

BROADENING OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

By Tony Malmberg

A glint caught my eye. I stepped off my horse and picked up the nearly perfect arrowhead. The winds of time had brushed back the veil of soil revealing a past page from the book of life. I rubbed the smoothed sides and chipped edge between my thumb and forefinger. This tool, of crafted stone, killed game and drew blood from enemies, during its reign. Now, this seemingly benign object caused me to pause in reverence, for an era past. The significance startled me. It seemed impossible that such an impotent rock could have put fear into the hearts of enemies while feeding nations.

The arrowhead and its nomadic culture bowed to gunpowder and agriculture. Scarcely had newly planted fields sprouted over the graves of the Nomad, before smokestacks sprang from the internal combustion engine. The erupting clouds of smoke cast shadows over crops waiting for harvest, and drew young farmers to the higher paid industrial society. Rural communities gave up their young to urban areas.

Driving down our nations highways we see that the book of life continues, as the page of one generation turns to the page of the next. Moisture, riding on the winds of time, rusts and erodes old, horse drawn, farm equipment from our agriculture era. The industrial society's smokestacks are not far behind. **As tools become obsolete, the society that grew around that tool fades into the halls of art galleries, the shelves of libraries, and the dark recesses of our memory.** Each generation will recognize the time in which they live and thank their forefathers that enabled them to seize this life. A few will hold too tightly to times past, and remain bitter and angry.

A new tool has emerged. The computer. And with it a new society. The knowledge society. A social transformation has begun. If we are to preserve our communities, our way of life, and ultimately, our values, we must learn what we have to offer in this new age and how to face the new frontier.

How does this new era differ from others? Previous to World War I, in an agrarian society, employees were dependent on their employers to supply cattle, land, machinery, and other financial resources for them to earn a wage. Following World War II, farm workers fled to the cities to join the industrial work force. Again, the employee depended on the "capitalist" to provide machinery, land, etc., to earn a wage. In both societies, "capital" requirements tied people to a community and to an employer. Workers of the "knowledge society", do not have as critical of a tie to a place or employer but have become highly mobile.

Today's emerging society of knowledge workers is the first that does not earn by the "sweat of their brow". It is the first where everyone does not do the same work. We are seeing more than a social change but a change in how people live, what they value, to what they are committed, and new sets of problems. In a knowledge society, the individual with knowledge becomes the "capital" of an organization. The employer becomes more dependent on the employee than the employee is on the organization. The employee has become independent of the "land, machinery, and capital," that tied him/her to a place in the agrarian and industrial societies. The employees that provide a) their knowledge, b) their computer, c) their experience, and d) their

ability to apply knowledge to produce, can live wherever they wish and plug their computer into any company they wish to work for.

The result of this newly found mobility is the "**Fifth Migration**". The 1st migration was from Europe to the America's. The 2nd migration settled the West. The 3rd migration moved people from rural areas to the cities. The 4th migration moved people from the cities to the suburbs. The 5th migration is that of people moving from urban areas back to rural areas. Many are moving to the Rocky Mountain states.

The 5th migration has changed the once strong western coalition of senators. For example, Senator Pete Domenici of New Mexico, has been struggling to craft a grazing bill that will pass Congress. Unlike 20 years ago, resistance to ranchers' wishes comes from citizens from within his own state. Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico are no longer rural. Ranchers no longer get carte blanc grazing legislation, even at the state level. As populations shift and cultures change, so do politics. We have not been able to amend NEPA, the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, nor have we been able to pass a Livestock Grazing Act or even a Farm Bill. Because of a social transformation, combined with a population shift, western states project different values. People of the 5th migration have concerns about how use by ranchers affects water quality, range condition, wildlife habitat, and endangered species. Our state of Wyoming, along with Idaho, and Montana are not far behind these other states in becoming less rural and more urbane in composition, at least in mind set.

Mobility resulting from an unprecedented independence of workers in the "knowledge society" will redefine our sense of community. When employees were tied to a place, the composition of that community was more "fate" than "choice". Mobility allows for choice. In his essay, The Age of Social Transformation, Peter Drucker explains that mobile employees will transfer their "sense of place" from a geographic location to organizations. This allows them to move from place to place and still have an "anchor". If they are a member of the Sierra Club, or American Quarter Horse Ass'n., they can move to a different location without severing their link to community. Even though they move they retain some continuity because they are still a member of the organization which serves as their community.

Today we have one million non-profit organizations with 70% of them surfacing in the past 30 years. Preceding this event, policy development was done by the **public sector** and the **private sector**. Dealing in terms of money, these two sectors could compromise by splitting the difference. Now, the **non-profit organizations** add a different twist to the policy development process. By focusing on a narrower scope, with that scope probably being value oriented, the non-profits have no room to compromise. If we are going to influence today's policy development, we must first, acknowledge the nomadic knowledge workers, their changing definition of community, and their changing values.

Shadows of past tools, fading societies, and a changing culture make me sad. I revere my forefathers that fashioned and designed tools to carve life from frontiers. The key to their success was to step out and greet the dawning frontier with gusto; a healthy curiosity, and a fearless faith. Our challenge is the same. I know that I must lift my head up from the whirlpool of melancholy to survey and assess the frontier of change that we now face. The position that -- "This is always the way we have done things!"-- or --"They don't know what they are talking about!"--**is no longer a defensible position**. We must ask, "How can I do things to add value

to my community and enhance what my fellow citizens want?" "How does our life here contribute to our neighbor's values?" Apparently, people in our changing community value: **1)** air & water quality, **2)** wildlife habitat, **3)** endangered species habitat, and **4)** open space. We can give them a healthy and diverse habitat with functional ecological systems. Ask, "How can I benefit while I do?"

The masts of non-profit organizations align the horizon. We have common values with many, particularly those that are concerned with habitat. Ducks Unlimited, Trout Unlimited, Big Horn Elk Foundation, Wyoming Riparian Association, The Nature Conservancy, and The Audubon Society, are all organizations that benefit from good agricultural practices that contribute to a healthy plant community, good water quality, and open space. By reinforcing organizations with values the same as ours, we will gain important allies for political battles, gain opportunities to educate people whom we would not otherwise reach, and learn of the many ways our values of stewardship and rural community life contribute to their cause. If we only agree with a small part of a particular organization's opinion we should step up and agree with that small part. Each time we reinforce common sense, we will gain supporters from the moderate environmental organizations. Each time we reinforce common sense, we will alienate the fringe radical environmentalists from the responsible, conservation-minded, environmentalists. Each time we reinforce common sense the moderate environmentalists will see the need to support radical agendas as less urgent.

Apparently, agriculture no longer has the numbers to get political results. To get political results in a democratic society we must change public opinion. We must make the public realize that many of our values are in common with theirs. We must educate people that our lifestyle, and a profitable family agriculture business will enhance what they value. Members of environmental organizations concerned with habitat have values in common with Farm Bureau members. By acting to build coalitions with environmental organizations we can reach people we have not been able to reach. By extending our sphere of influence beyond our organization we will gain more support for policy development that protects what we value.

BROADENING OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE IN AN AGE OF CONFUSION

By Tony Malmberg

"Don't suspect conspiracy when mere confusion will do."

Gregg Cawley, Ph.D. UW Dept. of Political Science

Recently, professor Cawley reviewed the history of policy development on public lands in our country. At the risk of oversimplifying his presentation for Wyoming Farm Bureau's mid-winter convention, he said that public lands policy is more of a people process than a land management process. Public lands policy changes to reflect the changes in peoples' values. Public land policy evolved from a "*Hunter-Gatherer*" society, of the Native American Indians, to the "*Agriculture*" society, to the "*Industrial Age*". We are now in another "***Age of social transformation***". The important thing to grasp from professor Cawley's remarks is that we are in a period of confusion. To make progress in policy development we need to reduce confusion. We can accomplish this by promoting dialogue with the public to define the type of society and community we wish to live in.

Periods of societal evolution (people changing how they live) bring about confusion. As people compete for contradicting goals, all sides become defensive, abusive, and downright discourteous. Pitting the wants of one segment of our society against the wants of another adds to confusion. We have a hard time understanding how we can get what we want when times are changing. By thinking in terms of, a "win-lose, or a zero sum game", we create fear and skepticism. The resulting confrontation erects a barrier, preventing dialogue necessary to clear confusion. If confrontation adds to confusion, then change the process.

"Don't suspect conspiracy when mere confusion will do."

The resulting confusion allows a larger presence of government to intervene and restore order. What appears as "order" following this intrusion is actually unrest being suppressed. This suppressed restlessness will surface from time to time as a revolt, like the Sagebrush Rebellion. As long as big government holds the reins of power, communities will be ruled by people apart from them. By continuing to bicker and battle, each faction of society becomes more defensive, making people more afraid, a revolt erupts, and the vicious cycle continues. If defensiveness adds to confusion, then change the process.

"Don't suspect conspiracy when mere confusion will do."

Who loses when confusion reigns? You and I of the Farm Bureau, members of the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, the Wyoming Stockgrowers, and all of our communities citizens lose! Who wins? Those who have the central power! In this case the Secretary of Interior, Bruce Babbitt. The only way to reduce the need for government

intervention is to remove the need for government to enforce order. By defining common ground with others interested in federal land use, we can define our own agenda at the local level. By asking the question, "How do we live peacefully and prosperously in our community?" we focus everyone on our common goal. Once we begin work to answer this question, tensions are reduced. How do we focus everyone on the question?

First, get to know our neighbors. Who values use of the public lands? Today's social transformation is driven by the computer, the primary tool of the "knowledge society". This tool allows the "knowledge worker" to be highly mobile. This mobility has prompted a move by many people away from cities and back to rural areas. One way to access our new neighbors may be through conservation organizations. In a de facto sense, their organization becomes a part of our community. Confusion causes us to think the values of our new neighbors, open space, clean water and air, wildlife habitat, and endangered species, are contradictory to ours. Our values, private property rights, a return on equity, family, and community enhance their values. In reality, the values of our new neighbors "New West", will be preserved by our values of the "Old West". Only through an open dialogue with our neighbors will we help them understand this symbiotic relationship between our goals. By sitting down to visit, we can explain that **our landscape and communities are an outcrop of our values and our lifestyle. What they want, is preserved by who we are and our culture.**

Second, be courteous to our neighbors and those that represent our neighbors. Our neighbors are people with hopes, fears, desires, concerns, bills to pay, children to feed, and with loved ones to nurture, just as we are. They are not a lurking enemy to conquer. Have you ever noticed how many ranchers get along fine with the fisherman, or the hiker, or the hunter, at home? Why do things get so out of hand when organizations representing the two citizens meet? All of a sudden, political posturing and bantering obscures the common ground we share back on our home main street. This is irrational when we have the same end goal in mind. Our common goal, "To live peacefully and prosperously in our community setting!" It is very easy to focus on differences. Focusing on differences takes no courage, no risk, and no imagination. And it brings no gain. The process of suspicion erects barriers of defensiveness, causing all of us to lose sight of this important goal. **The enemy we must all face is the process we have been undertaking to achieve the end goal.**

Our first inclination, to be defensive, will short circuit our end goal. If there is a fight, someone will lose. Defensiveness starts fights. Defensiveness begets fear, which incites more fear. From this posture, we act like victims and hand over our power to government agencies, to restore order. The next dangerous step is becoming a victim. By choosing to solve problems we reduce confusion and avoid becoming a victim. By granting our neighbors the courtesy to hear what they value, we will reduce tension. With reduced tension we can educate them as to how our values will preserve their

values. Only then can we identify the type of society we want to move toward during this time of change. Only then will we have the power to live without big government.

Organizations that are effective in redirecting energy spent on fear can begin understanding our neighbors. Organizations that understand our neighbors will see how we can all live peacefully in a different but exciting time. Organizations that mature to this point, will get the most for their members as we emerge from this time of confusion.

"Don't suspect conspiracy when mere confusion will do."

BROADENING OUR SPHERE OF INFLUENCE **THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY**

By Tony Malmberg

In these changing times, how do we determine who our allies are? With people streaming into the Rocky Mountain region, the only given is that times will change. To preserve our values, we need to do what we have always done well. Be neighbors! By greeting our new neighbors, knowing them as individuals, and welcoming them to our communities, we will have a solid foundation for future policy development. With this foundation at the local level, we will have a better chance of keeping decisions where they belong: at the local community level.

From this point we will have a stronger base in dealing with conservation and environmental organizations at the state and national levels. How do we decide which organizations to ally with and which ones to be wary of? How do we tell the good from the bad? How do we tell the bad from the ugly? To make progress in defining the goals for our changing society, we can sort through the chaff by organizations' actions. If a democratic society is to function properly, decisions must be made as close to home as possible. Only the people of a community are able to determine what values define quality of life for them. Only the people of a community are able to determine what form and means of production they wish to maintain in order to sustain their desired quality of life. Only the people of a community are able to determine and maintain a desired landscape description for their "place".

We can recognize the good organizations as those that accept responsibility for making decisions at the local level. The good organizations will work with us to live peacefully and prosperously in our community setting! We can work with these organizations to develop new tools that help us make a living on the land. We can join with them to develop policy that directs free enterprise to reward those that protect what society wants. Apparently, our changing society values clean air and water, open space, endangered species, and wildlife habitat. We can work with the good organizations to develop new infrastructure and tools to help people in agriculture that are good stewards of land.

The bad organizations are those that think our values must be compromised or discarded in favor of their values. Our challenge with these organizations is to educate them. We can show them that by living and producing on the land, we protect and preserve what they value. We can show them that a well managed ranch actually helps natural systems to remain functional. We can show them that livestock grazing improves the water cycle. We can show them that agriculture provides critical habitat for wildlife. Ignorance can be overcome by stepping out to visit with our neighbors and showing them what we do.

The ugly organizations are those that believe they can determine what our values and our essence of being should be. We cannot deal with these types. They will self destruct in the long run. We need only to ignore them.

Our goal is to work toward keeping decision making at the local level. To accomplish this we must work with the good organizations to direct policy development, craft new tools, and build infrastructure that will reward good land management. Our challenge is to educate the bad

organizations as to how our lives and business actually preserve what they want. The key to being effective in shaping policy during these changing times requires that we support the good, educate the bad, and ignore the ugly!

"One can stand still in a flowing stream, but not in the world of men."

-Japanese proverb