

PROFILE OF THE USER

By PHILIP A. DOUGLAS

*Assistant to Executive Director National Wildlife Federation,
Washington, D. C.*

The term use implies a benefit to or a privilege for the user. Too, in conservation, *wise* use is part and parcel of its definition. In the context of this symposium's theme, "Today's wildlife and How Should It Be Sold," the user considers a certain value, monetary or non-monetary, for the natural resource product. His efforts toward attaining that benefit or privilege may well be determined by his evaluation of the product. Today we're talking about the "Wildlife" product which we'll interpret broadly to include *fish and* wildlife—a hassle we do get into without a clear definition. So a profile of the user must involve the evaluation of wildlife in his own individual mind's eye. He may be swayed by group psychology, believing his use of the wildlife resource is best because it is "the thing to do," or it is the mode or custom of his time. Yet his actions will be his own, no matter what the bases for his decision. So let's look him over.

I doubt if he's an "average" American—each of you would conjure up an entirely different picture, so let's discard the idea of picturing him at all. Let's try on for size his likes and dislikes in the use of the wildlife resource. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) gave us our first statistical report on these preferences in its Study Report 19. This involved, as some of you may recall, a nationwide survey of the habits and preferences of Americans engaged in outdoor recreation. The U. S. Bureau of the Census conducted this project during 1960-61, sampling four separate seasons, each producing the results of 4,000 very detailed interviews. This points out very clearly that the fisherman and the hunter are not the only ones utilizing our wildlife resources.

Much grist for the mill is accorded this study report by wildlife administrators since for the first time it clearly catalogues the preferences, expenditures, and analysis of socio-economic factors involved from the participation by the U. S. citizen in 17 individual outdoor activities.

In the Census Bureau survey, as an example, fishing did hold second place among 33 percent of the population with picnicking, while swimming was the number one preferred form of outdoor recreation. Preferences must be further defined as to the overall activity, such as while on vacation, where fishing was in third place behind sightseeing and swimming. Of course only one of these top three involve consumption of a renewable natural resource to any extent, if lucky, and that's by the fisherman.

The picnicker may cause some temporary or permanent damage to the natural resource by overuse, trampling and cutting the vegetation, or polluting the water and degrading the environment by his litter. Too, though transient, he may in essence be a disturbing factor to an endangered or depleted form of wildlife through his mere presence.

In order to further define the desires of our user we go to ORRRC Study Report 20 (1962) where some very interesting facts are presented. With prompting it was disclosed in decreasing order of preference that: 13% of the population fished; that 10% enjoyed automobile riding for sightseeing and relaxation: 9% went to the beach to swim or just lie about; 7% picnicked; 5% hunted; 5% boated and/or canoed; 4% camped; 2% hiked; and 2% took nature and bird walks. These respondents all wished to carry out the above activities more often. In the categories of the survey involving no prompting (spontaneous), the user expressed interest in participation in the following as usual activities of their outdoor recreational experiences: 18% fishing; 10% swimming or beaching; 9% hunting; 6% driving for pleasure; 3%

boating and canoeing; 2% camping; 1% for going for walks and hiking; and none for nature or bird walks, or for picnicking.

Spontaneous responses by the population do give a much different picture of individual preferences. These place fishing and hunting in the top three positions, 18% and 9%, respectively, bracketing the number two choice of swimming and going to the beach at 10%. The first expressions of preference noted above, involving prompting, again change the picture but do firm up the number one position of the fisherman, but put the hunter in fifth place with the boater and canoeist. However, further analysis indicates that fishing and hunting are in the upper half of individual preferences of outdoor recreational activity. So it is essential that the manager of specific natural resource areas and the administrator of entire state and/or federal regions recognize the people-impact in the context of assigned importance and base program priorities on the facts. This can only be accomplished by well thought out advance planning to satisfy the use intensity as it really is. Certainly recognizable is the fact that the user profile will vary widely in accordance with the quantity and quality of the natural resource available, as well as the season of the year.

Some obvious examples come to mind. The elk herds in Yellowstone National Park must be viewed only and not hunted. Therefore the nature buff and just plain tourist will utilize this resource thusly, whereas, in Grand Teton National Park the elk may be legally harvested in season by the hunter as well as viewed by the tourist during his vacation time. Does this then double the use and increase numbers of users of the product?

For a limited few the quality of a bow and arrow sport fishery is high along some sections of the lower Colorado River for carp. Generally held in low esteem by anglers the quantities of carp in other waters supporting large populations do provide good license sale revenues.

These two examples of user profiles are merely illustrations of different uses of similar products. However, the analysis and deduced user consideration does get a bit complicated and possibly in error. A camper, for instance, may have as his prime motive fishing or hunting and the camping is a means to the end or incidental to, but an enhancement of, the total outdoor experience.

The Sport Fishing Institute reports (SFI Bulletin, No. 188, Sept., 1967) on the average time budget of families camping (1962) in auto campgrounds on the Huron-Manistee National Forest, during the day just prior to contact, as follows:

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Hours</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Percent of Campers</i>
Relaxation	8.3	67	93
Swimming	1.1	9	40
Fishing	1.0	8	32
Auto Sightseeing	0.9	7	35
Picnicking	0.4	3	19
Hiking	0.3	2	20
Boating	0.1	1	8
Nature Study	0.1	1	8
Gathering Forest Prod.	0.1	1	6
Canoeing	0.1	1	3
Waterskiing	tr.	..	tr.
	12.4	100	

However, on the basis of percentage of campers participating in the above-listed activities, a slightly different picture emerges: (see last column above). The degree of activity participation recorded at this particular campground would probably differ widely for other campgrounds with different facilities, natural features, and too the differing

interests of campers on other than that day when the activities were measured. The profile of the camper is therefore one of heterogeneity reflecting the multiple reasons people have for camping.

Richard H. Stroud, Executive Vice President of the Sport Fishing Institute, in an address delivered before the Northeast Fish and Wildlife Conference, January 17, 1966, in Boston, stated: "The main problem seems to be one of confusion resulting from misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the data and findings in several key ORRRC Study Reports. These data concern participation by Americans in various outdoor recreation activities, and the high degree of interdependence among them. This has led to a seriously mistaken notion by newly attracted generalists that driving and walking for pleasure, picnicking, sightseeing, etc., have suddenly displaced fishing and hunting as the principal outdoor pursuits by Americans." Stroud additionally reasons that . . . "Close examination of recreation data, indeed, makes it increasingly clear that the substantial (if not principal) thrust of several 'recreation activities,' particularly the relatively passive picnicking, driving, and walking for pleasure, are ancillary to more dominant traditional outdoor interests. If so, it would be a major blunder to deemphasize the role of fishing and hunting in outdoor recreation. On the contrary, it is necessary to reemphasize the traditional outdoor sports as constituting key values in outdoor recreation planning."

He rightfully concludes on examination of the statistics that "a net 46 percent of American adults fish and/or hunt." Augmenting this information is that presented at the 1971 AFS Annual Meeting by the U. S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife from the U. S. Bureau of the Census on 1970 participation in outdoor recreation pursuits, where data indicates that: about 75% of hunters do fish; as do 58% of the boaters; 57% of the campers; 54% of the picnickers; and 51% of those horseback riding. Multiple purpose activities do give an interesting many-faced profile of the user.

This profile may be changing in the 70's. The cry of "foul" is loud against the cruel hunter-killer; even the fisherman is being accused of torturing his captured quarry on the end of a sport rod. The protectionist seems to be having his "inning." Such TV productions as the CBS production "Say Goodbye" are making a very audible impression on the general public—though this film as a documentary has been thoroughly discredited, unfortunately after the fact, by the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners—for which action I highly laud my platform companion this morning and just past president, Chester Phelps. The long ensuing debates on humane methods of killing sea otters in Alaska, resulted from a rather bloody Sunday evening TV tabloid. So perhaps there is an upcoming change in the profile of the user of our wildlife resources.

It is true that most U. S. citizens have been isolated from the natural rhythm of life and death because of their too artificial urban environment. We as conservationists, have been somewhat reluctant to publicly defend hunting and risk jeopardizing support from the vast majority of people who are twice and three times removed from the land and do not hunt nor understand the reasons why others should be permitted to do so. And while this so-called "philosophical" battle between hunters and non-hunters goes on, the precious and very limited resources are diverted away from what we consider to be wildlife's real problems of environmental degradation. The on-going battle with the Committee for Humane Legislation of Washington, D. C., which falsely implies that hunters "out for a weekend of mayhem and murder" threaten America's deer herds with extinction. So the hunter no longer is pictured in the role of a conservationist, but as a culprit wreaking havoc on the renewable natural wildlife resources. According to Friends of Animals, New York City based, President Alice Herrington typifies hunters as "miserable cowards" with a "lust to kill." And there is then a woman, Marta Orbach, who appeared recently on a New York radio show to

speak her peace for "conservation": "The only good time I had during the entire hunting season, is at the end of the season when they said 27 hunters . . . were killed . . . it's my fondest wish that all these people are terrible shots and they will all be dead at the end of the hunt."

The picture that I am trying to portray is that there have really always been people who have denounced hunters as blood-thirsty perverts, but the attacks on the outdoor sportsmen have increased in their venomous implications more today than ever before.

Our Editor of Conservation News, Ed Chaney, points out that all of these people opposed to killing animals, will stand before a banquet audience denouncing the hunters as being blood-thirsty, but then will sit down and ". . . wrap a smile around a steak that earlier stood in a feedlot rolling its big brown eyes while being injected with enzymes and chemicals designed to please the palate." We look around us and find that even the most kindly people "kill" flowers for temporary table decorations or squash bugs because they are ugly, and kill snakes and worms because they are "wriggly." People are just hypocritical in many regards. The profile of the hunter to these attacking this form of outdoor recreation is more marred because he does this for sport, while no separation of feelings is given to those killing animals commercially for the food markets of the world. We certainly cannot sidestep some of the issues under attack because hunters are people, and among them there are the bad as well as the good, those masquerading as sports hunters who do commit cruelties and "obscurities" in the field. They give the sport the bad name that the anti-hunter is so willing to plaster on the hunter.

I give you a brief illustration of a specific case where the hunters actually help provide outdoor recreational features for the non-hunter. There are some 330 National Wildlife Refuges covering nearly 30 million acres in 46 states. U. S. duck hunters were responsible, through the Duck Stamp financing program, for these refuges where some 18 million people last year enjoyed visiting the refuges. Of this group, about two-thirds engaged in wildlife related activities and bird watchers, photographers, and tour groups got more mileage out of the federal areas than did hunters and fishermen. One-third of the people fished, and in those refuges open to the duck hunter only 4% partook of this sport.

Let's examine closely what the opponents to fishing and hunting have to offer. In my view only the words "don't take fish and game by sporting methods" are offered, with little being said as to how the surpluses can be harvested of these renewable natural resources, to keep populations in line with carrying capacities of their habitat. How much does the protectionist offer in the way of vital management and research program funding? For fiscal year 1971 project obligations for the Dingell-Johnson program were \$15,378,000; for the Pitman-Robertson program, \$41,084,000. These monies are derived from the excise taxes on certain fishing and hunting gear and paid by the angler and the hunter. Many states, operating on this 25%-state—75%-federal cost-sharing program, would of financial necessity have to drastically cut back their very basic projects working toward balanced fish and wildlife populations. In fact those urging no fishing, no hunting would end up with no research, no management, no regulation—and nothing—because these state agencies are dependent upon license sales and supplemental funds for operation of their conservation programs. What can the complete prohibitor of fishing and hunting offer as a substitute—nature cannot successfully maintain its own in balance in the civilized U. S. This has been disastrously proven in the "hands off" policies of deer herds in Oregon and the Kaibab of Arizona.

Our Executive Director, Thomas L. Kimball, ably addressed the combined AFS-IAGFCC on September 13, 1971, in annual meeting in Salt Lake City on "Professional Wildlife Management—Where To From Here." He points out the very salient feature that "Somehow we must

convince our antagonists that it is vital to the welfare of world wildlife populations that we continue to manage, or manipulate if you will, and that both protection and harvest are essential tools of the trade."

The profile of the user is changing as the people move off the farms into the "asphalt jungle," where the firearm is a tool of violence in commission of crimes, rather than a companion of the hunter in the field or autumn woods. The larger numbers of urbanites are demanding closer in and more open space for their enjoyment out-of-doors. The use of guns here may not be compatible with such prescribed use due to limited area. However, it is up to us as wildlife professionals to hear our opponents out and show a respect for their own particular philosophies. But then we must firmly convince the "moralist protectionist" that we need to recognize the real cause for decline of our wildlife, not by the angler's rod nor the hunter's gun, but by the loss of suitable habitat through degradation of life-supporting quality environment because of man's destructive activities.

So my belief is that the user has to exhibit a strong chin-out conviction that he must support the wildlife professional to retain and restore, where necessary, an adequate environment and its variety of animals for the enjoyment of all in whatever way he wishes to pursue that pleasure.

FEDERAL AID TO HUNTER SAFETY

By ROBERT G. NELSON

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Washington, D. C.

It is with great personal pleasure that I have been asked to participate in the Hunter Safety session of the I & E Section of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners. Also to be able to spend several days in the charming city of Charleston and the beautiful State of South Carolina. Although I may sound like a "damn yankee," I want you all to know I am a resident of Maryland, *south* of the Mason Dixon line.

The idea and practice of hunter safety is as old as the firearm, the bow and arrow, and most likely back to the stone axe. I can hear the first hunter safety lecture which may have sounded like this, "Now son, this is the way you daddy throw the stone axe. And remember, don't throw it if mommy or daddy are in the way," or "Be sure you release the handle just the way I demonstrated or you may lose a leg." So for all practical purposes, let us say basic hunter safety is as old as hunting.

Formative firearm education, as we know it, began in New York State in 1949 when the first law was enacted in mandatory firearms safety instructions as a prerequisite to purchasing a license. This has been copied across the Nation and presently there are 16 mandatory State programs, 25 voluntary Statewide programs, with most of the remaining nine States developing programs due to the passage of Public Law 91-503.

This law amends, in part, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, commonly called the Pittman-Robertson Act, to provide for the use of excise tax monies collected on pistols and revolvers. One-half of the revenues accruing to the fund from any tax imposed on pistols and revolvers shall be apportioned among the States in proportion to the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States. No State shall receive more than 3 per centum nor less than 1 per centum of such revenues. Specifically, the Act reads,

"Each State may use the funds apportioned to it under Section 4(b) of this Act to pay up to 75 per centum of the costs of a hunter safety program and the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor target ranges, as a part of such program."