1988 - Vol. V (no. 1, 2, 3, 4), Special Issue (September)
- 1989 - Vol. VI (no. 1, 2, 3)
- 1990 - Vol. VII (no. 1, 2, 3)
- 1991 - Vol. VIII (no. 1, 2, 4)
- 1992 - Vol. IX (no. 1, 2, 3)
- 1993 - Vol. X (no. 1, 2, 3), Special Issue (Spring)
- 1994 - Vol. XI (no. 1, 2, 3)
- 1995 - Vol. XII (no. 1, 2, 3, 4)
- 1996 - Vol. XIII (no. 1, 2, 3, 4)
- 1997 - Vol. XIV (no. 1, 2, 3, 4)
- 1998 - Vol. XV (no. 1)

SUWA E-mail Alerts

- November 19, 1997
- December 17, 1997
- February 02, 1998
- March 10, 1998

Utah Public Lands Multiple Use Coalition and Utah Farm Bureau Federation

Ten Wilderness Issues (six-page issues statement)

Utah Wilderness Education Project. "USU Wilderness Study Peer Review."
Utah Wilderness Facts, No. 12.

Utah Wilderness Education Project. "How Utahns Really Feel About
Wilderness." Utah Wilderness Facts, No. 5.

Utah Wilderness Education Project. "Ten Facts You Must Know About
Wilderness." Utah Wilderness Facts, No. 7.

Utah Wilderness Association

Utah Wilderness Association Review

- 1981 - Vol. 1 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4)
- 1982 - Vol. 2 (no. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- 1983 - Vol. 3 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- 1984 - Vol. 4 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
- 1985 - Vol. 5 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
- 1986 - Vol. 6 (no. 1, 3, 4, 5)
- 1987 - Vol. 7 (no. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)

- 1988 - Vol. 8 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
 1989 - Vol. 9 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 1990 - Vol. 10 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 1991 - Vol. 11 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 1992 - Vol. 12 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)
 1993 - Vol. 13 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), "Vision for the Desert Lands" (Spring),
 Special Cougar Alert (July)
 1994 - Vol. 14 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), "Utah Wilderness: the First Decade."
 (September)
 1995 - Vol. 15 (no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), Utah's Endangered BLM Wilderness
 Lands (January)
 1996 - Vol. 16 (no. 1, 2)

Alternative Suggestion to Addressing the BLM Wilderness Issue. *Letter to Governor Mike Leavitt from Dick Carter* dated January 31, 1995 with accompanying documentation.

Wilderness Recommendations from the San Rafael Swell. *Letter to Governor Mike Leavitt from Dick Carter* dated March 28, 1995 with accompanying documentation.

Utah Wilderness Coalition

Wilderness at the Edge: A Citizen Proposal to Protect Utah's Canyons and Deserts. 1990.

The Utah Wilderness Coalition Newsletter

- 1986 - Fall
 1987 - Spring, Fall
 1988 - Spring, Fall
 1995 - August

Wilderness Warrior Information News

- 1997 - November (Issue no. 10)

INTERVIEWS

- Arthur, Chris: phone interview (February 10, 1998)
- Calkin, Brant: phone interview (February 04, 1998)

- Callister, Debra Cox: personal interview at her home in Salt Lake City (February 24, 1998)
- Carpenter, Susan: phone interview (March 04, 1998)
- Carter, Dick: a) personal informational interview at In the Company of Friends, Logan, Utah (January 12, 1998)
b) personal interview at in the Company of Friends, Logan, Utah (February 11, 1998)
c) Utah Public Radio interview (April 10, 1996)
- Catlin, Jim: personal interview at the Wildlands Project office in Salt Lake City (February 16, 1998)
- Freemyer, Allen: phone interview (March 06, 1998)
- Glick, Daniel: phone interview (February 26, 1998)
- Groene, Scott: personal interview in Salt Lake City (February 06, 1998)
- Knuffke, Darrell: phone interview (February 17, 1998)
- Legate, Lawson: personal interview at Utah Chapter of the Sierra Club office in Salt lake City (February 13, 1998)
- Macfarlane, Gary: phone interview (February 09, 1998)
- Martin, Terri: personal interview at her home in Salt Lake City (February 24, 1998)
- Matz, Mike: a) personal informational interview at SUWA office in Salt Lake City (January 13, 1998)
b) personal interview at SUWA office in Salt Lake City (February 06, 1998)
- McCormack, Wayne: personal interview at the University of Utah Law School (February 24, 1998)
- McCoy, Liz: personal interview at the Wasatch Mountain Club office in Salt Lake City (February 24, 1998)
- Medberry, Mike: phone interview (February 12, 1998)
- Nickas, George: phone interview (February 09, 1998)
- Rait, Ken: phone interview (February 03, 1998 and February 05, 1998)
- Smith, Del: phone interview (February 11, 1998)
- Snow, Donald: phone interview (March 09, 1998)
- Tixier, Susan: phone interview (February 12, 1998 and March 10, 1998)

APPENDIX B. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

LIST o f I N T E R V I E W E E S

- **Chris Arthur:** Legislative Director for Rep. Maurice Hinchey
- **Brad T. Barber:** Deputy Director, State of Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
- **Deborah Cox Callister:** former Senior Project Coordinator, Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000: Community and Wild Lands Futures
- **Brant Calkin:** former Executive Director and Outreach Coordinator, SUWA¹
- **Susan Carpenter:** Professional Mediator for Community and Wild Lands Futures Project (Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000)
- **Dick Carter:** former Founder, Board Member, and Coordinator, UWA²
- **Jim Catlin:** Wildlands Project, UWC³
- **Allen Freemyer:** Staff Director for U.S. House of Representatives' Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands
- **Daniel Glick:** Freelance writer/journalist
- **Scott Groene:** Issues Director, SUWA
- **Darrell Knuffke:** Vice-president of Regional Conservation, The Wilderness Society, UWC; Board Member, SUWA
- **Lawson Legate:** Southwest Regional Coordinator, Sierra Club, UWC
- **Gary Macfarlane:** former Conservation Director and Board Member, UWA
- **Terri Martin:** former Rocky Mountain Regional Representative, National Parks and Conservation Association, UWC
- **Mike Matz:** Executive Director, SUWA
- **Wayne McCormack:** former Board Member and legal analyst, UWA
- **Liz McCoy:** Grassroots Coordinator, UWC
- **Mike Medberry:** former Utah Representative, The Wilderness Society, UWC
- **George Nickas:** former Assistant Coordinator and Board Member, UWA
- **Ken Rait:** former Issues Director, SUWA
- **Del Smith:** former Fundraising Coordinator and first paid staff, SUWA
- **Donald Snow:** Executive Director, Northern Lights Research and Education Institute
- **Susan Tixier:** former Associate Executive Director, SUWA

¹ SUWA = Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

² UWA = Utah Wilderness Association

³ UWC = Utah Wilderness Coalition

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEWEE CORRESPONDENCE

January 28, 1998

Name
Title
Address

Dear _____:

I am writing to introduce both myself and my thesis project, with the hope that you will grant me the privilege of engaging in a conversation with you, concerning an issue with which you have significant connection. I am interested in exploring the roles of SUWA and UWA in advancing the forum and level of debate over the designation of BLM lands as Wilderness in southern Utah.

Presently, I am a graduate student at Utah State University in the Department of Forest Resources and I am pursuing a certificate in Natural Resources and Environmental Policy. Although I am a native of New York State, I have resided in the Rocky Mountain region since 1994, where I have grown to appreciate and value the few unadulterated spaces we have left. While I am more acutely familiar with the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem, after spending a year teaching at the Teton Science School in Kelly, WY, I have also had the opportunity to explore some of the canyons of southern Utah. Furthermore, since arriving at USU I have become very familiar with the many perspectives on public lands in Utah. My keen interest is in the environmental movement as a means to social and policy changes, specifically concerning the roles of environmental organizations as facilitators of such transformations.

My thesis work is to examine the "Grassroots of the Desert" (a tentative title). Thus, I am writing to enlist your assistance as I embark on this research. I would like to provide a rich history and understanding of the origins, strategies, tactics and visions of the two dominant grassroots organizations (SUWA and UWA) involved in this Wilderness debate. The bottom line is, a study like this would not be successful or sufficient without your insight and personal input.

I obtained your name through examination of relevant literature, supplemented by a couple of scoping interviews with leaders from SUWA and UWA. I have designed a series of questions related to your personal history as an advocate for wilderness; your insight into the organizational

progression of your group, from structural and strategic perspectives; and your connection with the policy process. This inquiry has been developed for administration via personal interview, and is predicted to take about two hours in order to fully explore all topic areas. Thus, I am writing to enlist your support and permission to conduct such an interview with you. Given the geographic distribution of some key figures, it may be necessary to alter the format to a phone interview, although not as preferable, such a format will be entirely functional.

I will be contacting you in the next week to set up a meeting, either by phone or e-mail. If for any reason you need to contact me before that time please see the enclosed card and do not hesitate to write, call, or zap (I am a self-professed e-mail addict, so you can be sure to catch me through that medium). Thanks for your time and interest. I am enthusiastic about the prospect of embarking on what I believe is a very intriguing environmental history, and I am very much looking forward to your input, support, and insight throughout this study.

Warmest regards,

Amy E. Brennan

February 28, 1998

Name
Title
Address

Dear _____:

I am writing to thank you for your input and time. It was my pleasure and privilege to have the opportunity to speak with you and to draw upon your tremendous experience. As mentioned previously, this project would not be possible without the significant input you have lent to it. As my investment into this thesis work deepens, I grow increasingly encouraged by your efforts on behalf of wildlands. While the information you have provided is extremely valuable to my research, the inspiration you have, perhaps unknowingly, offered is even more influential. Your dedication and passionate pursuit of protection of wilderness areas is something that will be highlighted in my thesis, as I attempt to explore the organizations that have so fervently fought for a landscape to leave for future generations. I honor your work in conservation and hope that I may one day share that combination of career and conviction.

Again, I am most grateful for the time and insight you were willing to share. If you have any further thoughts, suggestions, comments, or questions on this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Warmest regards,

Amy E. Brennan

APPENDIX D. INTERVIEW PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS

INTERVIEW PROCEDURES AND PROTOCOLS

PRE-INTERVIEW

- **Contact** interviewee via letter on *Natural Resources and Environmental Policy Program* stationery--explaining the project and reason they have been selected as a resource with a brief introduction to the researcher.
- Follow-up with phone call or e-mail.
- Explain interview format (open-ended) and that a **time** allotment of **two hours** will be necessary to complete the interview.
- **Establish** date, time, and location of meeting.
- **Ask them to prepare** copies of any articles, writings, papers, or other materials that may better inform the research process.

INTERVIEW

- **Introduction of researcher:**

- Graduate student in Forest Resources, pursuing a certificate in Natural Resources and Environmental Policy at Utah State University
- Grew up in New York
- College: Hobart and William Smith Colleges
- Academic background: Economics and Environmental Studies
- Reasons for moving to the West:
 - Across the Great Divide
 - CM Ranch
 - Teton Science School---interest in environmental education and non-profit conservation/environmental organizations

- **Introduction of the project:**

- Very interested in the environmental movement
- Keenly interested in interactions and differences between grassroots and mainstream groups
- The currency, proximity, and complexity of the BLM wilderness issue in Utah provided an interesting way to incorporate those interests while tying the issue and the groups into an analysis of the policy process.

- **Clarification:**

This is meant to be an in-depth analysis of their organization's formation and development, by providing organizational histories and an understanding of each group's analysis of the policy sphere they were/are working within over time.

- **Tell them why they are so important:**

Through a review of the literature and upon the recommendations of other key individuals from both organizations they were recommended as an integral player in the context of the research.

- **Anonymity/Recording:**

Given the interviewees' knowledge and involvement in the issue, the researcher will ask for permission to quote them and to record their responses via audiotape if the situation permits, as these interviews are a means of assembling an oral history. Verbal consent will be obtained from all participants to:

- a) interview them, and
- b) publish information obtained through the interview process.

All interviewees will be reminded of their right to refuse participation in this research and that should they choose to participate, their comments may be used in the final thesis document. Furthermore, the researcher will guarantee to comply with any request to have any comments, made by the interviewees, stricken from the record and thereby impermissible for publishing.

The interviewer/researcher will be the sole person in charge of data collection and storage and the use of any information obtained through the interviewing process is strictly for the purposes of the aforementioned thesis project.

- **Instructions:**

The survey was structured to be administered in a personal and engaging format. Interviewees will be encouraged to ask for clarification of any confusing wording or concepts. Additionally, they will be asked to answer all questions to the fullest depth possible. Many questions require significant recall of the past, so they will be asked to do so to the best of their ability. If, following the cessation of the formal interview process, they would like to clarify some of their responses, they will be given contact information for the researcher so that they may clarify or enhance any of their answers at their earliest convenience.

- **Overview:**

The earliest questions will concern their own background, individually and as it pertains to the organization. Further questions will focus on their perceptions of the organization from various perspectives (e.g., structure, relations, strategies, etc.).

- **Any questions** before we start?
- **Conduct interview**

POST-INTERVIEW

- **Remind** them that the researcher wishes to give them full credit for their insight, reflections, analyses, and participation. It is important to the credibility of this research that the interview is able to be referenced as a source of information. Is there anything they wish to have **off-the-record**?
- Remind and encourage them to contact me if they have questions, concerns, or more information to provide.
- **Thank** them, personally, and then send them a written thank-you.

G R A S S R O O T S O F T H E D E S E R T

Interview Form for All UWA, UWC, SUWA Participants

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

A-1) NAME: _____

A-2) LOCATION: _____

A-3) DATE: _____

A-4) TIME: start: _____ end: _____

A-5) a) Who do you presently work for/with?

SUWA

UWA

UWC (*specify organization*):

OTHER (*specify*):

If OTHER, what was your previous position with
UWA/SUWA?

Or, if OTHER, how has this position enabled you to interact with
SUWA/UWA?

b) Please explain your present role (with the above named entity),
including title:

B. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

The next few questions are asked in order to gain a better understanding of your background and to compare your background with that of other environmental leaders.

B-1) Where were you born? _____

B-2) Did you grow up there? Y N
If NO, then where? _____

B-3) How would you classify the area where you grew up:
RURAL URBAN

B-4) How long have you resided in Utah? _____ years

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

- B-5) Gender: MALE FEMALE
- B-6) What is your age? _____ years
- B-7) Please describe your formal education:
 School(s):
 Degree(s):
 Major(s):
 Other:
- B-8) Where and how do you typically spend your leisure time?
- B-9) Describe your present and past history of involvement with other environmental organizations.
- B-10) Describe your career path before becoming a part of this organization.
- B-11) Did you previously work for another environmental organization?
 Y N
 If YES, with which one? _____
 And, in what capacity? _____
 And, for how long? _____
- B-12) Did you previously work for a government agency? Y N
 If YES, with which one? _____
 And, in what capacity? _____
 And, for how long? _____
- B-13) Tell me a little about your past involvement in this organization.
 What was the date of your initial affiliation? _____
 And, in what role? _____
- B-14) What motivated you to become a part of this organization?
 What were your concerns?
- B-15) Please describe your personal concept of wilderness.

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

C. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The following questions refer to the development of your organization.

- C-1) What factors and events led to the formation of this organization?**
- C-2) a) Beginning with the onset of your involvement with this organization, what are some of the most significant changes, internal and external, that you have seen take place?**
- b) How have these changes affected the goals and strategies of the organization?**

The following questions refer specifically to your organization.

- C-3) What do you see as the major strengths of the organization?**
- C-4) What do you see as the major weaknesses of the organization?**
- C-5) Please describe the leadership.**
Characteristics
- C-6) Please describe the membership.**
Characteristics
Involvement
- C-7) a) Please describe the tactics employed by your organization.**
- b) Which are most frequently used?**
- c) Which do you consider most successful?**
- C-8) How did the designation of the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument affect you organization's goals, strategies, and tactics?**

Organization-specific questions:

For UWA:

- C-9) a) What factors led to your current status of hibernation?**
- b) What is the possibility of coming out of hibernation?**
- c) What has happened to UWA's supporters? Realignment?**

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

For SUWA:

C-9) Describe the impact of having an office and staff member in DC.

For UWC:

C-9) Please describe the importance of the UT wilderness debate relative to the other issues pursued by your organization.

D. STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS

The following questions refer to your organization's involvement with other stakeholders in the BLM Wilderness debate in Utah. When answering the following questions, please indicate any significant changes in these relationships over time by providing examples of cooperation or conflict.

D-1) a) If you had to draw a timeline of the Wilderness debate in Utah, what would be the significant events or dates you would include?

b) And, how might you periodize this debate?

D-2) a) Who do you see as your organization's greatest allies?

b) Has this changed since the onset of your involvement? Y N
If YES, how?

D-3) a) Who do you see as your organization's most significant foes?

b) Has this changed since the onset of your involvement? Y N
If YES, how?

D-4) In relation to the Wilderness debate, how would you assess the political landscape:

- a) nationally?
- b) state-wide?
- c) locally?

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

Please describe your organization's overall relationship with, involvement with, and/or assessment of the following stakeholders.

- D-5) How would you describe your organization's interaction with wise use advocates?**
- D-6) How would characterize your organization's experience with Utah county officials?**
- D-7) Please describe your organization's experience with industry (specifically those industries with stake in potential BLM Wilderness areas in UT).**
- D-8) How would you assess your organization's relationship with the BLM?**
- D-9) How would you describe your relationship with national environmental organizations?**
- D-10) Please characterize your organization's relationship with local citizens in the rural regions adjacent to or near proposed Wilderness areas.**
- D-11) How would you characterize your organization's relationship with the media (nationally, state-wide, and locally), based on...**
- a) your coverage** (letters-to-the-editor, reporters)?
 - b) your own use of the media?**

E. SUWA/UWA RELATIONS

The following refer to your organization's relationship with SUWA/UWA:

- E-1) Please describe the role or niche of each of the following:**
- a) SUWA**
 - b) UWA**
 - c) UWC**
- E-2) Please describe the history of your organization's relationship with SUWA and/or UWA.**
- E-3) Describe how lack of a united front with one of the other influential wilderness advocacy groups (SUWA/UWA) has influenced the advancement of wilderness designation.**

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

- E-4) Why did these organizations have such different proposals/positions?
- E-5) Given that UWA is in a state of hibernation, do you feel that there is/are any other organization(s) that may assume UWA's role?
If YES, who?
Why?

F. FUTURE SPECULATIONS

The following questions ask you to speculate on the future of wilderness and your organization:

- F-1) Why haven't we yet had Wilderness designation of BLM lands in Utah?
- F-2) What would it take to resolve the BLM Wilderness issue in Utah?
- F-3) a) What is the acceptable level of Wilderness designation of Utah BLM lands supported by your organization?

b) If this extent of protection were granted tomorrow, what do you predict would happen to your organization?
- F-4) Where do you see the goals, strategies and tactics of this organization headed in
a) the next year?
b) the next ten years?

G. PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE WILDERNESS ISSUE

The following questions refer to your involvement in wilderness issues in Utah:

- G-1) Describe your thoughts on being a wilderness advocate/activist in the state of Utah?
Why do you do it?
What are the rewards?
What are the challenges?
- G-2) Have writers or has literature influenced your interest in pursuing a career or becoming involved in wilderness issues? Y N
If YES, which ones?
How?

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

- | | |
|--|--------|
| G-3) Have certain places influenced you?
If YES, which ones?
How? | Y N |
| G-4) Have particular people influenced you?
If YES, which ones?
How? | Y N |
| G-5) Have certain events influenced you?
If YES, which ones?
How? | Y N |

H. ENVIRONMENTAL IDEOLOGIES

*Answer the following questions with reference to the **present**, as well as to the conditions at the **beginning of your affiliation** with this organization.
Please refer to the list provided to select your answer.*

Choices:

- A) Resourcism
- B) Conservationism
- C) Preservationism
- D) Ecocentrism/Biocentrism/Deep Ecology
- E) Political Ecology
- F) Ecofeminism

H-1) Please select the ideology that most closely represents the convictions of your organization:

NOW:

PAST:

H-2) Please select the ideology that most closely represents your personal convictions:

NOW:

PAST:

That's It!! Please share any additional comments you have on the above questions or any further information not prompted from the above questions.

THANKS!

Interviewee: _____

Date: _____

ENVIRONMENTAL IDEOLOGIES*

RESOURCEISM

- Nature has no intrinsic value.
- There are abundant natural resources available for human use.
- Human welfare requires development of the natural environment.

CONSERVATIONISM

- The proper management philosophy for nature is to realize the greatest good for the greatest number of people over the longest period of time.
- Nature can be managed by use of technical knowledge by professionals.

PRESERVATIONISM

- Human actions can impair the ability of natural systems to maintain themselves or to evolve further.
- Wilderness and wildlife are important components in both the physical and spiritual life of humans.

ECOCENTRISM/BIOCENTRISM/DEEP ECOLOGY

- Human survival is linked to ecosystem survival.
- Natural systems are the basis for all organic existence, and therefore possess intrinsic value.
- All life on earth has intrinsic value.

POLITICAL ECOLOGY

- Domination of humans by other humans leads to domination of nature.
- Resolution of environmental problems requires fundamental social change based on empowerment of local communities.

ECOFEMINISM

- Ecosystem abuse is rooted in androcentric concepts and institutions.
- Earth is home for all life and should be revered and nurtured.

**These definitions were extracted from the following works:*

- Brulle, Robert J. 1996. Environmental Discourse and Social Movement Organizations: A Historical and Rhetorical Perspective on the Development of U.S. Environmental Organizations. *Sociological Inquiry* 66(1): 58-83.
- Oelschlaeger, Max. 1991. *The Idea of Wilderness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

APPENDIX E. UTAH WILDERNESS CHRONOLOGY

UTAH WILDERNESS CHRONOLOGY

1936:

- Bob Marshall identifies 18 million acres of roadless wilderness in Utah

1964:

- The Wilderness Act passes

1970:

- First annual Earth Day (April 22)

1976:

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act passes
- Dick Carter goes to work for The Wilderness Society---making him the first paid environmentalist in Utah

1978:

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM) begins Wilderness inventory in Utah

1979:

- Grand County Commissioners bulldoze within a BLM Wilderness Study Area (WSA)
- BLM eliminates 17 million acres of the 22 million acres in its initial inventory (April)
- Dick Carter leaves The Wilderness Society (June)
- Utah Wilderness Association (UWA) founded and establishes an office in Salt Lake City (June)
- UWA holds its first fundraiser with Barry Lopez and Edward Abbey (October)
- UWA incorporates as a 501(c)(3) (December)

1980:

- Sen. Orrin Hatch presents legislation (S. 1680) calling for the return of all U.S. Forest Service and BLM lands to the states
- Gary Macfarlane and George Nickas become involved with UWA
- Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act passes
- 2.4 million acres of land are summarily eliminated from the BLM inventory, prompting conservationists to appeal

1981:

- UWA and 13 other organizations file a 1,400 page appeal with the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) (April)
- UWA publishes its first newsletter: *Utah Wilderness Association Review* (May/June)
- BLM releases final WSA findings for Utah, amounting to 2.5 million acres

1982:

- Terri Martin becomes the National Parks and Conservation Association's Utah representative

1983:

- IBLA releases findings on 29 WSAs, ordering re-inventory of 88% of acreage under appeal and adding 560,000 acres to WSA status
- Utah Wilderness Act introduced in Congress (November 18)
- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) incorporates (December 12)

1984:

- Gary Macfarlane and Dick Carter testify before the Senate on hearings for the Utah Wilderness Act (February 9)
- SUWA holds its first organizational meeting (May)
- Utah Wilderness Act signed into law by President Reagan (September 28)

1985:

- Darrell Knuffke hired as Central Rockies Regional Director for The Wilderness Society
- Del Smith hired as SUWA's first paid staff member
- Utah Wilderness Coalition (UWC) members convene conferences to hammer out a proposal for BLM Wilderness (February)
- UWA and the other environmental/conservation groups (eventually known as the Utah Wilderness Coalition) agree NOT to agree and pursue separate agendas
- UWA releases a 3.8-million-acre BLM Wilderness proposal (March)
- House Public Lands and National Parks subcommittee, chaired by Rep. John Sieberling (D-OH), conducts oversight hearings on BLM lands (March 28)
- 76,500 acres added to WSA status upon an IBLA ruling on an UWA appeal (April 12)
- SUWA presents a 5,032,900-acre-proposal for BLM Wilderness (July 16)

- SUWA opens its office in Boulder, Utah (July)
- UWC formally organizes (October)

1986:

- Sen. Allen Cranston introduces the California Desert Protection Act for the protection of 7 million acres of arid lands in California
- BLM releases Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Utah, recommending 1.9 million acres for designation (May)
- Governor Bangerter releases Utah wilderness poll, showing strong support for wilderness (June 22)
- UWA responds to the BLM DEIS with a 250-page document and the comment period closes (August)
- SUWA opens metropolitan office in Salt Lake City (Fall)
- SUWA hosts its first annual Wilderness Round-Up

1987:

- Scott Groene joins SUWA's Board of Directors
- Lawson Legate begins working for the Sierra Club in Utah
- SUWA adopts by-laws, budget, and personnel policy (January)
- Rep. Wayne Owens speaks at UWA's Wilderness Forum (March)
- Preliminary injunction ordered against the construction of the Burr Trail (March 10)
- Brigham Young University releases study on Wilderness in Utah showing significant support for wilderness protection (May)
- Mike Medberry hired as The Wilderness Society's Utah representative (September)
- Utah BLM alleges that Clive Kincaid's house is within a WSA

1988:

- Clive Kincaid resigns as SUWA's Executive Director (January)
- Brant Calkin hired as Executive Director and Susan Tixier as Associate Executive Director of SUWA (February)
- SUWA headquarters moves to Cedar City (April)
- UWA and UWC have meetings with Rep. Wayne Owens
- UWA supports Rep. Owens' 5.1-million-acre bill

1989:

- Ken Rait hired as SUWA Issues Coordinator and Scott Groene hired as SUWA staff attorney
- Rep. Owens introduces HR 1500, "Utah BLM Wilderness Act of 1989"
- SUWA begins direct mail recruitment campaign
- SUWA opens an office in Washington D.C.
- UWA meets with Governor Bangerter to express desire to work with the state on resolving the BLM Wilderness issue (May)
- *Defending the Desert* released---a 45-page booklet outlining UWA's 3.8-million-acre proposal (September)

1990:

- UWC publishes *Wilderness at the Edge*
- Carter and Macfarlane meet with Garfield County commissioners (January)
- Michael Frome speaks at UWA Earth Week celebration (April 18)
- Rep. Wayne Owens re-elected to U.S. House of Representatives (November)

1991:

- UWA endorses HR 1500, but advocates a consensus-based process
- BLM releases final Wilderness recommendation: 1,975,219 acres (January)
- Utah State Legislature proposes a 1.4-million-acre resolution to BLM Wilderness (January)
- Rep. Owens re-introduces HR 1500 (March)
- Rep. Hansen and staff attend first public hearing in Price, Utah (April 5)

1992:

- President Bush asks Congress to designate less than 2 million acres of Wilderness in Utah (June 26)

1993:

- SUWA's membership exceeds 10,000
- Calkin and Tixier announce retirement from SUWA
- Rep. Maurice Hinchey (D-NY) introduces HR 1500 "America's Redrock Wilderness Act"
- Coalition for Utah's Future/Project 2000: Community and Wild Lands Futures---Emery County Pilot Project begins
- Mike Matz hired as Executive Director of SUWA

1994:

- SUWA is voted Best Local Citizen's Action Group by *Private Eye Weekly* (March 2)
- SUWA hires Canvass Director (May)
- Robert Redford endorses SUWA
- Majority party in Congress is Republican for the first time in 40 years (November)
- The House Natural Resources Committee changes its name to the Resources Committee
- California Desert Protection Act passes

1995:

- UWA offers a 2.95-million-acre BLM Wilderness recommendation to the Governor and the Utah delegation (January)
- Liz McCoy is hired as UWC Coordinator (January)
- Community and Wild Lands Futures Project terminates (March)
- *Salt Lake Tribune* endorses UWA's proposal (May)
- HR 1745 and S. 844, "Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995" introduced---presenting a 1.8-million-acre proposal (June 6)
- Wilderness hearings held in Cedar City and Salt Lake City (June 22-24)
- Congressional hearings and committee mark-ups on HR 1745 (July/August)
- Carter announces resignation from UWA (September)
- Senators Hatch and Bennett take S. 884 to the Senate Energy Committee (December 6)
- Editorials appear in major national newspapers denouncing HR 1745 (December 14)
- Rep. Hansen pulls HR 1745 from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives (December 14)

1996:

- Sen. Bradley (D-NJ) filibusters to prevent S. 884 from being included in the Omnibus Parks and Recreation bill (March 26)
- UWA officially closes its office (March 29)
- Interior Secretary Babbitt testifies before the U.S. House of Representatives' Resources Committee that at least 5 million acres of Wilderness exist in Utah (April 24)
- SUWA opens office in St. George

- UWC begins re-survey of the Citizens' Proposal
- U.S. Department of Interior directs the BLM to re-inventory Utah's BLM lands
- President Clinton uses the Antiquities Act of 1906 to designate 1.7 million acres of land in southern Utah as the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument (September 18)
- 104th Congress adjourns (October)
- Utah Association of Counties files suit to stop BLM's re-inventory (October 14)
- Injunction upheld to restrain BLM from continuing its re-inventory (November)

1997:

- S. 773 (a companion bill to HR 1500, "America's Redrock Wilderness Act") introduced in Senate by Sen. Richard Durbin (D-IL) (May)

1998:

- 10th Circuit Court of Appeals overturns injunction on BLM's re-inventory (March)