

ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE

Richard Miller. Foresta Institute, Washoe Valley, Carson City, Nevada

When I speak of International Wildlife, it strikes me that I should offer an apology to a number of people whose faces loom before me because they have records of attacking or addressing themselves to wildlife problems abroad and coming out with very good results. This has been to the credit of the Wildlife Society because they, as Wildlife Society members, have helped to export a badly needed commodity and have shown the economic significance of wildlife management measures.

I wish not to offer suggestions about how to get into international wildlife: rather than talk about opportunities for the individual, I would like to have each individual, particularly the students, look out the windows and doors that are open to us from America, looking out on our neighbors abroad to see and compare ourselves with them and see in what ways we can share what we have with them from our professional point of view.

The average person of your stature abroad doesn't sit in a meeting like this, except on a very rare occasion. Probably he doesn't have a boss who knows the credo of his professional society. Or, if the boss does know about it, he may not honor it. A year ago at Humboldt State College, some of you heard me state that the professional standards which have risen here in American wildlife management are due to this Society and that we have had the opportunity to build up our own careers on the basis of what those who have gone ahead have laid out. They have made opportunities for us because they have proceeded, sometimes over rather rough ground, into executive positions. As executives, they have the opportunity to open the door to new employees, to write job descriptions, and to conduct examinations or to sit in on examinations or write them. And this has made a world of difference. I'd spent many a year before I realized what this means, because once you go abroad you see a man working in a wildlife refuge or a national park, or in some federal or national branch of the agriculture or forestry service where they may have a research or a field station. He doesn't have the background or the assurance that we have.

The trend in wildlife management indicates that all of you working in wildlife now, especially the students who are preparing, are faced with working in a whole new and different context. Already you are working in an area where the human consideration has to be given a whole lot more attention than in the old days. In every federal agency today, and in state agencies, you are confronted with the problem of not just deriving a harvestable crop and eliminating some of the limiting factors, but you have to consider that you are working in habitat which is going to be used by people. You have work that is going to be invaded, and a factor introduced over which you may not have much control.

In the schools today we probably should be preparing students for working with people in the field. It is called visitor orientation: it's called interpretation. There are visitor centers; there are road blocks; there are many fronts on which to encounter the public as it is using the habitat. We still need much training in communicating and eliciting compliance and cooperation. Basically the whole situation now is our need to concern ourselves not just with what we call habitat, but with the total environment. I mean environmental studies have to include factors which previously the wildlife student, professor, and manager could ignore. Here at home we are going to see more attention given to this, and it's going to have an effect abroad.

The man who can hunt and fish in Idaho or in Colorado, or in Oregon or Washington, has much choice and, because he has a good salary, he has good equipment, and he can go where he wishes in his spare time. This man is going to find so many people in the United States in the next few years that he is going to move abroad for this kind of fun. Jet planes can get him to the tip of South America.

It has been a great concern to me in the last 6 years that people are going to get there before South America is ready for it. The kind of habitat or environmental inventories that should be taken at this point are not being promulgated there, and we ought, as neighbors, to do what we can to increase the opportunity for such preparation. This might mean that some North Americans will go. It also might mean that we, as North Americans, will vote money to allow work abroad through some kind of aid program. This I think of as a citizen's responsibility, which we must consider because of our background in wildlife knowledge. Here is one opportunity for us to be leaders in the community in deciding what we want to do in foreign aid or by professional assistance. We could be helping to preserve the habitats of the world from deterioration by industrialization, urbanization or by people-use where a government hasn't established a background of management of the resources.

Several instances of the effectiveness of professional and special conservation meetings should be noted. They show what seem to be the questions that are important to people abroad. The reason I speak on international subjects is that I've been involved with meetings of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, and I have served on its commissions. The Survival Service Commission is

very much concerned with the actions necessary to protect endangered species from total annihilation or extermination. First, we have to have an inventory, and this group has been very busy conducting inventory of the world's wildlife, especially the rare and endangered species, both flora and fauna. In addition to that we have an Education Commission, on which I represent the Americas. The membership of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature is world-wide, with both government membership and institutional membership and these are widely spread through the United States, Europe, and Asia. In 1963 we had a General Assembly in Nairobi and had the technical meetings there. Discussions were held on all phases of wildlife management, particularly with the habitat and populations problems of Central and East Africa.

In May 1965 I attended a Latin American Committee on National Parks meeting held at the University of Michigan. A young fellow by the name of Orlando Perez, a negro, who is wildlife manager in Nairobi and had been a student training at Michigan State, told us that in 1965 he was able to say that the meeting in 1963, which some of us felt this or that way about, whether it was being effective or whether it could do any good, he was able to say two years later that, in his life, that meeting had made a world of difference to him and his country. That Kenya could now feel some assurance in its government and populace that they would, in the future, have the big herds of the big game which have been their heritage. Whereas, in 1963 at the time of the meeting and at the time when they were gaining their independence as a nation, they were not at all certain that this was possible. To us as members of IUCN, this was very interesting to hear. I may be giving it more meaning than it should have, but to me it indicates that whatever little things we as individuals, or in a group, or any little thing our group can do in what we stand for - what we speak up for, where we hold our meetings, or who we try to argue into taking a position, a stronger position for resources and for conservation - whatever we do in this light may have effects we can't anticipate. We can only hope for them. Of course, for all we know, the great herds of Africa may not be saved even now and it's not going to be settled just there. It's going to have to be something to watchdog continually. The International Union has proceeded in its work. In November 1965, we held a meeting in Bangkok, in which a similar effort was undertaken. This was an effort to bring to the foreground for Asian countries which had not previously addressed attention to the conservation phase of their resource heritage. It was a meeting of foreign neighbors in this case who spoke of their problems and considered what they might do together in Southeast Asia. A series of resolutions were passed at the end of the week's session on Conservation of the Renewable Resources of Southeast Asia.

Reserves and Safeguarding of Habitat:

- Research on giant catfish, turtles, the ourang, and others.
- Rehabilitation and other action programs.
- Specific measures against fishing with poisons and explosives.
- Specific measures for certain endangered species.
- Specific measures for developing conservation education.

International cooperation, and regional organization in conservation.

The resolutions were recorded, were passed along to the governments, and are to be published.

When we go to a meeting we rather abhor the adoption of resolutions - we think that nobody pays much attention to them - but in these international meetings, for one reason or another, the press of interest from without seems to move a government to a show of comprehension of the need, and a capability to act. And these resolutions which are left behind when the meeting is over and the delegates departed are sometimes drawn upon as policy or for legislation by the local government.

In October I was in Mar del Plata, Argentina, where a meeting had been called by the Order of the American States, the Organization of American States, on conservation of renewable resources, on a continental basis in South America. The thing that strikes you when you attend a meeting of that sort is that these people are aware of what is needed. They don't need you or me coming to tell them what to do. They have studied and they know the literature. Somebody usually knows the problems, and they know better than we in many cases what is the ideal approach or solution. But they are strapped for funds, they haven't the professional recognition or support in their communities to act or to institute effective measures. While they know well what they should be doing, they need the forum to give strength to their arguments. And the enunciation of some of the principles heard from a Brazilian, heard from a Panamanian, or heard from another delegate - these things, heard from neighbors - force or strengthen the hand of the local agents. And the local representative sometimes is a man who has very good concepts of what his agency might do or his University might do if he could get the superiors in his department, his ministry, his fiscal office, or his congress to see.

Are these aspects of the international wildlife problem? These are social problems.

Land management, land reforms in some cases, make it almost impossible for refuges, new reserves, or new national parks, to be created. But even here the outcome of such an international meeting may be the formation of an international committee which survives year after year. Through its bringing together of experts, enabling them to exchange ideas, there develops a rapport among them that in a way is a substitute for a wildlife society.

There is one thing that an individual in this country can do. That is, on a campus or in a town where there are foreign students, whether or not these students were sent to study wildlife or any biological subject or any environmental problems or any of the sciences, and whether or not that is their main motive in coming to this particular college - it would be a great thing if the wildlife people on the campus could bring these

people into their confidence and bring them to meetings, to let them see a bit of the kind of professional rapport that helps make conservation of resources in America work. Here he will see a special phase of citizenship in action. A view of this hidden peculiarity of their host should not be denied them. They may never become very much concerned, or directly involved with the resources of their countries but even as citizens, they will be better able to understand what is necessary in a serious way to make the resources count for the most.

It seems we are gaining an international outlook in the wildlife profession. It is symbolized by the student group in Utah which has advertised in the African Wildlife Journal that they would like to exchange correspondence and journals, and that they have a lot of extra leaflets and journals from the various agencies in the United States that they would be glad to send to interested students in Africa or elsewhere for some of the information from another country. This is a healthy kind of thing that students might be doing and is a way of opening the windows for international understanding.

One more item of international understanding. I saw a Rossellini film the other day. It is an Italian film. You might call it a training film in antlerless or either-sex harvesting. It's called The 10th Victim and envisions a world where war is replaced by the Great Hunt. Quarry and hunter are randomly paired and notified by international computer and the stalk goes on, in and out of ultra-modern architecture. If you have a chance to see it, it might give you confidence that even when people are everywhere and the wild game is all gone, there might still be a job for you in game management, especially if you have a way with the computer, and especially if the hunter doesn't fall in love with the game.

That story and many other impacts foretell the change coming and already upon us in the work of the wildlife specialist. More people and new pressures on wildlife and habitat will demand adjustment, patience, and ingenuity. This generation of wildlife students can have a great part by outrunning humanity and by getting to the far and unspoilt scenes to help save habitats and herds with timely management and with attention to the international needs in wildlife.