Relations, Places, and Practices

The *Trumpeter*
ISSN: 0832-6193
Volume 22, Number 1 (2006)

Living in Mixed Communities of Humans, Mountain Lions, Bears, Condors, and Wildfires in California

Bill Devall

Bill Devall is Professor Emeritus at Humboldt State University, Arcata, California. He has published several books on the deep, long-range ecology movement including *Deep Ecology; Living as if Nature Mattered*, with George Sessions (1985); *Simple in Means, Rich in Ends* (1988) and *Living Richly in an Age of Limits* (1993). He has published many articles on the deep, long-range ecology movement and assisted Alan Drengson on the Selected Works of Arne Naess project. He is currently working on a paper reviewing several strategies for protecting the Earth's biodiversity.

Introduction

In this paper I attempt to apply principles developed by Arne Naess to the conditions prevailing in the state of California in the first decade of the twenty-first century. In particular I intend to apply Naess's principles and norms of coexistence to living with bears, mountain lions, California condors, and wildfires. Many threatened and endangered species dwell in California. However I selected bears, mountain lions and condors because there is continuing conflict between humans and the *vital* needs of those three species in California. Bears and mountain lions thrive in California, however condors are listed as threatened and endangered on federal and state endangered species lists.

Naess developed his principles of coexistence with wild predators in the context of Norwegian society during the latter half of the twentieth century. I will first outline Naess's approach to dwelling in mixed communities of humans and other animals and discuss those principles

in the context of modern Norwegian society. I will then briefly describe California and attempt to apply Naess's principles in the context of that society and culture.[1]

Naess provides a system of norms starting from more or less general norms to more specific ones.

Self realization!

Ecological sustainability!

Humans have the right to satisfy their *vital* needs!

Humans have no right to wilfully cause the extinction of other species!

Naess specifies these norms in the context of human and wolf relationships in Norway.

The well-being of the species wolf as part of human and nonhuman life on Earth has value in itself (intrinsic value, inherent value)! This value is independent of the narrow usefulness of the nonhuman world for human purposes!

Richness and diversity of wolf races and habitats as part of the general richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves![2]

Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity, including wolf habitats and races of wolves, except to satisfy vital needs!

These norms can be specified in the context of California society in the twenty-first century.

The scale and complexity of society in California is much greater than the scale and complexity of society in Norway. Naess agrees that the complexity of society and of social policy issues is an important variable. Many issues arise because of increased complexity. Approximately 4.5 million humans dwell in Norway. California has approximately 34 million residents. California has a huge infrastructure of freeways, water delivery systems, and intensive agriculture, including millions of acres of private timberlands that are managed as tree farms.[3]

I chose California as the focus of this research for several reasons. It is a large state with a wide variety of ecosystem types. It has a large, mostly urbanized population. There are many conservation organizations in the state devoted to protection of wildlife. Indeed, some historians conclude that the American conservation movement was born in California when John Muir and his associates founded the Sierra Club in 1892. There is a large body of public policy, regulations, and education programs devoted to the relationships between humans and bears, mountain lions, and condors. There has been and continues to be extensive public debate and discussions concerning research on bears, mountain lions, condors, and wildfires in California and debate concerning specific laws and policies governing relationships between these species and humans.

How can Naess's general norms be applied to California? One step in the process is to specify some of the normative statements that Naess made in Norway to the social condition in California.

The well-being of bears, mountain lions, and condors as part of human and nonhuman life has values in themselves (intrinsic value)! This value is independent of the narrow usefulness of nonhuman species for human purposes!

Richness and diversity of bears, mountain lions, and condors and their habitats as part of the richness and diversity of lifeforms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves!

Humans have no right to reduce richness and diversity, including bear, mountain lion, and condor habitats except to satisfy *vital* needs!

None of these norms apply to human relationships with wildfires. How can we apply Naess's normative systems to human relationships with natural forces such as wildfires? Within the borders of the state of California there is a variety of ecosystems. However, all of them include wildfires as a natural element of change. Even old growth redwood forests experience periodic wildfires. Wildfire suppression during the twentieth century and accelerating population growth in what is called the urban/wildlands regions has increased the severity of wildfire impact on humans.[4]

Consistent with Naess's approach to normative systems, we need statements, such as the following, to include wildfire in our discussion in this paper.

Wildfires have intrinsic value and value as part of the processes of evolving landscapes in California!

That statement does not resolve conflicts between *vital* human needs and desires of humans and actions of wildfires. It does suggest that humans learn to live with wildfires in California rather than attempt to eliminate all wildfires from the landscape in California (which is not possible).

It is possible to eliminate certain species of wildlife from the landscape of California. Grizzly bears have been exterminated in California. The last sighting of a grizzly bear in California was during the 1920s. Condors and mountain lions were almost eliminated from the landscape of California by human actions. However, mountain lions are now protected under state law in California. Condors are listed as *endangered* under the federal *Endangered Species Act.*

How does the growing population of humans in California live with wildfires, bears, condors, and mountain lions?

There are statements concerning value established in California state policy. For example, the California Department of Fish and Game in their publicly posted statement concerning "Living With California Black Bears" states in bold letters that "**People have a responsibility to the wildlife whose habitat they are sharing**."

There is also conflict between the vital needs of bears, mountain lions, and condors, and the desires of some humans living in California.[5]

For example, the Defenders of Wildlife, a private conservation group, stated in their website during the summer of 2004

> There are approximately 36,000 black bears in California, and the growing urbanization in that state, coupled with vacation home development in the woods and wilderness, is leading to increased conflicts between humans and bears. One of the largest problems results when bears begin eating food they find in trash bins.[6]

I will give a brief description of policies and practices of each species beginning with California condors.

California condors

After many scientific studies and intense debate among scientists and between scientists, conservation groups, and the general public, the California condor was listed as *endangered* under the federal *Endangered Species Act*. This act specifies that only biological conditions of the species be considered in determining listing and management, not human economic conditions or human preferences concerning species. For example, condors are considered by many people as aesthetically unappealing. Using indicators showing a rapidly decreasing number of condors in California it was decided by public agencies to capture all remaining wild California condors and develop a captive breeding program with the goal of releasing condors back into the wild. The last wild condor was captured in 1987. No California condors flew free in the skies of California between 1987 and 1992.

Considerable debate occurred before the decision was made to capture all remaining wild condors. David Brower, a leading conservationist, argued against capturing wild condors. He stated that condors are "five percent feathers and bone and ninety-five percent place." Condors in captivity are not condors soaring over the mountains and valleys of California. However, condors were dying because they were shot by humans and because they were ingesting chemicals produced by industrial civilization including fatal doses of such chemicals as anti-freeze dumped along the highways by careless humans. Brower argued that we should address the habitat of condors and clean up the mess humans were causing and protect habitat from the accelerating growth of human population in condor habitat.[7]

The Audubon Society, a leading conservation group, opposed capture of all wild condors. However, the Audubon Society concluded that wild condors were not reproducing successfully and changed its position. The Audubon Society then supported capture of all remaining wild condors with the goal of breeding chicks in captivity and returning them to the wild. With all wild condors in captivity, the state of California and private organizations continued to buy land in the southern San Joaquin Valley as habitat for condors that would be released into the wild in the future. The release of condors back into the wild elicited many news reports. When condors nested in the wild, laid eggs, hatched chicks, and died in the wild, the activities of specific birds were reported in widely circulated news stories.[8]

The most difficult controversy is over the property rights of private landowners who own property in condor habitat. Some landowners argue that they have a "right" to develop their property, even if such development, including massive housing developments, negatively

impacts California condors. Some condors have died of lead poisoning. Some scientists and conservation groups argue that the state of California should act more aggressively to ban lead from bullets. Condors are scavengers and some of them eat carcass of mammals that have been shot and left by sport hunters. The bullets contain lead. Some condors have been found with plastic and other garbage from industrial civilization in their bodies.

It appears that many of Naess's recommendations concerning the relationship of humans living in mixed communities are followed in California concerning relations between humans and condors. There is continuing dialogue based on non-violent communication, although in a few instances it is suspected that hunters have deliberately shot wild condors. There has been and continues to be extensive research on condors. Private conservation organizations have discussed their condor policies and have changed their position over time based on changing circumstances. Public and private organizations have made statements that at least imply that condors have intrinsic value. The lives of individual condors have been recorded and successful fledgling of young birds have been viewed with widespread joy, and the deaths of individual condors have been mourned. In other words, the quality of life of individual condors has been considered. The relationship between condors and humans has been the subject of deep questioning as seen in the public debate over the decision to capture all wild condors.

While it is difficult to find specific examples of statements of a land ethic by scientists studying condors, the behaviour of scientists, conservationists, and public agencies can lead to the inference that there is a land ethic concerning condors among at least a small segment of the human population in California.

Mountain lions

A special issue of *Outdoor California* began with the statement that

> No species of native wildlife has been more controversial in California than the mountain lion. This fierce, beautiful mammal, an icon of wildlife in the Golden State, remains a living link to our proud and rugged outdoor heritage. It inspires awe, respect and passion.[9]

Considered predators on sheep and other domestic livestock, mountain lions were hunted some times by bounty hunters for over one hundred

years after California became a state in 1850. The legal situation of mountain lions changed considerably in 1990 when the voters of California passed an initiative that designated the mountain lion a "specially protected mammal," the only mammal so designated in California law. While there is considerable debate concerning the number of mountain lions living in California, there is wide consensus that more humans are living and recreating in mountain lion habitat. The surging human population in California and the desire of more residents to build homes in mountain lion habitat is frequently blamed for increasing negative encounters between mountain lions and humans during the 1990s. However historical research by researchers at the California department of Fish and Game concluded that for 76 years between 1910–1985 there were no known attacks by mountain lions on humans in California. The Department of Fish and Game investigates each reported negative encounter between a mountain lion and a human. This list includes three human deaths due to mountain lion attack between 1990 and January 2004. In a few cases, police have called upon sharpshooters to kill mountain lions seen in suburban areas during daylight hours. Police argued that the specific mountain lion posed a danger to children playing in the neighbourhood.[10]

The California Department of Fish and Game claims

> primary responsibility for managing and protecting all fish and wildlife, including their habitat, in the public interest. We do not represent the exclusive views of a narrow segment of the public on any issue, especially one as complex as mountain lion management. Our public trust responsibility for wildlife sets the stage for our activities. However, protecting the public and alleviating damage to private property are equally important priorities. What does a balanced approach mean? Examples of the public trust role include responding to animal welfare needs-such as caring for sick, injured or orphaned young mountain lions-and developing contingency plans for dealing with mountain lions which show up in residential areas. But it may also involve removing a mountain lion that threatens or attacks a human, as well as confirming cases and removing mountain lions that kill livestock and pets. In addition, we may need to step in to prevent excess predation by mountain lions on small populations of prey, such as threatened California bighorn sheep.[11]

In some specific situations, the Mountain Lion Foundation, a private organization, has mediated between specific mountain lions and specific property owners. In their autumn, 2004, newsletter the Foundation discusses its work with P1 and P2, "very likely the last lions left in the Santa Monica mountains . . ." near Los Angeles. P1 found a herd of goats on a ranch and killed several goats. The landowner called

in a professional hunter with hounds who was given a state permit to kill P1. However P1 evaded the hunter. *The Los Angeles Times* published an editorial asking the rancher to work with the Mountain Lion Foundation to "figure out a better way to protect his goats." The rancher called off the hunt for P1 and trained guard dogs and built protective enclosures for his goats. The Mountain Lion Foundation reported that P1 and his mate, P2, had four kittens who have survived with their parents.

Reviewing public documents, statements by state agencies, especially the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, reviews of research by scientists, statements by some conservation organizations, and news stories, the following tentative conclusions can be stated. Some of Naess's norms have been applied in California concerning relationships between mountain lions and humans. The passage by California voters of the mountain lion protection initiative indicates that many California residents support the intrinsic right of mountains lions to their habitat. Reports in news media of sightings of mountain lions indicate that many people experience awe and respect when they see a wild mountain lion. Individual mountain lions, not only the whole population of mountain lions, are given respect and attention. Specific conflicts between specific mountain lions and specific humans are investigated. Killing a specific mountain lion is considered a last resort option.

It is difficult to ascertain if "self-realization" is maximized in mixed communities of mountain lions and humans. Some people profess admiration of mountain lions while other people express fear of mountain lions and demand that mountain lions be killed if they "trespass" into residential areas.

Black bears

Black bears live in varied landscapes from the Mexican border to the Oregon border. They occupy forests and woodland. The California Department of Fish and Game estimates that between 16,000 and 24,000 bears live in California. Permits are given to hunt bears in California. Conflicts between humans and bears most frequently occur when bears become habituated to eating from human garbage. Bear attacks on humans are so rare that each incident reported to California Department of Fish and Game is investigated. During the 1990s, one attack by humans on a bear in Yosemite National Park resulted in the death of the bear. News reports in the *San Francisco Chronicle* state that

> News of the attack was the talk of park employees, who were angry and horrified…. "None of us can believe anyone would do this," said Allen Mourton, assistant manager at the Tuolumne Meadows store. "It makes you wonder what people are teaching their kids. We all want to make sure that nobody gets away with something like this."

Bears have been part of mythology, religion, and philosophy in numerous societies for thousands of years. In California, several conservation groups, as well as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, have engaged in research, education campaigns, and public policy discussions concerning human relations with bears. Two areas provide examples of implementation of policies aimed at reducing the death rate of bears and increasing the general welfare of bears. In the Tahoe Lake basin, Defenders of Wildlife and other conservation groups installed bear proof dumpsters and began an education campaign to encourage residents to protect garbage and pet food and encourage residents to live in harmony with their wild neighbours.

In the Mammoth Lakes region one study estimated that more bears were living inside the urban area because they were attracted to dumpsters. A Wildlife Management Officer uses bang devices, rubber bullets delivered via revolver or shotgun, and verbal commands and body language to communicate to bears to change their behaviour.[12]

Humans hunt bears for sport and also for their bile, whole gall bladders, and paws. These are used in traditional Chinese medicine. Although it is illegal to hunt bears in California without a permit from the California Fish and Game Department, poachers kill wild bears and sell bear organs to a growing market in China and around the world. Some animal welfare private organizations are attempting to educate consumers to use alternatives such as synthetic bile and herbal remedies.[13]

Review of the literature indicates there is a large collection of law, scientific studies, public debate, policy and practice in California concerning relationships between black bears and humans. However, deeper questioning, in the method advocated by Naess is rarely encountered in the literature. Some phrases indicate human affection for bears and consideration of the needs of individual bears. "Living in harmony with bears" and "helping Californians embrace black bears" and "black bears should be treated with utmost respect" indicate underlying ethical considerations. These phrases repeated in news stories and in official statements issued by the California Department of Fish and Game indicates that black bears are considered to have

intrinsic value as a species and as individuals in landscapes of California. Debate concerning "bear management problems" and continued "bear-awareness programs" indicates many residents of California seek to live in harmony with bears. Researchers express concern for the health of individual bears. Bears feeding mainly on dumpsters frequently are overweight and decline in health. The official policies of state agencies and many conservation groups is to encourage individual bears to live on wild resources rather than on contents of dumpsters which contain high fat meals which are considered less healthy for both humans and bears.

Wildfires in California

Naess supports the norm that humans have a right to sustain their *vital* human needs. However, inappropriate consumption, destruction of wildlife habitat to sustain increasing standard of living versus quality of life threatens the habitat of wildlife, and patterns of settlement increase the risk of damage to some human settlements by wildfires. There is no doubt that wildfires will continue in California landscapes. Studies of the impact of wildfires on the landscape conclude that they are essential to healthy functioning of ecosystems.[14]

One of Naess's norms is ecological sustainability! Wildfires in various types of California landscapes—including forests, woodlands, chaparral and grasslands—sustain ecological functions. Scientists conclude that some plants germinate only after a wildfire event. American Indians observed the effects of wildfires on selected plants that they used in weaving baskets and for other purposes and several tribes conducted what scientists today call "prescribed burns" to encourage the growth of these plants.

However, over the past century, intensive efforts have been made to suppress wildfires in California landscapes. When timber and homes are burned during wildfires, news reports call the event a "disaster." Humans "fight" wildfires with paramilitary forces. Firefighters are mobilized to "defend" against the wildfire. Firefighters who are injured or killed while fighting the wildfire are considered heroes. The state of California maintains a large paramilitary force, the California Department of Forestry (CDF) with equipment including airplanes, trucks, tankers, and on call personnel, including inmates in some state prisons who are trained to fight wildfires.[15]

During the 1990s, public policy towards forests "threatened" by wildfires changed from only actively fighting wildfires to reducing

"fuel loads" in forests by removing vegetation including large trees that provide fuel for wildfires. Some conservationists assert that this new policy could be summarized by the statement "we must cut down the forest in order to save the forest."[16]

CDF released guidelines to residents living in wildfire prone areas. These guidelines include recommendations to cut down vegetation growing within two hundred feet of a structure, avoid putting shake roofs and wooden decks on buildings. Research indicates that when residents follow CDF guidelines it is much less likely that wildfires will consume human occupied buildings.[17]

Some public agencies experimented with "let burn" policies in areas remote from human settlements, particularly in designated Wilderness areas. Some agencies experimented with "controlled burn" practices in certain areas such as Redwood National Park. However, most of the arguments and intellectual justification for public policies concerning wildfires has been framed by different views of "ecological sustainability." It is difficult to take Naess's high level norms and apply them to specific policy decisions and specific practices concerning wildfires. Are participants in discussions over public policy concerning wildfires engaged in "deeper questioning?" That is difficult to ascertain. As noted in previous sections of this paper, it is possible to ascertain that some residents of California have positive feelings towards the species bear, mountain lion, and condor, and towards specific bears, mountain lions, and condors. However, the emotions expressed concerning wildfires are more expressions of fear. Underlying norms expressed by some people are: Wildfires have no right to burn my property! and The government should be required to protect my property from wildfires! President Bush has promoted a "healthy forests" initiative involving spending millions of dollars of Federal money on "fuel reduction" by cutting trees before they burn in wildfires, clearing understory vegetation and "salvage sales" of timber burned in wildfires. All these proposals have evoked strong criticism from conservation organizations and leading forest ecologists.[18]

Naess's general statements indicate he would support forest ecologists who argue that generally speaking the best policy after a wildfire event is to "let nature heal herself." Forest ecologists argue that the natural regenerative process maximizes plant diversity and provides greater probability for more rapid recovery of an area that has experienced a wildfire than building roads across the area burned by a wildfire to access salvageable timber. Other programs to help areas recover from

wildfires, such as seeding watersheds so grass will grow to protect fragile exposed soils exposed by wildfires are controversial. Some reseeding programs, for example, have introduced non-native species of grasses and other non-native plants which inhibited the growth of plants native to the area.

Conservation groups have filed lawsuits asking the courts to prohibit salvage logging in certain areas. In some cases, protesters have engaged in non-violent direct action against loggers entering burned areas to engage in salvage logging. Protesters have blockaded logging roads and police have arrested protesters. The message promoted by those who protest salvage logging after a wildfire is "protect the integrity of the landscape."

Naess, in his brief review of "maximal realization of potentials" concludes

> Clearly a policy of restraining certain forms and life-styles in favour of others is called for—in favour of those with high levels of symbiosis or more generally, good potentialities of coexistence. This seems to suggest a very active interference in nature: defending the hunted against the hunters, the oppressed against the oppressors. But here ecology has taught us a very brutal lesson: our vast ignorance of the interdependence of life-forms and the often tragic consequences, for the hunted and the oppressed, of the elimination of the hunters and the oppressors. Interference has to be carried out with the utmost care.[19]

Interference has to be carried out with the utmost care! can be a guiding norm for any actions taken in areas that have experienced wildfires. Any massive initiative such as President Bush's "healthy forests" initiative which uses a misleading slogan to label massive interference with forests over millions of acres is rejected.

The suggested outcome of this deeper questioning is that human residents of California adapt their behaviour. This includes adapting settlement patterns. Settlement should be discouraged in regions that experience high frequency of wildfires. One way to encourage this goal is by developing local zoning ordinances that concentrate development and provide for roads that allow residents to leave the area rapidly before a wildfire reaches that specific residential area.

Conclusion

Naess says

> The way in which I have talked about life-forms and life-styles suggests that it is species and other collective units, not particular living beings, which realize potentialities. I do no rule out the possibility of self-realization of collectivities but prefer to think only of particular beings, particular humans, frogs, hookworms.[20]

In his discussion of Naess's position, Harold Glasser concludes that Naess does not call for a new environmental ethic or changes in our fundamental values but rather he "focuses on transforming environmental policy by helping individuals to develop more thoroughly reasoned, well-informed, and consistent policy positions."[21]

However,

> where conflicts arise within or amongst individuals as a result of conflicting ultimate premises, or when conflicts arise on policy positions that have been reasoned consistently and coherently from fundamentals the DEA (Naess's deep ecology) appears to offer scant recourse . . . Modern environmental problems, with their complex trade-offs between ethical, ecological, scientific, political, legal, social, and economic considerations, demand an empirically and procedurally more sophisticated approach for systematically evaluating alternatives and assessing conflicts.[22]

Glasser concludes that it is difficult to translate Naess's philosophical norms into public policy statements and difficult to translate his norms to species and landscape levels of decisions.

In the context of Conservation Biology as a scientific framework for policy decisions, Naess has made a few comments. Naess had conversations with Michael Soulé, one of the founders of Conservation Biology. Naess understands Conservation Biology is a crisis driven movement, not an academic exercise in science. Recognizing that human impacts are increasing the rate of species extinction on the planet, conservation biologists are compelled to devote themselves to rescue efforts. Naess suggests that supporters of Conservation Biology are supporters of the deep, long-range ecology movement. Conservation biology is not only a descriptive science; it is a proscriptive and prescriptive science. Naess asserts "We assume some kind of 'ecosophy,' some kind of wisdom, which we are able to verbalize only imperfectly and fragmentarily." That is, Naess asserts that scientists working within the community of conservation biologists should state their value priorities.[23]

David Foreman presents a strategy for protecting biodiversity by establishing large wilderness areas. Foreman states that "from my earliest days, I have been drawn to the heart of wildness, to wild lands and wild rivers and wild things, to the places and beasts outside the rule of humankind." As he grew older Foreman expressed a sense of loss as he witnessed "roads ripped into the wilderness, forests buzzcut, rivers dammed, coal torn from the badlands . . ."[24]

Foreman relies on principles of Conservation Biology as science to provide his vision and strategy for rewilding North America.

Foreman assumes Aldo Leopold's "land ethic" as an underlying principle for his own work in conservation. And he concludes his book by asking the questions "How then do we act according to our ethics? How then do we begin to behave in keeping with the recognition that our actions have long-term consequences? How do we become responsible?"[25]

He answers his own question by asserting that we consciously act according to the "land ethic."

> Consciously, deliberately, physically acting to heal ecological wounds may be a way to overcome the gulf between a land ethic and land caring. Assuming that we have to thoughtfully work to practice our ethics toward nature may lead to better behavior. We might be able to practice our land ethic only by consciously practicing it. Physically restoring streams, pulling exotic weeds, helping with native species reintroductions, closing harmful roads—such actions may be how we become consciously responsible. We need to create a hopeful vision for the future and consciously work to gain it, not naively assume that humans will unconsciously move in the right direction.[26]

Foreman uses the collective *we* without specifying responsibilities of specific organizations, agencies, governments, or corporations. Foreman has what Naess calls the "intuition of deep ecology." Foreman articulates principles of Conservation Biology for rewilding North America but he does not provide sociological analysis of contemporary society in North America.

Some conservation biologists argue that conservation biologists must be neutral on questions of public policy or they will lose their credibility as scientists. Arguments over the science of endangered species for example frequently involve policy decisions that form the premises that

are used to justify policy decisions. For example, the Bush administration decision to count hatchery born salmon along with estimates of wild salmon to arrive at decisions concerning habitat needs of salmon as required under provisions of the Endangered Species Act, has been vigorously debated by scientists.

In conclusion, it can be argued that Naess's normative approach has, to some extent, been applied in California. Naess's concern with specific animals and the suffering that humans inflect on them is expressed in several of the examples cited in this essay. However, the application of Naess's methodology to human relationship with wildfires in California requires much more examination. My comments are based on my experience as a social scientist. While Naess encourages use of social science methodology for many decades during his professional career, a review of the literature indicates that very few social scientists have been interested in undertaking empirical research based on Naess's approach to issues of wildfires in California.

On the other hand, a social scientist can use empirical research to determine public norms concerning living in mixed communities of humans, bears, mountain lions, and condors in California. Spending money is also an indicator of public support for certain norms. For example, maintaining private organizations, such as the Mountain Lion Foundation, requires private donations. The millions of dollars donated by private donors as well as expenditure of public money by federal and state agencies indicates support for the conclusion that some residents of California support the norm that individual condors, condors as a species, and habitat for free roaming condors is a valued norm. Research is needed on how humans acquire and manifest these values and how they make decisions in situations of conflict. For example, the lifestyles of many Californians would have to change to conform to the norm "living with wildfires" as part of the flow of nature. Naess advocates research on "quality of life" and argues that conventional studies of "standard of living" do not measure what Naess calls "richness of experience" of living in relationship with nature.

In much of his writing Naess advocates dialogue, asking deeper questions, and engaging philosophy in daily practice and in public policy. While much thinking has been done in California over the past century concerning the topics discussed in this essay, much more decision is necessary. Human practices need to change in order to live in harmony with the species mentioned in this paper and with wildfires in the landscape.

The situation of many native species in the California landscape is precarious. Even with millions of dollars spent on restoring condors to the skies of California, the stated goal of the program is only 200 wild condors. Minimal goal. All species of salmon that inhabit the rivers of California are listed as *endangered* under the Federal Endangered Species Act.[27] The list of endangered species increases as the growth of human population in California increases. If anything approaching the vision stated by Dave Foreman of rewilding California is begun, massive changes in value priorities, lifestyles, settlement patterns, rates of consumption, investment in restoration programs, and withdrawal of current human uses from millions of acres of California landscape would be required. For example, hundreds of thousands of California residents demand their "right" to ride off-road vehicles on public lands in the California desert in habitat of the endangered desert tortoise. These vehicle users assert that their quality of life is lowered if they are not allowed to use their vehicles for off-road races in the desert. Naess's norm of "maximum (native species) diversity" and "humans have no right to exploit nature except for vital human needs" is violated every hour in California. Perhaps some readers will be motivated after reading this essay to undertake the task of outlining the process of changing human culture, politics, value priorities, and economy that would be necessary to fulfill the norms stated by Naess in California. One of Naess's favourite slogans is "the front is very long." Each person has something to contribute to the philosophical frontier and to the practice of living in mixed communities. Naess asserts he has faith and is optimistic for the twenty-second century. I do also.[28]

References

Barringer, Felicity. 2004. "U.S. Rules Out Dam Removal To Aid Salmon." *New York Times,* December 1, 2004, p. A1.

Foreman, David. 2004. *Rewilding North America: A Vision for Conservation in the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Glasser, Harold. 1996. "Naess's Deep Ecology Approach and Environmental Policy." *Inquiry* 39, 157-187.

Glater, Jonathan. 2003. "Condor Rescuers Lose a Most Valued Teammate." *New York Times,* April 26.

Naess, Arne. 1979. “Self-realization in Mixed Communities of Humans, Bears, Sheep, and Wolves.” *Inquiry*, 22, 231-4.

Naess, Arne, and Ivar Mysterud. 1987.“Philosophy of Wolf Policies I: General Principles and Preliminary Explorations of Selected Norms.” *Conservation Biology* 1, 22-34.

Phillips, David, et. al. 1982. *The Condor Question: Captive or Wild Forever?* Andover, MA: Brick House Publishing.

Shepard, Paul, and Barry Sanders. 1985. *The Sacred Paw: The Bear in Nature, Myth, and Literature*. New York: Viking Penguin.

Snyder, Noel. 2000. *The California Condor*. New York: Academic Press.

Notes

[1] Naess, Arne. “Self-realization in Mixed Communities of Humans, Bears, Sheep, and Wolves.” *Inquiry* 22, 231–241. This article has been reprinted in the special Festschrift volume of the *Trumpeter*, which accompanies this issue.

[2] Naess, Arne, and Ivar Mysterud. 1987.”Philosophy of Wolf Policies I: General Principles and Preliminary Exploration of Selected Norms.” *Conservation Biology* 1, 22–34.

[3] State of California; The Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game. 2003. *Atlas of the Biodiversy of California*. “It is the rapid population growth in California’s more rural areas—the Central Valley, Sierra Nevada foothills, and the Southern California Coast Ranges—that presents a more troubling trend for native plants and animals. While not matching the growth predictions for the San Francisco Bay Area or South Coast, population growth in these areas is still predicted to be very high. These areas are likely to have housing densities much lower than in the major cities. The combination of high population growth in rural areas and expected low housing densities means that substantially more land presently in natural habitat will be converted to housing. Urban expansion into rural areas compounds the problem because these areas generally lack the infrastructure to handle new growth. Consequently, new residential and industrial development requires transportation, water, sewer, and other services to be greatly expanded or newly built, only aggravating the cost to habitat.” p.72.

[4] Different regions of California have different wildfire regimes. In the Southern California Coast Ranges wildfires are expected at intervals of between 7 and 17 years.

[5] The website of the California Department of Fish and Game made the statement quoted in the text of this essay in the Department’s essay “Living With California Black Bears.”

[6] Defenders of Wildlife website; "Helping Californians Embrace Black Bears." Accessed Feb.10, 2006 at http://www.defenders.org/defendersmag/issues/summer04/ground.html

[7] Phillips, David et al. 1982. *The Condor Question: Captive or Wild Forever?* Brick House Publishing Company.

[8] Cooper, Daniel S. 2003. "Audubon and the California Condor." Audubon California website http://www.audubon-ca.org/California-Condor.html . An extensive discussion of the history of the California condor is found in Snyder, Noel. 2000. *The California Condor*. New York: Academic Press. Many news stories relate the birth, life, and death of specific named condors. For example CNN.com./U.S. published a news story on October 5, 2002 with the headline "California condor found dead." "The first California condor to hatch in the wild in nearly two decades has been found dead." http://archives,cnn.com/2002/US/West/10/05/condor.dies.ap/ Another example is an article by Rita Beamish, "Days of the Condor: The raptors, once nearly extinct, take wing as humans cheer them on." *The Washington Post National Weekly Edition*, December 13–19, 2004 p. 35. Also Glater, Jonathan. 2003. "Condor Rescuers Lose a Most Valued Teammate." *New York Times*, April 26.

[9] The special edition of *Outdoor California* magazine devoted to mountain lions is printed online http://www.dfg.ca.gov/lion/outdoor.lion.html.

[10] Chester, Tom. 2004. "List of Mountain Lion Attacks on People in California." website http://tchest.org/sgm/list/lion-attacks-ca.html Sightings of mountain lions in suburban areas of California are so rare they are sometimes reported in newspapers.

[11] Charles F. Raysbrook, "DFG Responsible for all Wildlife," *Outdoor California*, March 21, 1996

[12] A discussion of the progress in improving human-bear relationships in the Mammoth Lakes region of California is found in the January 8, 2005 edition of the PBS Weekend Explorer http:/www.pbs.org/weekendexplorer/destinations/California/mammoth/bears.html

[13] Castle, Teresa. 2005. "State battles lucrative bear bile trade," *San Francisco Chronicle*. April 25, A8.

[14] Pyne, Stephen J. 1995. *World Fire: The Culture of Fire on Earth*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

[15] During September and October, 2003, massive wildfires burned in the urban/wildlands interface areas of Southern California. Extensive documentation of the wildfires and the response of residents, firefighters, and public agencies is found in the archives of the *Los Angeles Times*.

[16] The controversy over "fuel breaks" and other proposals to "thin" forests before a wildfire and to salvage log after wildfires is found in the case study of the "Biscuit" Fire in south-western Oregon and northern California during 2002. Discussion of policies encouraging humans to live with wildfires is found in the *Journal of Conservation Biology*, August, 2004.

[17] For specific guidelines consult the California Department of Forestry website.

[18] Controversies over the privileged status of science are part of the continuing discussion between modernist and postmodern/deconstructionist philosophers. In Naess's methodology, debate continues through non-violent communication.

[19] Naess, "Self-realization in Mixed Communities of Humans, Bears, Sheep, and Wolves." p.232.

[20] ibid. p. 234.

[21] Glasser, Harold. "Naess's Deep Ecology Approach and Environmental Policy." *Inquiry*, 39, p.157–187.

[22] ibid. p.180.

[23] Naess does not use the phrase "deep ecology." He says "supporters of the deep, long-range ecology movement.

[24] Foreman, David. 2004. *Rewilding North America: A Vision for the 21st Century*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press. p. 1.

[25] ibid. p.228.

[26] ibid.

[27] Barringer, Felicity. 2004, "U.S. Rules Out Dam Removal to Aid Salmon." *New York Times*, December 1, A1.

[28] Naess, Arne. 1995. "Deep Ecology for the Twenty-Second Century." In Sessions, George ed. *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism.* Boston: Shambhala. p.463–467.