

10-1-2015

## A Contradictory Ethos: Sportsman Citizenship and Native Exclusion in Aldo Leopold's Pine Cone

Daniel A. Cryer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Cryer, Daniel A.. "A Contradictory Ethos: Sportsman Citizenship and Native Exclusion in Aldo Leopold's Pine Cone." *New Mexico Historical Review* 90, 4 (2015). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol90/iss4/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu), [lsloane@salud.unm.edu](mailto:lsloane@salud.unm.edu), [sarahrk@unm.edu](mailto:sarahrk@unm.edu).

## A Contradictory Ethos

Sportsman Citizenship and Native Exclusion in Aldo Leopold's *Pine Cone*



DANIEL A. CRYER

Aldo Leopold is well-known as an innovative twentieth-century forester, wildlife manager, educator, and environmental ethicist. He is also acknowledged as a canonical figure of American nature writing, noted for his ability to combine poetic sensitivity, scientific credibility, and effective public activism.<sup>1</sup> H. Lewis Ulman, a scholar of environmental literature and rhetoric, cites Leopold as a prototypical example of the nature writer who casts his own persona, or ethos, as an example of “how to be and act . . . in the natural world.”<sup>2</sup> Like Henry David Thoreau and John Muir before him, Leopold offered himself as a behavioral model for readers to follow. But these observations have only been made in reference to Leopold’s later writings, most often the essays of his best-known work, *A Sand County Almanac* (1949). By looking at his first foray into environmental policy debates in the New Mexico Game Protective Association’s (NMGPA) *Pine Cone*, a quarterly newsletter Leopold edited and largely wrote from 1915 to 1931, we see him honing this rhetorical technique.<sup>3</sup> We also see the contradictions buried within his ethos and the negative consequences it helped bring about for New Mexico’s indigenous cultures.

Leopold’s New Mexico writings and their relationship to the indigenous peoples of the Southwest have received scant attention from historians. Curt

---

Daniel A. Cryer is Assistant Professor of English and Director of Undergraduate Writing at Roosevelt University in Chicago. His work has appeared in *American Literary Realism* and since 1999 he has served as Associate Editor for the poetry journal *Smartish Pace*. He wishes to thank *NMHR* editor Durwood Ball for his attentive and patient guidance during the editorial process, as well as an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments. Research for this essay was made possible by a dissertation fellowship from the Russell J. and Dorothy S. Bilinski Foundation.

Meine and Julianne Lutz Newton look closely at Leopold's life in Arizona and New Mexico, and Neil B. Carmony and David E. Brown have collected and commented on his early-career writings from the Southwest, but all treat this period of Leopold's life primarily as a time of discovery en route to his later, better-known professional successes in Wisconsin.<sup>4</sup> William deBuys's environmental history of New Mexico chronicles the biodiversity loss that Leopold tried to halt and examines Leopold's wilderness activism in the Southwest. However, he makes no mention of the *Pine Cone* or Leopold's efforts, ultimately unsuccessful, to annex a valuable parcel of Jicarilla Apache land for the federal government.<sup>5</sup> Only historian Louis S. Warren has given a detailed account of the effects Leopold's advocacy in the Southwest had on its indigenous populations, but Warren does not apply the tools of literary and rhetorical analysis to Leopold's arguments to examine the traditions that influenced them or how they worked to persuade his readers.<sup>6</sup>

This essay argues that Leopold's primary means of persuasion in the *Pine Cone* was an ethos that drew heavily on the myth of the ruggedly independent American frontiersman. This ethos was meant to instill in readers a strict code of outdoorsmanship and sustainable hunting practices, and was part of a national movement to wrest control of the natural world from Native Americans and other politically marginalized groups. The most striking characteristic of what I call the ethos of the sportsman citizen is its welter of contradictions. Historians have shown that the American ideal of the sportsman is rooted equally in the conflicting personae of the aristocratic English sport hunter, the American Indian subsistence hunter, and the American frontiersman subsistence hunter.<sup>7</sup> An examination of the *Pine Cone* further shows that Leopold's sportsman-citizen ethos was used to exclude the state's indigenous subsistence hunters, particularly Apache and nuevomexicanos, from a newly forming conservationist public that would steer regional environmental policy decisions for several decades.

### Ethos and Persuasion: Hunting for a New Public

Since its earliest codifications in classical Athens, the field of rhetoric has defined "ethos" as the aspect of persuasion that derives from the character or perceived character of a speaker.<sup>8</sup> In his treatise *On Rhetoric*, Aristotle says that it is "almost, so to speak, the most authoritative form of persuasion."<sup>9</sup> But how does it persuade? If an ethos "works"—that is, if it connects with an audience—it is because it embodies or expresses truths accepted by a given community. As S. Michael Halloran, a scholar of classical rhetoric, has put it, "To have *ethos* is to manifest the virtues most valued by the culture to and for which one speaks."<sup>10</sup>

Ethos, then, is always a co-construction of author and audience; and of individual and community, society, and culture.

Leopold's efforts in New Mexico, however, were not aimed at identifying his interests with those of an existing community as much as they attempted to create a new community of unified recreational hunters. Historian and cultural theorist Michael Warner offers a theory of community formation that provides untapped insights into the persuasive effects of a well-constructed ethos. Warner calls communities of strangers united toward a common purpose "publics" and argues that they are created and maintained through discourse—that is, through written and spoken language.<sup>11</sup> The attraction of joining a public is in part the attraction of joining one's self with the ethos of a given discourse, and thus of a community of like-minded people. When this ethos reflects a person's existing values, it gives "a general social relevance to private thought and life. Our subjectivity is understood as having resonance with others."<sup>12</sup> In this way, publics validate an individual's sense of self by showing its overlap with other selves.

To create social change, however, the discourse holding a public together must offer an ethos that leverages existing values toward actions beyond those already being taken.

This is how the sportsman-citizen ethos of the *Pine Cone* functioned. It served as a persona that was substantially similar to identities embodied in its target audience—men who hunted for sport, who valued wildlife for the recreational opportunities it afforded, who worried about its decimation, and who had an interest in blaming others for that decimation—and in doing so validated and united a community of strangers with shared, previously unexpressed interests. It also promoted new hunting laws that many sportsmen had actively ignored, so in addition to accommodating individual values, it extended them into new behaviors.

A public that valued new, more sustainable hunting behaviors was sorely needed in New Mexico in the early twentieth century. After earning statehood in 1912, New Mexico was taking stock of the ecological damage done to its flora and fauna by decades of grazing and market hunting and trapping. Short on resources, the state struggled to enforce hunting laws necessary to conserve what was left of its game animals.<sup>13</sup> To fill in the gap between public regulations and private behavior, Leopold helped to bring the state's conservation groups under the banner of the NMGPA and created its quarterly publication, the *Pine Cone*, to define and distribute the new group's tenets.<sup>14</sup> At the time, Leopold was working for the United States Forest Service's Office of Grazing in Albuquerque, relegated to indoor work after suffering from exposure when he became lost in the rugged mountains of northern New Mexico. During a seventeen-month

convalescence, Leopold became keenly interested in game protection, a task that was then volleyed in a haphazard fashion between the Forest Service, the Park Service, state governments, and the Bureau of Biological Survey (precursor to the modern Department of Fish and Wildlife). Wildlife management and conservation would become one of Leopold's most important legacies. In 1933 he published *Game Management*, the standard textbook in the field for decades, and became the nation's first Professor of Wildlife Management, at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a post he held until his death in 1948.

One of Leopold's most concise statements of the NMGPA's mission came in a letter to a Russian conservationist named Boris Zakharoff who had written to Leopold in May 1917 to inquire about "the protection of birds, game and fish in America"—an indication of the global nature of biodiversity loss and the extent to which word of the NMGPA had spread.<sup>15</sup> Leopold's reply shows his thinking on how the *Pine Cone* was meant to work in relation to New Mexico's hunting laws:

Realizing that laws alone will probably never succeed in bringing back the wild life of the United States, the last ten years have witnessed a remarkable growth in the organization of public sentiment as a supplement to legal restrictions toward the end of wild life conservation. . . . Our first effort was to start something in the way of public education which was accomplished primarily through the medium of our quarterly paper, copies of which are enclosed.<sup>16</sup>

Leopold saw the *Pine Cone* picking up where the law—never complete in its ability to effect behavioral change—left off. Its purpose was to create, through "education," a public of sportsman citizens motivated by an ethical code that was enforced by watchful fellow sportsmen. Its tone was often more ironic, and in some cases belligerent, than educational.

One example of the sportsman-citizen as both an ideal for readers to aspire to and an enforcing presence in the field appears in an article titled "Every Citizen a Game Warden" from October 1917. Its first paragraphs reference New Mexico's understaffed and underfunded game warden infrastructure and illustrate the jaunty tone that characterizes the *Pine Cone's* style:

There are 70,000,000 full sized acres of land in the State of New Mexico. To effectively prevent violations of the game laws solely through regularly constituted officers of the law would require the service of 7,000 *game wardens*.

At a salary of \$1,000 per year it would take \$7,000,000 a year to pay them. Our State Game Department lacks just \$6,985,000 of this small sum. It lacks wardens in proportion.

Who, then, is going to see that the game laws are enforced—our handful of wardens?

The article goes on to describe a rare conservationist victory in the Sandia Mountains despite the lack of wardens there: while pigeons all over the West were being “lawlessly killed off,” blue rock pigeons were thriving in the Sandias. In the only instance of a woman sportsman appearing in the *Pine Cone*, the author claims that these pigeons owe their lives to the “lady-in-charge” of the Las Huertas ranch, who watched over the pigeons, placed a call to Albuquerque if she saw anyone illegally killing them, and told everyone “how all the neighbors [were] trying to protect [the pigeons] in accordance with the law, and how most of the men folks belong[ed] to the G. P. A.”<sup>17</sup>

As in Leopold’s later popular writings, the author here establishes a light-hearted and likable ethos which he uses to drive home a serious point: readers needed not only to abide by game laws, but also to help enforce them.<sup>18</sup> This was the code of the sportsman citizen as established by the *Pine Cone*. The enjoyment of outdoor sports was to be translated into citizenly action that grew from a sense of ethical responsibility. But if this translation failed, there were true, morally superior sportsman citizens watching and waiting to call the authorities. There was internal motivation in the form of an ethical code, and outer motivation in the form of watchful others.

In other articles the ethos of the author himself serves as the sportsman citizen actively engaged in shaming his moral inferiors unwilling to abide by the code. The *Pine Cone* from October 1916 included a boxed feature with large centered lettering, taking up two columns in the middle of the issue’s third page, which strongly urged hunters to confront anyone they saw shooting game out of season (derisively called “game hogs”):

MR. CITIZEN

DO YOU WONDER why it is so hard for the legitimate sportsman to find his buck?

*Do you realize WHY these conditions exist? They exist because YOU DON’T CARE*

Because you, when you see a game hog that ought to be “pulled,” say to yourself, “Let John do it.”

Because you, when you hear a law-breaker bragging, smile, and let him think: “Ain’t I brave.”

Next time why don’t you look him square in the eye and call him what he is—

A SNEAK THIEF.<sup>19</sup>

The direct address here assumes that anyone reading the *Pine Cone* would not himself hunt deer out of season; to suggest that the simple act of abiding by existing game laws was anything other than a foregone conclusion would admit that some readers might remain unconvinced of the laws' legitimacy. Abiding by game laws, then, was the minimum requirement for being a "legitimate sportsman." More to the point, the reader is accused of occupying this minimal and unsatisfactory status and is commanded to go farther, not only to behave in a certain way on the hunt but also to castigate those who did not, thereby rising to the level of the speaking ethos. As a true sportsman, the bearer of this ethos acted according to the code that he and the members of his public had internalized, so holding others to this code was more than simply enforcing governmental restrictions. It was, instead, enforcing a higher, moral standard shared by a sporting elite.

In both of the above examples, the true sportsman chooses to enact a code that originates not in law but in morality. The "lady-in-charge" keeps a watchful eye out for "game hogs" because she loves "the pigeons fluttering and cooing in her yard."<sup>20</sup> The unnamed ethos of the "Mr. Citizen" feature places a high value on a legitimate "sportsman" "find[ing] his buck," but he acts because, unlike the castigated reader, he is not afraid of confrontation and indeed prefers it to the depletion of the state's deer population. These two sporting elites were meant to stick in readers' minds as ideals and enforcers, representing what Warner calls "the co-presence of strangers in our innermost activity."<sup>21</sup> Although the sportsman-citizen code is characterized as a series of free moral choices, the method by which it is actually spread is an ethos, or series of united ethoi, that directs individual behaviors in complex ways.

The *Pine Cone's* primary means for creating its ethos and its public was by defining both against a subsistence-hunting Other (those hunting for their daily physical and cultural needs, or to sell meat and pelts), making it clear that the true sportsman-citizen was a purely recreational hunter. One of a number of articles to tackle the issue of subsistence hunting directly says, "[W]ild life conservation is *not* primarily a food supply proposition. Think twice, Mr. Sportsman. When you see a flock of mallards dropping into the old pond at sunset, are they nothing to you but thirty pounds of meat divided into ten bundles of three pounds each? If that's all they are to you, don't shoot! Save your shells and go home and buy a beefsteak. It's a more conservative investment."<sup>22</sup> Seeing animals as food was untenable and vulgar to the sportsman citizen, who could choose among a range of options for supplying himself and his family with meals. The notion of choice was central because it implied that hunters could regard animals in the wild any way they wished: as food, as sport, or as an expression of divine beauty. By the *Pine Cone's* logic, hunters who killed for

food voluntarily renounced the mantle of “sportsman” and deserved any punishment ascribed to them by law.

Articles in the *Pine Cone* coded the sportsman and non-sportsman according to race and class. One short piece that presented the two types of hunters told the story of a conservationist NMGPA member (called a “protectionist”) fishing in northern New Mexico with a “native” who suggested fishing by hand:

Inquiry as to the “by hand” method of fishing led to information that above the lake the stream divides and then comes together again, forming an island. The native stated that one of the branches is easily dammed and that it then goes dry. When the water has been diverted out of the branch it is only necessary to pick up the good sized fish which are left flopping high and dry. If the water is again let in promptly the *small* fish are kept from perishing. (True sportsmanship!)

The protectionist . . . was told that all of the native people took their trout in this manner.<sup>23</sup>

To someone fishing for subsistence, the diversion method made far more sense than tossing a fly onto the surface of the stream and hoping for a bite. But one key tenet of sportsmanship was to “give game a sporting chance,” so only the latter technique was sportsmanlike.<sup>24</sup> The *Pine Cone*’s would-be sportsman readers are directed to sympathize with the “protectionist” and scorn the “native.”

Who were these two types—the sportsman and the “native” hunter—more specifically? Historians generally agree that self-described “sportsmen” from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries were primarily middle-class, professional, urban-dwelling Anglo men, like Leopold.<sup>25</sup> For them hunting was a way of maintaining masculinity in what they saw as an increasingly feminized culture.<sup>26</sup> In the early twentieth century, middle-class men were more likely to spend their days indoors working at the minutiae of running businesses or government offices than in the rugged outdoors. Leopold was especially stung by this reality at the time he was publishing the *Pine Cone*. Having begun a career in forestry that kept him outside, his bout of exposure made him an indoor worker for several years, and even after his long recovery he never fully regained the independence he once enjoyed.

The subsistence-hunter “natives” of New Mexico consisted mainly of Apache, Navajo, and Pueblo Indians, and nuevomexicano villagers. To varying degrees, all of them relied on hunting for food, clothing, income, and to supply materials for daily life, shelter, and religious and cultural ceremonies. Although there were conflicts between them, the region had supplied all of these people with game for centuries before Anglo American settlers began arriving in large numbers in 1821, when Mexico gained independence from Spain and declared itself

open for trade with the expanding United States. Less than a century later, New Mexico was part of the United States and had been emptied, or nearly so, of elk, mountain sheep, ptarmigan, beaver, and grizzly bear.<sup>27</sup> But how did it serve the *Pine Cone* to demonize the hunters with the longest tradition of sustained interaction with the state's wildlife? Louis Warren argues convincingly that the NMGPA's bid to unite the state's recreational hunters was successful precisely because it scapegoated subsistence hunters who could be blamed by urban Anglo hunters, nuevomexicano and Anglo ranchers, and wealthy landowners for taking too many animals.<sup>28</sup> The NMGPA knew there was much these groups did not agree on, but that they could all agree to point an accusatory finger at subsistence hunters for biodiversity loss.

### Sowing Contradiction: The Sportsman in History

The bitter irony of the *Pine Cone*'s sportsman-citizen ethos is that it was deeply rooted in the identity of the very peoples it defined itself against, a contradiction with a long history. By the time the *Pine Cone*'s first issue appeared in 1915, the ethical code of the sportsman was well established in the American consciousness, as was the tradition of American sportsman-conservationists. The code was originally an import of the English aristocracy, members of which published "shooting books" that elevated sport hunting above subsistence and market hunting seen as activities of the lower classes.<sup>29</sup> Despite its European roots, or perhaps because of them, the sportsman figure in America soon became a means of *separating* the New World from the Old. It did so through association with the mythologized frontiersman who was himself closely linked with American Indians. One such figure was Daniel Boone. Although Boone was precisely the kind of market and subsistence hunter that the *Pine Cone* and other early-twentieth-century conservation publications would later deride, in the decades before the Civil War popular media depicted him as a hero of the American wilderness: independent and courageous, with a canny, bodily intelligence, and scornful of anything remotely attributable to "society" in all its forms.<sup>30</sup>

By the beginning of the war, men proudly calling themselves "sportsmen"—middle- and upper-class recreational hunters, mostly white and urban—were members of a well-organized movement whose ethos had been cleanly separated from its European forebears. These sportsmen joined hunting clubs and game protective associations that pushed for new restrictive laws defining what could be hunted, and where and when; and, judging by the number of books and periodicals that advocated their causes in post-Civil War America, they wrote and read prodigiously. Magazines of this time, like *The American Turf Register*, *The Spirit*, and, starting in the 1870s, *Forest and Stream*,

did an enormous amount to establish the sportsman's code as an American phenomenon.<sup>31</sup>

As a hunter and amateur naturalist from an early age, Leopold was heir to this tradition in a number of non-quantifiable ways, but a direct link can be established through one of his major influences: Theodore Roosevelt. Leopold read Roosevelt's books and magazine pieces and absorbed his philosophy at the Yale Forestry School, established by Roosevelt's influential Secretary of the Interior, Gifford Pinchot. Roosevelt was the preeminent sportsman of his day.<sup>32</sup> In books such as *Hunting Trips of a Ranchman* (1885), *The Strenuous Life* (1900), and *Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter* (1905), Roosevelt cultivated the persona of the masculine frontiersman hunter and connected it to the strength of the nation. Along with Frederick Jackson Turner, he argued that the closing of the frontier in 1890 marked a fundamental loss of American identity. Historian Douglas Brinkley points out, in fact, that Roosevelt himself may have been the inspiration for, if not the originator of, Turner's famous frontier thesis, which placed the American frontiersman in a middle space between Indians, seen as a savage, and Europeans, seen as effete.<sup>33</sup> For Roosevelt the loss of big game animals meant the loss of the nationally valuable brand of masculinity earned in hunting them.

Roosevelt's conservationism, embraced by Leopold in and beyond the *Pine Cone*, stood in contrast to what is now called the "preservationism" of John Muir, not least for the gendered ways in which the two men were sometimes presented.<sup>34</sup> Roosevelt was the man's man, eager for a hunt or a fight. Muir, in leading the march against the development of Yosemite's Hetch Hetchy Valley, aligned himself with a group characterized by one Sierra Club member as "short-haired women and long-haired men."<sup>35</sup> The battle over Hetch Hetchy was at its hottest point in 1909, the same year Leopold arrived in the Southwest to begin his tenure with the Forest Service. In that year, a San Francisco newspaper, the *Call*, printed a cartoon that depicted Muir in a dress frantically trying to beat back a huge wave, labeled "Hetch Hetchy Project," with a broom.<sup>36</sup> Leopold cited Muir as an inspiration in several of his writings, but in the *Pine Cone* it was Roosevelt's ethos of the masculine sportsman that he channeled. For Leopold, as with Roosevelt, the ethos was something of a compensation—Roosevelt had grown up sickly, and the mountains of northern New Mexico had debilitated Leopold. Regardless of who donned this ethos, it was a mask hiding a culture increasingly ashamed that, in expanding, it destroyed the wild nature that had formed an integral part of its self-image.<sup>37</sup>

### Reaping Contradiction: The Sportsman in the *Pine Cone*

The NMGPA's relationship with New Mexico's Indian population was fraught with contradiction and irony. While praising them indirectly through the



Figure 1. New Mexico Game Protective Association logo, October 1916. Photograph courtesy Aldo Leopold Foundation, [www.aldoleopold.org](http://www.aldoleopold.org).

frontiersman ideal that hunting was supposed to maintain, the *Pine Cone* and Leopold himself worked to take their lands and treated them as atavistic creatures of the past rather than present people deeply invested in the state's wildlife.

The NMGPA logo on the first page of every *Pine Cone* illustrates the bulletin's contradictory attitudes toward American expansion and New Mexico's Indians (fig. 1). In the center of the logo is a buffalo skull canted at an angle, the horns and snout extending just beyond a circular border that contains the words "Game Protective Associations of New Mexico." In the background the sun sets behind shadowed mesas under the NMGPA's rallying cry to "Remember the Buffalo," a slogan peppered throughout the *Pine Cone*. The skull and the setting sun represent the dwindling numbers of game species available to hunters in the Southwest and the need for individual and legislative action to keep them from going the way of the buffalo, by that time nearly extinct. Although this conservationist message was necessary at the time, its delivery in the logo and the arguments of the *Pine Cone* embody a clash of competing stories. The pioneer narrative explicitly touted by Leopold, Theodore Roosevelt, and other prominent conservationists celebrated a conquering spirit essential to American identity that was in danger of being extinguished with the closing of the frontier and the exhaustion of big game. The narrative implied in the logo, however, was an unmitigated tragedy of waste in which the settlers of the West had squandered its resources. On the one hand, the message was, *Shame on the pioneers for slaughtering the buffalo*, but on the other, it was, *We must keep our wild game so that we can be like the pioneers*.

Illustrating a further contradiction, the logo drew heavily on sympathy for Native Americans without acknowledging them directly. The buffalo were closely associated in the conservation movement and in American art with

Native American nobility, strength, and disappearance.<sup>38</sup> Natives were of course treated brutally by the same westward movement that decimated the buffalo. The NMGPA logo called attention to the destructive aspects of expansion that served its purposes and ignored those aspects that did not, while the arguments in the *Pine Cone* glorified the pioneer spirit of expansion that the logo decried. At the heart of such selective attention to the negative effects of expansion is an opportunism that revealed itself more clearly in a *Pine Cone* article by government surveyor J. Stokley Ligon, that diverts sympathies for Native Americans towards wildlife, applying the trope of the buffalo as the “anthropomorphic image of the noble savage” to elk:<sup>39</sup> “But the elk, that noble creature, who here made a last and desperate stand for his claim on the home that he had so long been master of, has been forced to go the route of the buffalo. Elk should be brought back to the Sacramento [Mountains]. We are practically assured by the Indian department that if Elk are placed in the reservation, they will get the proper protection. Let us not rest until we bring them back.”<sup>40</sup>

The *Pine Cone* also contained attacks on New Mexico’s Native peoples that were more direct. A poster on the back page of the July 1917 issue claimed that the 20,000-acre “Navajo Country” in northwest New Mexico and northeast Arizona was an “Advance Sample of Gameless America” that was “Stripped Clean of Every Living Thing Bigger Than a Coyote.” At the center is a drawing of a barren landscape behind a large barrel captioned “The Remnant of Wild Life.” The barrel is shot through with holes from which torrents of water spill; the most prominent of these is labeled “Legal Slaughter.”<sup>41</sup>

It is likely that the poster refers to Indian sovereignty as it related to game laws, which created considerable anxiety among conservationists. Hunting rights figured prominently in treaty negotiations between Indian tribes and government officials in the mid-nineteenth century, and in many treaties tribes maintained the right to hunt as they wished on their own lands as well as on other lands. Several treaties repeated a phrase that gave Native peoples the right “to hunt on the unoccupied lands of the United States so long as game may be found thereon.”<sup>42</sup> William Temple Hornaday, one of the nation’s leading wildlife activists and profoundly influential on Leopold and the *Pine Cone*, was incensed at the idea that Indians would not have to follow federal or state game laws.<sup>43</sup> In *Our Vanishing Wild Life* (1913), he makes the argument forcefully:

The Indian should have no game advantages whatever over a white man. He does not own the game of a region, any more than he owns its minerals or its water-power. He should obey the general game laws, just the same as white men. In Africa, as far as possible, the white population wisely prohibits the natives from owning or using firearms, and a good

idea it is, too. I am glad there is one continent on which the 'I'm-just-as-good-as-you-are' nightmare does not curse the whole land.<sup>44</sup>

Much of Hornaday's book shows the racial animus that stoked many conservationists at the turn of the century. Two of its chapters, "Destruction of Song-Birds by Southern Negroes and Poor Whites" and "Slaughter of Song-Birds by Italians" are largely devoted to connecting mass-killings of animals with racial or cultural tendencies. But while Hornaday railed against Indians' so-called "game advantages," territorial and state game commissioners still tried to enforce laws over Native Americans that should not have applied to them, and because treaties differed across tribes and the status of a given plot of land was not always clear, Native hunters were still driven from their legal hunting grounds, sometimes violently.<sup>45</sup>

Although the NMGPA, like other game protective groups around the country, focused its ire on subsistence and market hunters, the biggest driver of ecological change and loss of animal habitat in New Mexico was widespread overgrazing by sheep and cattle. Grazing animals ate the forage on which deer, antelope, and elk fed, as well as the grasses, shrubs, and trees that they used for nesting and cover. Underfed and overly exposed, their numbers dwindled.<sup>46</sup> Sheep and cattle also changed the ecosystem in more fundamental ways. By eating back the deep-rooted native grasses, they deprived the soil of the organic matter that held it together against harsh wind and rains, and the sheer weight and incessant pounding of the herds hardened the ground, further reducing its capacity to absorb moisture.<sup>47</sup>

The sportsmen of the NMGPA, however, did not go after ranchers as culprits of biodiversity loss, but in fact allied with them in worsening it. In the masthead of the *Pine Cone's* first issues, one of the items in a numbered list comprising "Our Platform" states, "We stand for co-operation with stockmen in a systematic campaign against the predatory animal menace to game and livestock." This attitude toward predators was the exact position Leopold would later disavow in his classic essay, "Thinking Like a Mountain," but his public support for the biggest driver of ecological damage in the Southwest was never part of his *mea culpa*.<sup>48</sup> It should be noted that Leopold was closely tied to New Mexico's ranchers in at least two ways besides their shared disdain for predators. First, as a ranger and then a supervisor in New Mexico's national forests, he would have worked closely with ranchers who grazed their herds on public lands and paid fees that helped the Forest Service manage the forests.<sup>49</sup> Second, the family of his wife, Estella, whom he married in 1913, ran one of the largest sheep-ranching operations in the region.<sup>50</sup> Leopold does not mention the latter connection in any personal or professional documents that I have read, but he was closely

attuned to the intersection of state politics, wildlife conservation, and public land management. His intertwined interests in maintaining good relations with ranchers would surely have been on his mind.

Unwilling to alienate the state's most powerful economic elites and at that point only slowly coming to understand their connection to wildlife loss, the NMGPA and the state government focused their conservation efforts on limiting the activities of individual hunters. Between 1895 and 1905, hunting of big game (e.g. deer, elk, antelope) was restricted for nine months of the year; killing of deer was limited to antlered bucks, and no one person could take more than one buck per year.<sup>51</sup> In working to help enforce these laws and pass new ones, the *Pine Cone* focused its biting prose on wealthy landowners trying to set up private game refuges (who deserved it, but were not harmed by it), and subsistence hunters (who were much less deserving and more harmed by it). The *Pine Cone*, then, defined New Mexico's long-time inhabitants as the antithesis of the sportsman citizen. Even as the state's Indians and nuevomexicanos embodied in many ways the ideals of the sportsman far more than the NMGPA leaders themselves, the private ethic that the *Pine Cone* constructed as a means of enforcing hunting laws was directed away from them and toward recreational hunters.

#### From Contradiction to Confrontation: The Case of Stinking Lake

The incident that perhaps best illustrates the NMGPA's dismissive attitude toward indigenous claims to land and wildlife, and the one that occupies the most space in the pages of the *Pine Cone*, is that of Stinking Lake. The NMGPA sought to change the status of the lake—a large pristine body of water in northern New Mexico that served as a breeding ground for waterfowl—from Indian-owned land to government-operated wildlife refuge, a battle that connects the conservationist organization with a larger national effort to remake Native peoples into Americanized citizens and drive them from their lands under the stated purpose of preserving spaces for outdoor recreation and the public good.

Stinking Lake was part of the Jicarilla Apache reservation, but not in the opinion of the *Pine Cone*. An article in the January 1918 issue says that land “adjacent” to the lake was on the reservation, but not the lake itself.<sup>52</sup> Leopold biographer Curt Meine also takes this tack. But J. Stokley Ligon, in his New Mexico game survey report of 1927, says that Stinking Lake “is on an Indian Reservation,” and maps in Veronica Tiller's history of the Jicarilla Apache show the area of the lake well within the bounds of the reservation as it was defined in 1887, 1908, and at the time of her book's publication in 1983.<sup>53</sup>

The Jicarilla's history in the region extends back at least five hundred years.<sup>54</sup> The tribe ranged widely over what we now know as northern New Mexico,

southern Colorado, southwestern Kansas, and the Texas panhandle. Although they grew vegetables and herbs, the economic and cultural roots of their culture lay in hunting. Even after the buffalo were largely killed off, the Jicarilla hunted mountain sheep, elk, deer, antelope, and smaller game like rabbit and beaver. As with all tribes in the region, the U.S. annexation of northern Mexico in 1848 brought a wave of destructive changes to the Jicarilla. Through the early twentieth century, the Jicarilla's history as inhabitants of the United States is marked by several efforts by local and federal authorities to turn them away from nomadic hunting and gathering toward a settled agricultural lifestyle more in keeping with American ideals of individualism and private ownership. This was part of a nationwide strategy epitomized and enforced by the Dawes Act (1887) that assigned to each family an individual parcel of land to farm, thus breaking up (or attempting to break up) communal cultures of shared subsistence.<sup>55</sup> By the time the NMGPA was working to redefine Stinking Lake as a game preserve, the Jicarilla were in the midst of their most trying years. In the first two decades of the twentieth century, tribal populations fell to their lowest levels in recorded history.<sup>56</sup> A combination of failed attempts at agriculture due to drought and unfit lands on the one hand, and government mismanagement of tribal funds on the other hand, led to unprecedented levels of malnutrition and disease.

The *Pine Cone's* treatment of the lake paid scant attention to the Jicarilla, who at the very least had a legitimate interest in its fate. The NMGPA considered its primary foe the Jicarilla Club, a group of Colorado businessmen who wanted to turn the lake into their private hunting grounds. The NMGPA's proposal and its version of the Stinking Lake situation were most thoroughly laid out in a January 1918 article, "GPA and Jicarilla Club Go to 'The Mat.'" The first part of the article describes the lake itself and the NMGPA's petitioning of the Bureau of Biological Survey to turn it into a national bird refuge. On an interior page (the first half of the article is the issue's lead story), after the concerns of the NMGPA, the private club advocates, and the "Chama Sportsmen" had been addressed, the article's last paragraph deals with "The Jicarilla Indians." It begins, "This Association has at all times recognized that while the ducks belong to the public, the land adjacent to Stinking Lake is a part of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation, and that the Indians are entitled to full consideration."<sup>57</sup> Yet earlier articles on the subject of Stinking Lake make no mention of the Jicarilla Apache.

Just as the federal government's attempts to turn the Jicarilla into an agricultural people was part of a larger national pattern of assimilation, so was the NMGPA's attempt to cordon off Stinking Lake a single example in a national program of barring Indians from lands rich in natural resources under the guise of the public good. National park lands were often characterized by Anglo settlers as uninhabited when in fact they had been lived in or managed by Indians

for hundreds of years.<sup>58</sup> In the mid to late nineteenth century, when Yellowstone and Yosemite were being carved out as National Parks, the American cultural idea of past Indians as noble stewards of the natural world clashed with its characterization of present indigenous people as greedy squatters taking up the nation's most beautiful lands.<sup>59</sup>

The *Pine Cone* and Leopold's other early writings reflect these clashing perceptions. In his unpublished manuscript "Southwestern Game Fields," particularly its second chapter, "The Virgin Southwest and What the White Man Has Done to It," Indians are explicitly credited with what we would now call sustainable land-management practices.<sup>60</sup> But the Indians in Leopold's bygone Southwest were not so much stewards of the land as features of it, like a deeply running, unsilted Rio Grande, that had simply disappeared. The Jicarilla, it seems, were a different people altogether from Leopold's idealized Indians, and so leaving Stinking Lake in their charge was unthinkable. Ultimately, Stinking Lake was not designated as a bird refuge, nor was it leased by private hunters, but remained part of the Jicarilla Reservation.<sup>61</sup> The NMGPA did succeed, however, in changing the lake's name. In autumn of 1917, Miles Burford, former NMGPA president, died, and the organization worked with the federal government to rename the lake in his honor.<sup>62</sup>

## Conclusion

Leopold's involvement with the NMGPA, including his writing and editing of the *Pine Cone*, was his first foray into local politics, and he wielded considerable influence. He played a leading role in securing the appointment of a genuinely conservationist game warden by New Mexico's governor in a time when that job was seen as a soft political appointment.<sup>63</sup> He also succeeded in convincing the Forest Service and the state that it was in their interests to manage national forests for the propagation of game animals, and, in his later work with the Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, in touting New Mexico as a sportsman's tourist destination. But the long-term effects of these changes were not positive. Noting Leopold's additional success in getting a portion of the Gila National Forest declared the nation's first wilderness area, Louis Warren says, "Ecological shifts on the Gila and across the entire Southwest brought declines in game, aggravating inherent political tensions in the alliance that built the state commons and sundering the federal-state consensus over deer management in the region."<sup>64</sup> The cause of the NMGPA, then, was more successful rhetorically than ecologically.

Yet the reforms Leopold sought in the sportsman-citizen ethos were in many ways necessary. His writings responded to a very real biodiversity crisis that

has rolled steadily on from his lifetime to our own. Soon after the period of the NMGPA's most sustained activity, Leopold would change his approach to conservation activism and repudiate some of his earlier beliefs. After leaving New Mexico in 1924, he would no longer advocate for the eradication of predatory animals like wolves and bobcat. More fundamentally he came to see advocacy that focused on individual hunting practices as a myopic response to broad ecological problems.

The sportsman-citizen ethos of the *Pine Cone* took hold in part because there was a tradition for it, one connected with upper-class characteristics deemed desirable: rugged independence, finely honed skill in nature, ethical restraint, and an appreciation of natural beauty. It was also distanced from characteristics identified with lower socioeconomic classes and non-white others and deemed undesirable: greed, desperation, a mercenary attitude, and a lack of self-control. In this sense sportsman citizenship was not only a way of defining public-spirited behaviors, but also a way of drawing borders around who could and who could not be considered a citizen. Sportsman citizenship was a kind of membership, and because it sought to define proper and improper interactions with the natural world, the stakes of membership were extremely high, particularly for those who depended on wild animals for their livelihood and cultural meaning. It was first deployed in the United States as a celebration of aristocratic European values, and then morphed into a whitewashed embodiment of Native American competence in nature. Paradoxically, the whitewashed version could not, by definition, include Native Americans because the frontiersman defined himself precisely by conquering them and all they stood for. The frontiersman, who hunted for food or monetary gain, paradoxically served as the basis of a new citizenship closed to subsistence and market hunters. He also served as an ethos into which outdoor recreationists could slip, satisfying their contradictory desire to be more like the very people they were excluding.

Not long after the heyday of the *Pine Cone*, Leopold expanded on the importance of modern humans' ability to move between identities. In an essay published in 1925 he argued that wild landscapes and urban settings allowed us to embrace different sides of ourselves. City living developed valuable social cohesion, while leaving the city was to "disappear into the wilderness of the Covered Wagon Days" and become "a pioneer." "[T]he measure of civilization is in its contrasts," he said, "a modern city is a national asset, not because the citizen has planted his iron heel on the breast of nature, but because of the different kinds of man his control over nature has enabled him to be."<sup>65</sup> What he and his contemporaries did not see, and what we are attuned to now, is the privilege inherent in this city-to-wilderness mobility. The whiteness of the Anglo sportsman afforded him a malleable identity that was equally at home in a duck blind or

a restaurant, and he was no less “civilized” in either place. Yet no such mobility was open to New Mexico’s native subsistence hunters. In this light, the “contrasts” of Leopold’s time, and the arguments used to maintain them, now appear as contradictions.

## Notes

1. M. Jimmie Killingsworth and Jacqueline S. Palmer, *Ecospeak: Rhetoric and Environmental Politics in America* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), 53–64; Scott Slovic, “Epistemology and Politics in American Nature Writing: Embedded Rhetoric and Discrete Rhetoric,” in *Green Culture: Environmental Rhetoric in Contemporary America*, ed. Carl G. Herndl and Stuart C. Brown (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996), 82–110; and H. Lewis Ulman, “Thinking Like a Mountain: Persona, Ethos, and Judgment in American Nature Writing,” in *Green Culture*, Herndl and Brown, 46–81.

2. Ulman, “Thinking Like a Mountain,” 49. Ulman sets up a clear distinction between “persona” and “ethos,” defining the former as the more general term, but in this essay I use them somewhat interchangeably. While both refer to a set of characteristics jointly created by author and audience, for his purposes, Ulman defines “persona” as a “character type,” and “ethos” as “the sum of *particular* intellectual and moral qualities” (emphasis in original). This distinction essentially agrees with the one laid out by Roger D. Cherry who traces “persona” as a term in literary studies and “ethos” from its Greek origins in the study of rhetoric. It is just as common, if not more so, for current rhetorical studies to use “persona” and “ethos” as rough equivalents, though the latter, as I will show, is the field’s theorized term and therefore the one most useful for textual analysis. Roger D. Cherry, “Ethos versus Persona: Self-Representation in Written Discourse,” *Written Communication* 5 (July 1988): 251–76.

3. Leopold had previously titled an internal U.S. Forest Service newsletter, which he started, the *Pine Cone*, making the NMGPA *Pine Cone* the second publication with that name. Both can be found in the Aldo Leopold Papers, 1887–1948, UW-Madison Libraries, University of Wisconsin, Madison [hereafter LP], which are accessible online.

4. David E. Brown and Neil B. Carmony, *Aldo Leopold’s Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995); Curt Meine, *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2010); and Julianne Lutz Newton, *Aldo Leopold’s Odyssey: Rediscovering the Author of A Sand County Almanac* (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 2006).

5. William deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation: The Life and Hard Times of a New Mexico Mountain Range* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1985).

6. Louis S. Warren, *The Hunter’s Game: Poachers and Conservationists in Twentieth-Century America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1997).

7. John F. Reiger, *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*, 3d ed. (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2001); Daniel Justin Herman, *Hunting and the American Imagination* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001); and Monica Rico, *Nature’s Noblemen: Transatlantic Masculinities and the Nineteenth-Century American West* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2013).

8. Nan Johnson, "Ethos," in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*, ed. Theresa Enos (New York: Garland, 1995), 243–45.

9. Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 39.

10. S. Michael Halloran, "Aristotle's Concept of Ethos, or If Not His, Somebody Else's," *Rhetoric Review* 1 (September 1982): 60.

11. Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002), 67. For more on publics, the public sphere, and rhetoric, see Gerard A. Hauser, *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).

12. Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, 77.

13. deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation*, 98–99; and Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 96–99.

14. The *Pine Cone* was supposed to appear quarterly but did not always come out on schedule. The first four and a half years produced sixteen issues (the main run of the *Pine Cone* ended in July 1920, after which it was published intermittently until 1931). It was usually published as a single newspaper-sized sheet folded once to produce four pages.

15. Zakharrow to Aldo Leopold, 12 May 1917, p. 665, series 8, Box 8, Aldo Leopold Papers, 1887–1948, US-Madison Libraries, University of Wisconsin [hereafter 8B8, LP].

16. Aldo Leopold to Zakharrow, 23 July 1917, pp. 662–64, 8B8, LP.

17. "Every Citizen a Game Warden," *Pine Cone*, October 1917, p. 1, Folio 1: Writings: NMGPA *Pine Cone*, Subseries 6: Writings, [hereafter 6F1, LP].

18. Although Leopold wrote much of the newsletter's content, the NMGPA *Pine Cone* rarely used by-lines so authorship of specific articles remains uncertain. Curt Meine explains that Leopold wrote most of the bulletin himself until sometime in 1916. Meine, *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work*, 549n13. A front-page story in the *Pine Cone*'s final issue gives a short history of the paper in which Leopold is largely credited for the entire enterprise. "The *Pine Cone* Resumes Publication after Lapse of Seven Years," *Pine Cone*, July 1931, p. 1, 6F1, LP. It is reasonable to conclude, then, that Leopold wrote many if not most of the items appearing in the *Pine Cone* and that he acted as the bulletin's guiding hand for the entirety of its existence.

19. "Mr. Citizen," *Pine Cone*, October 1916, p. 3, 6F1, LP.

20. "Every Citizen a Game Warden," p. 1, 6F1, LP.

21. Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, 75.

22. "Game as a Food Supply," *Pine Cone*, July 1917, p. 2, 6F1, LP.

23. "A Pleasant 'Diversion,'" *Pine Cone*, July 1916, p. 2, 6F1, LP.

24. Reiger, *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*, 3.

25. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*; and Herman, *Hunting and the American Imagination*.

26. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 14.

27. deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation*, 92–100, 280–81.

28. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 71–105.

29. Reiger, *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*, 6–9.

30. Herman, *Hunting and the American Imagination*, 93–113.

31. Reiger, *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*, 35–43.

32. Meine, *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work*, 55, 128.

33. Douglas Brinkley, *The Wilderness Warrior: Theodore Roosevelt and the Crusade for America* (New York: HarperCollins, 2009), 241; and Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Frontier in American History* (New York: Henry Holt, 1921).
34. For a significant complication of the conservationist-preservationist split, see Donald Worster, *A Passion for Nature: The Life of John Muir* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), especially chapters 10 and 14.
35. *Ibid.*, 433.
36. *Ibid.*, 434.
37. Brinkley, *The Wilderness Warrior*, 22, 36–37, 68.
38. Herman, *Hunting and the American Imagination*, 241–42; and William H. Truettner, *The West As America: Reinterpreting Images of the Frontier, 1820–1920* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991), 6, 18, 311–12.
39. Sebastian F. Braun, “Ecological and Un-Ecological Indians: The (Non)portrayal of Plains Indians in the Buffalo Commons Literature,” in *Native Americans and the Environment: Perspectives on the Ecological Indian*, ed. Michael E. Harkin and David Rich Lewis (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 193.
40. J. Stokley Ligon, “Turkey in Every Canyon, Deer on A Thousand Hills,” *Pine Cone*, July 1917, p. 3, 6F1, LP.
41. “An Eye Opener for Optimists,” *Pine Cone*, July 1917, p. 4, 6F1, LP.
42. Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 32, 147n28.
43. “Sinews of War,” *Pine Cone*, April 1916, p. 5, 6F1, LP; Aldo Leopold, “Address before the Albuquerque Rotary Club On Presentation of The Gold Medal of The Permanent Wildlife Protection Fund,” July 1917, pp. 666–73, F5, 8B8, LP; and “A Christmas Suggestion,” *Pine Cone*, December 1915, p. 2, 6F1, LP. Hornaday was the NMGPA’s single largest private financial backer and the only conservationist, national or local, cited among the numbered items comprising “Our Platform” in the *Pine Cone*’s masthead. He presented Leopold with the Permanent Wildlife Protection Fund’s gold medal for wildlife conservation in 1917. The *Pine Cone*’s first issue called Hornaday’s *Our Vanishing Wild Life* “the most convincing argument for better game protection ever written” and suggested giving it as a Christmas gift. For more on Hornaday and his role in American conservation, see Gregory J. Dehler, *The Most Defiant Devil: William Temple Hornaday and His Controversial Crusade to Save American Wildlife* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013).
44. William T. Hornaday, *Our Vanishing Wild Life: Its Extermination and Preservation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library, 1913), 176.
45. Shelley D. Turner, “The Native American’s Right to Hunt and Fish: An Overview of the Aboriginal Spiritual and Mystical Belief System, the Effect of European Contact and the Continuing Fight to Observe a Way of Life,” *New Mexico Law Review* 19 (spring 1989): 377–423; and Warren, *The Hunter’s Game*, 1–3.
46. J. Stokley Ligon, *Wild Life of New Mexico, Its Conservation and Management* (New Mexico State Game Commission, Department of Game and Fish, 1927).
47. deBuys, *Enchantment and Exploitation*, 222.
48. Aldo Leopold, “Thinking Like a Mountain,” in *A Sand County Almanac, And Sketches Here and There* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), 129–33.
49. A long letter from Leopold to the District Forester dated 4 May 1910, when Leopold had worked for the Forest Service for less than a year, is one of the earliest documents

related to his activities with ranchers. In it he discusses the finer points of grazing allotments, such as when to grant and revoke permits. Aldo Leopold, "Letter to the District Forester," 4 May 1910, pp. 96–101, 8B8, LP.

50. Meine, *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work*, 111.

51. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 90.

52. "GPA and Jicarilla Club Go to the Mat," *Pine Cone*, January 1918, 6F1, LP.

53. Meine, *Aldo Leopold: His Life and Work*, 164; Ligon, *Wild Life of New Mexico*, 181; and Veronica Velarde Tiller, *The Jicarilla Apache Tribe: A History, 1846–1970*, rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 111, 203.

54. The history of the Jicarilla Apache in this essay is drawn from Tiller, *The Jicarilla Apache Tribe*. Tiller herself is Jicarilla Apache.

55. For more on the importance of Indian mobility, the U.S. government's attempts to limit it, and the Dawes Act's effects in the Southwest, see Trudy Griffin-Pierce, *The Columbia Guide to American Indians of the Southwest* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 49–65, 68–71.

56. For population figures, see Tiller, *The Jicarilla Apache Tribe*, 131.

57. "GPA and Jicarilla Club Go to the Mat," 3.

58. Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness*.

59. *Ibid.*, 29–30.

60. Aldo Leopold, "Southwestern Game Fields," (unpublished manuscript, 1927), Folder 1, Box 10, Subseries 6: Writings, Aldo Leopold Papers, 1887–1948, UW-Madison Libraries, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

61. Carmony and Brown, *Aldo Leopold's Southwest*, 29–30.

62. *Ibid.*; and "Name of Stinking Lake to be Changed to Lake Burford," *Pine Cone*, April 1918, p. 1, 6F1, LP. Today the lake remains on Jicarilla land, and current maps label it Stinking Lake.

63. Aldo Leopold, "Putting the 'AM' in Game Warden," *Sportsman's Review* 54 (31 August 1918): 173–74.

64. Warren, *The Hunter's Game*, 113.

65. Aldo Leopold, "Conserving the Covered Wagon," *Sunset Magazine* 54 (March 1925): 21.