Chapter 16

PUBLIC-PRIVATE INTERFACE

Clare A. Gunn*

Along with unprecedented growth of recreational opportunity has come an alarming amount of misunderstanding and conflict between the public and private sectors. As greater demand has stimulated more intensive use and more extensive development for outdoor recreation, the number and intensity of controversies over many issues of policy, development, management, and service have multiplied greatly.

The purpose of this discussion is neither to be comprehensive nor to offer solution, but to examine some fundamentals of the public-private relationship as a basis for resolution of the issues, particularly for the federal role. It will be seen that there is historic precedent for each sector to perform as it does today—that the apparent overlap, confusion, and conflict is a logical outcome. Furthermore, all outdoor recreational development has been and continues to be heavily influenced by penetrating ideologies, especially those of conservation, recreation, and tourism. Deeper examination shows a much stronger functional symbiosis between and among the elements of both the private and the public sector than is carried over into either organization or policy. Therefore, when the entire outdoor recreational phenomenon is given an overall systems approach, many avenues of collaboration and cooperation appear to be possible.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The private sector in resource development for recreation has grown to become a hugh and unintegrated complex of separate establishments and programs
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that are supported primarily by nongovernment sources. This support comes mostly from fees and charges as well as from foundations, gifts, and nonprofit organizations. Although many private establishments are subsidized by government in various ways, they are not operated by government. The scope ranges from airlines to river-running tour operators, from Boy Scout camps to historic sites, and from resorts to amusement parks. Such a vast and complicated array almost defies enumeration and definition but represents a volume of activity of vital importance. It is important to society, to the economy, and to the environment, and it has been since the beginning of the nation.

Although the strain of the frontier and the demands on survival forced emphasis on work for all of the able-bodied population, recreation activity, especially that provided by the private sector, was a vital part of the country's evolution. The corn huskings and barn-raising bees, the hoe-down fiddler dances, as well as card playing, theatrical skits, and sports and amusements took place primarily on private grounds in private buildings and were sponsored by private interests.

With the coming of steamboats and railroads in the late 1800s, largely through private initiative and investment, came also the development of private resorts with their many indoor and outdoor recreations. Boating, fishing, hunting, riding, promenading, and indoor sports were popular recreations. The pursuit of health was strong motivation and provided a market for mountain, lake front, seaside, mineral spring, and cool northern summer fun spots. Intellectual and religious programs were also involved at many locations. The electric trolley or interurban railway provided access to nearby waterfronts and stimulated the development of private amusement parks for a great many U.S. cities.

But it took the automobile, a private development, to produce an explosion in the opportunity to recreate—greater variety of activities, greater
expansion of locations, and greater mass use. Mass outdoor recreation seems to have paralleled the expansion of automobile ownership and use. The "tin can" tourists of the late 1920s and the 1930s became the butt of cartoons and editorials, as these new travel recreationists picnicked and camped everywhere including city lawns and country farmyards. The first commercial reaction was the building of service stations, and hot dog and pop stands along the roadside. This was followed by the only segment of the building industry to expand during the depression—"tourist cabins." Then came "tourist courts" followed by "motels." During the same period, vacation homes began to increase in popularity especially around lakes newly accessible on a weekend drive from home.

In recent years additional factors have spurred the growth of the private sector into a sprawling, diverse, and extremely productive mass of services and facilities, catering to millions—approximately 8 million Americans traveling for business or pleasure at any one time. Among important factors have been higher incomes, expressways, air conditioning, and greater mobility of friends and relatives. Certainly the massive development of thousands of private services and facilities has increasingly provided for enrichment, entertainment, relaxation, physical renewal, and general leisure pursuit of millions of Americans.

The policies (objectives) of the private sector for outdoor recreation are difficult to generalize. They vary greatly even in the degree of profit making. Generally, they fall into the following categories:

a. major profitmaking: e.g., hotels, motels, gift shops, airlines, theme parks;

b. supportive or partial profitmaking: part-time farm vacation resorts, seasonal motels, hunting guides, industrial tours;

c. social welfare and education: youth camps, children's camps, church camps;

d. activity-oriented: sports clubs, trail clubs, hunt clubs;
a. preservation, protection: historic buildings, historic sites, events, pageants;

f. business protection: business and professional organizations;

g. personal: private vacation homes, recreation vehicle owners.

Therefore, when we speak of the private sector in only a commercial context, we are only partially correct. Many other purposes are equally strong. The private sector thrives on freedom to organize, to acquire property, and to develop and manage it for stated private sector objectives. Generally, the least constraint by laws and regulations is preferred by the private sector. Commercial operations are willing to take risks of possible financial loss at the same time they hope to succeed. The rewards from being creative and innovative and accepting their own probabilities of being successful financially are prime motivators. Competition is accepted on the premise that selectivity of the market and quality of management will eventually demonstrate success of the viable and failure of the weak or unproductive enterprises. The nonprofit sector "succeeds" on its ability to identify specific organizational goals and work toward them with programs and physical development.

The private sector sets its own policies regarding what to provide and the standards of design and quality of such services or products, but within certain limits set by governments. For example, a restaurateur can identify his own market, create his own menu, set his own standards of food service and products, and build to his own design at a location of his own selection. Although health departments may require certain standards of sanitation and building departments, certain minimum standards of construction, generally private interests set their own standards. Those in the nonprofit sector--such as organization camps and historical societies--are equally free to
develop their own outdoor recreation facilities and programs within government constraint.

The major influence on the number, quality, and class of product or service is the market. Each private enterprise must show concern over a public's acceptance of its standards, or it cannot survive for long. What may be criticized as "poor," "trashy," "overcommercial," or even "posh" and "exclusive" may in fact be serving a vital demand by some segment of the public. Increasingly recreation businesses, like all private enterprise, are becoming more sensitive to markets and consumer behavior. Increased research is demonstrating the need for refinement of consumer preferences and consumer decision making.

Collectively, the private sector of recreation has responded to mass recreation demand with a variety of development and programs that include social welfare as well as profit-making objectives.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR

At the same time, governments at all levels have increasingly become directly and indirectly involved in recreation. This involvement has been expressed basically two ways—as a regulator and as a competitive developer. As a regulator, much legislation and many agencies control aspects of private sector land acquisition, planning and management of resources, facilities, services, and programs. As a competitor, governments own and manage extensive land areas, facilities, and services, and thus direct programs for the recreating public. While there may have been logical rationale and public support for the establishment of each of the many segments of recreation over the history of development—both private sector and governmental—there is now an increasing number of policy questions that deserve attention and resolution.
The entrance of government, at all levels in the United States, into recreation development had several and quite disparate beginnings. What now is generalized as the public sector is not at all singular and is not easily understood unless its background is traced. The complicated maze of agency involvement today may appear to be overlapping and even unnecessarily proliferated. It has this composition because of its past growth pattern. For example, the contemporary definition of a governmentally owned and managed urban park is far from uniform. It may be merely "open space with lawns, trees, and natural streams or ponds." Or, it may be a football stadium, a zoo, a swimming pool, a playground, or an outdoor theater. This is the result of a variety of different policy and agency origins. The original urban park concept, borrowed from England, was that of a pleasant natural setting for rest and contemplation. The purpose was to provide a social welfare antidote to the ills of industrialization, especially bad working conditions, and unhealthful housing, but not necessarily recreation as physical activity.

It is surprising to learn that even though some 85 percent of all outdoor recreation land in the United States is owned by the federal government, no federal recreation agency, exclusively created for recreation, administers these lands. Even the Heritage, Conservation, and Recreation Service is not a landowner-manager but a catalyst and banker for public outdoor recreation development. Many agencies with other-than-recreation original legislative mandates, have, over the years, assumed recreational functions.

For example, the U.S. Forest Service (155 national forests with 822 million recreation days a year) was not established for recreation. The purpose of this agency, according to its organic act of 1897, was to protect and improve forest reserves for continued supply of timber and for watershed control. Incidental to this purpose, it discovered that these
forest lands often contained physical assets, including favorable location, desired by outdoor recreationists. Since most of the reserves contained usable waters, game, and esthetic assets, they were in demand by increasing numbers of visitors. In order to reduce fire hazard, erosion, and stream pollution and even to protect the users against themselves, the Forest Service began to provide development and programs for recreation, especially camping and outdoor sports such as hunting and fishing. And, as was discovered by highway departments, development of services and facilities even further induced use.

A similar sequence was experienced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Its main purpose was to assure the protection and perpetuation of fish and wildlife. When this was necessarily translated into landholdings, the public became aware of their recreational assets and demanded access.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, now manager of some 3,080 recreational sites with 391 million recreation days a year, was originally concerned with engineering solutions to navigation and flood control. Because one technique was the building of dams, the resulting reservoirs became of even greater economic, social, and political importance for recreational purposes.

When created in 1933, the Tennessee Valley Authority had the purpose of reclaiming an entire region that had been socially and economically eroded through overexploitation of forests, soils, and minerals. Because electrical power was fundamental to economic growth, emphasis was placed on hydroelectric plants. Again, the recreational potential of the resulting reservoirs was exploited and now the 600,000 acres of water and 11,000 miles of shoreline support millions of dollars of private development as well as some 108 state, county, and municipal parks, 2 national wildlife refuges, and 22 state fish and game wildlife management areas.
The Bureau of Indian Affairs, conceived as a management agency for protection of the hunting and settlement land for Indians, has backed into equal concern over tourism and recreation. The lands often happened to contain many elements of scenic, historic, and ethnic interest to visitors. To exploit these resources or not has caused considerable controversy within Indian tribal councils.

The Bureau of Land Management, an outgrowth of the General Land Office, now manages some 203 sites for 91 million recreational visits a year—quite outside its original purposes. Instead of exclusive concern over the disposal of public lands and later the regulation of privately owned livestock on public lands, recreation is now one of several multiple-use management responsibilities.

Perhaps these illustrations are sufficient to dramatize the point that today's recreation involvement of many federal agencies was more an accident of history than an act of purpose. Much of this history has been public pressure (user, visitor, recreationist) supported by political commitment to make recreational use of public lands no matter who has custody. It should be emphasized, however, that agency reaction to this pressure has varied greatly. Even the National Park Service, originally created to protect certain resource assets and provide for public use, has not consistently supported recreation as a major function.

Throughout the country, state agencies have experienced similar shifts into recreation activity even though not mandated originally. Therefore, it is not unusual for the recreating public to experience the same services and facilities by governments as by private enterprise. For example, the resorts, marinas, and camping areas of the Kentucky state park system outrank in quality and level of service many private enterprise operations of similar kinds.
INFLUENTIAL IDEOLOGIES

Running through these developments of both the private and public sector have been several ideological themes that have further complicated recreation roles. Expanded land development, exploding recreational use, and increased awareness of environmental issues now suggest reassessment of at least the three ideologies of conservation, tourism, and recreation.

Conservation

The North American concept of conservation grew from several independent and even conflicting roots. Modern mutations of conservation emerged from these roots.

Often associated with conservation are parks. Actually, the park movement, especially that of urban parks, grew out of social concern. The ills of expanding industrialization and industrial cities, first in England and then in the United States and Canada, gave rise to a demand for park and open space. The dedication of public land was (and still is) seen as an antidote to delinquency, crime, illness and the drudgery of work. Moral and ethical values were and continue to be strong elements of conservation in the eyes of many.

Early conservation efforts, both in the United States and Canada, also were expressions of efficiency of resource use. It was less "wasteful" of resources to consider long-range programs, especially those for renewable resources such as timber. But the emphasis was on utilization not preservation. Water resources were to be harnessed and soils were to be made more productive. Much of modern agricultural production is based upon this concept of conservation.
The idea of land conservation in an _esthetic_ sense historically came relatively late. The defense of conservation areas today on the grounds of scenic beauty is a complete capitulation of the frontier: mastery of nature. The most popular recreation activity today, sightseeing, depends heavily upon a strong contemporary definition of conservation. Wilderness beauty is described as timeless, dimensionless, all encompassing, dynamic, uncluttered by the artist's conception and a form of beauty that gratifies all the senses.

Another contemporay concept of conservation is that of _science and ecology_. The premise is that of man-environmental balance. The only way of striking this balance is to define conservation in terms of resource protection. This must prevent habitat destruction, habitat homogenization, reduction of species, and natural resource pollution.

Conservation, in the sense of preservation and redevelopment of the _cultural heritage_, is increasingly supported today. Many man-made artifacts have a scarcity value that becomes as important to society's well-being as do the natural resources. Therefore, conservation means their protection, restoration, and interpretation.

In summary, the three sectors of outdoor recreation—profit-making enterprise, nonprofit organizations, and the federal government—now carry out conservation roles but in varying degrees. Profit-making enterprise capitalizes upon natural and cultural resources for its own profit-making goals and for its immediate functions (hotels, parking, product sales). However, at the same time, profit-making depends upon the conservation of these resources for repeated and continuing enjoyment and participation by visitors. Nonprofit organizations, likewise, must meet their individual goals but frequently depend upon resource conservation in order to continue
meeting them. Most of the historic sites of this country are owned, restored, and interpreted by nonprofit organizations. Many federal government agencies and programs are oriented toward conservation.

Tourism

Currently well accepted into the language is a term that grew out of the nineteenth-century society and technology: tourism. Although definitions vary, most include elements such as pleasure travel, expenditures of money at a place other than where earned, and more than a short stay.

Tourism development dominantly has economic motivations. Proponents support tourism development locally, nationally, and internationally primarily for economic reasons. States, provinces, and nations cherish the tourism economy they now possess, and undeveloped nations seek its economic rewards. Economic inputs cited most frequently are those of incomes, jobs, and taxes—derived primarily from an export-type of business enterprise. In the United States, travel is reported to account for approximately $100.4 billion and 4.0 millions jobs annually.

Because of its economic emphasis, profit-making segments dominate tourism. Those most directly involved provide lodging, food service, transportation, and recreation activities.

Profit making, like conservation, has many colored meanings. For some persons, particularly those outside tourism, it means excessive exploitation of resources and lack of social sensitivity for the sake of personal money rewards. For others, it means the provision of services and facilities on a creative free enterprise basis that supports national economic health.
Certainly, in tourism, the profit-making sector is important and is represented by several levels: small, independent businesses, chain and franchise corporations, and lease or concession arrangements on public lands. Research has shown that profit motives vary with different business types, especially among the small outdoor recreation owner-managers. Some do not wish to maximize financial returns but are in business because of beliefs in conservation or because of recreational values for family members. Some wish to keep retirees busy. Others seek only supplementary incomes for unemployed or underemployed family labor. Others seek the more traditional goals of gaining revenues that will cover all capital and operating costs including return on investment (3, p. 3). While some criticism is levied toward profit-making enterprise because of its apparent lack of sensitivity to social welfare issues, Drucker insists that:

There is no conflict between "profit" and "social responsibility." To earn enough to cover the genuine costs which only the so called "profit" can cover, is economic and social responsibility --indeed it is the specific social and economic responsibility of business. It is not the business that earns a profit adequate to its genuine cost of capital, to the risks of tomorrow and to the needs of tomorrow's worker and pensioner, that "rips off" society. It is the business that fails to do so (10).

By and large, tourist businesses would not be in business if it were not for attractions that lure people to travel and participate in a variety of recreation activities. And the bulk of the ownership and management of attractions in the United States is by the public and nonprofit sectors. Hence, a major role of tourism is played by the not-for-profit sector, especially the federal government agencies that have custody of special scenic, historic, and recreational resources.
Typical of profit-making enterprise, tourism businesses engage heavily in marketing and promotional activities, individually and collectively. From the standpoint of marketing, tourists are seen as consumers of tourism "products"; enjoyable activities related to pleasure travel. Segments of tourist businesses therefore engage in consumer behavior studies in order to understand better the characteristics of people and their interests. For example, Plog (2, p. 57) divided flyers and nonflyers into classifications of "psychocentrics" versus "allocentrics" based upon their individual habits and interests. Another study indicated that tourists are not always sure of their plans when they leave home—many engage in "impulse" travel (17, p. 8).

Government involvement in tourism varies. At the state level, governments generally provide regulation and control, heavy inputs for promotion, functions of support through highways, airports, and the provision of public lands that actually serve as attractions. At the federal level the greatest involvement has been the provision of attractions, assistance to transportation, and the promotion of foreign visitors to the United States.

In promotion, businesses are assisted greatly by state and federal involvement. For example, forty-eight state tourism offices, together with those in U.S. territories and possessions, spend approximately $62 million a year (30, p. 3). In addition, the U.S. Travel Service budget is $14.5 million a year, most of which is spent on promoting travel to the United States (32, p. 5).

In summary, tourism is primarily involved with profit-making businesses that relate to pleasure travel. These businesses are largely of four categories: lodging, food service, transportation, and other items, especially entertainment and the purchase of goods. The goals are dominantly profit-making but these are met only by the provision of goods and services desired by consumers.
Recreation

Recreation, as a pleasurable diversionary activity, has been practiced by man for centuries. Although it has met with varying social acceptance throughout history, it has been practiced by all people everywhere. For example, Sunday games were decreed by King James I in 1618 but were prohibited by colonists (11, p. 10).

Recreation is defined in many ways, but most definitions include such terms as: activity engaged in during leisure; the acquisition of skills and better physical, mental, and emotional health; activity for pleasure and enjoyment or activity that enriches the lives of people (19; 23; 9). But in many countries the word does not exist. Instead, the several segments—such as sports, physical training, dance, hunting, and fishing—are actively engaged in but are not under control of recreation agencies.

In North America, as soon as recreation became a role of government, definitions became more important. As it was formalized and institutionalized, recreation was defined in whatever terms the proponents created as policy.

Some recreation professionals, especially those supporting government-sponsored recreation, draw a strong distinction between that which is an end in itself and that which is purposeful. They say that the former is negative while the latter is positive. Leisure, engaged in for its own sake, provides no focus, whereas those recreation activities accepted by society as wholesome, creative, and uplifting are worthy of public support (28, p. 4).

Although interpretations vary, recreation is generally agreed to mean human activity associated with leisure (5, p. 222). It is social in context because it is part of society's cultural class structure, status groupings,
and temporal patterning and because it generally follows the rules laid down by society. At this same time, it is individual. In spite of group pressure and conformity with social norms, in recent years there has been in recreation a strong:

... social need for the individual to be his own master and to please himself, to enjoy the time formerly taken up by activities which were in part imposed by the firm, the family, and socio-spiritual or socio-political activities (12, p. 40).

Recreation agencies having land, facilities, and programs are now well institutionalized at all levels of government in both Canada and the United States. They vary from those that are resource oriented (extensive parks that accept a minimum of people-use) to those that are user oriented (marinas, beaches, picnic areas, and playgrounds).

The prime justification for public agency and nonprofit entrance into recreation programs is that of social welfare: for the good of the individual and society. The federal role is seen as a responsible acceptance of the need for fostering the development of lands, facilities, and programs that provide for recreation participation. It is on this basis—not on economics or resource protection—that recreational policies of many federal agencies—such as the Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, and the Forest Service—are founded.

At the same time, the private sector has also assumed a heavy responsibility for the provision of recreation lands, facilities, and programs. Even though the primary motivation for entrance—profit making—may have varied from that of the federal government, by and large the private sector must also provide for the social welfare. There is little evidence to prove that the gains—either to the individual or to society as a whole—are any the less from participation in the recreation at Disneyland (profit-making enterprise)
or Williamsburg (nonprofit organization) than from participation in the recreation at Padre Island National Seashore (National Park Service).

Recreation therefore is an ideology that is dominantly social and personal--promoted and supported for its value to the participants within society. Although custom and law have supported strong recreational programs by government, both profit-making and nonprofit organizations support recreation as a social welfare good.

RELATIONSHIPS

Coexistence

For many years, the three separate forces, with their three separate leaderships and followings, functioned independently and without much conflict. Recreation exponents were preoccupied with program emphasis and were busy promoting the establishment of playgrounds, parks, and their staffs. Recreation programs and development were associated with governments because of their sponsorship. Recreation became a motherhood goal that never failed for public support.

Conservation, even with its many meanings, retained its popularity and support primarily from its soil erosion control and reforestation origins. It also was associated primarily with governments and government programs.

Tourism was seen strictly as promotional efforts by business for economic objectives. It appeared that greater enticement was the only element lacking for the development and support of tourism. Therefore, the first expression was that of providing moneys for advertising.

During this stage, there was little contact among the agencies, organizations, and individuals from these three groups. Whatever contact that did take place was casual and polite, and it tended to support their independence.
Each saw his role as well defined and clearly separate from the others. In many countries and in some states, that is true today.

Conflict

As all three forces—conservations, tourism, recreation—grew in stature, and in total public awareness, the next expression was that of conflict. Park departments in cities saw their roles as clearly separate from those of recreation departments and opposed overtures toward amalgamation. Each saw the other as competing for public funds and public support and, in some instances, as competing for the same lands.

Federal agencies that had declared or were induced to accept recreational roles began to define recreation according to their own values. These, particularly in the 1960's, were not wholly acceptable to the visiting publics; and increasing conflict between managers and users developed, even to rioting and property destruction.

As mass recreation expanded and congestion at campground and beaches became the rule in parks, conservation interests cried "rape." In spite of the fact that early park policies in both Canada and the United States supported and promoted visitor use and visitor facilities, the exponents of conservation (meaning resource protection) believed people were ruining the parks. Excessive erosion, wear and tear at certain intensively used sites supported this belief.

With the promotion and increased growth of tourist travel, parks began to function as attractions. As the masses of recreation participants and tourists increased, the need for commercial tourist facilities and services increased. The manner in which these were located, built, and managed were not always to the liking of those who created and managed the parks. Within national parks those profit-making tourism segments—primarily concessions—
became the target for much criticism from conservation protection organizations.

Park and conservation exponents couched their goals in social welfare terms and justified as "for the good of society" land condemnation and entrance into commercial-type operations such as concessions and campgrounds. Tourism exponents, as champions of private enterprise, often called this unfair competition.

Further conflict came between all three of these forces and outside interests. Competition for land occurred between tourism-recreation-conservation forces and other developers, such as those involved in manufacturing, housing, and agriculture. Sometimes tourism, with the use of "outside" capital and labor, disrupted both the social and economic order of the locality.

Symbiosis

In spite of continuing issues of conflict, the three forces of tourism, conservation, and recreation have developed many symbiotic characteristics: mutual benefit by functioning together (4).

As natural and cultural resources are put in public and nonprofit ownership and management for resource protection and conservation programs, they increase in popularity. Millions of people take greater interest in these assets of the nation and wish to see them, photograph them, enjoy them, and become enriched by them: functions commonly labeled recreation. In the process of doing so, they demand lodging, transportation, food service, and a variety of products (camera film, hiking gear, boats) and services (guides, travel agents): functions easily labeled tourism.

As recreation virtues are promoted—both by agencies and organizations as well as society itself—millions more people are interested in gaining the rewards of such recreational activities. Although the majority of this
leisure activity takes place indoors, the outdoor segment has mounted to unprecedented magnitude in recent years. Outdoor recreation takes place on lands frequently brought into the identification and management sphere of conservation. At the same time, recreation in the out-of-doors frequently demands lodging, transportation, food service, and a variety of products and services, easily identified as tourism.

As businesses and agencies promote tourism, a very important component of their "product" is the outdoor natural and cultural resources that were dedicated to conservation purposes. An equally important "product" is that of outdoor recreation: boating, fishing, swimming, skiing, hunting, photography.

Synergism

Although proponents of each force would deny it, tourism, recreation, and conservation are abstractions that have greater total impact and interdependencies than their sums would imply; hence, strong synergistic characteristics.

Tourism, for example, is not only completed by the addition of commercialism to recreation and conservation, but it made different, stronger, and more penetrating because of the conservation and recreational components within its makeup. It could not survive without them and the result is greater than the sum of the several parts.

Recreation is more than social concern over physical fitness or mental enrichment. Much of the participation would not take place if it were not for the components of tourism, such as travel, lodging, food service, and the sale of products. Furthermore, elements of conservation, such as esthetics, resource protection, environmental education, and heritage interpretation are included in definitions of recreation.
A national park such as Yosemite is not a conservation area--it is a complex that has elements of conservation (protection of many natural and historic resource assets), of recreation (hiking, horseback riding, photography, camping), and of tourism (convention lodging, food services, souvenir sales).

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that both the private and the public sector have separate, conflicting, and overlapping roles in recreation in this country. It is likely that these roles will continue. It is also likely that these roles will continue to be influenced by the ideologies of conservation, tourism, and recreation.

The main issue today seems to be one of rising above polarization and of improving the functioning of both the public and private sectors to meet desirable goals. While each segment of each sector may appear to have divergent objectives, there seem to be at least three goals common to both sectors:

1. The goal of improving the quality of life through leisure is a very pervasive one for both sectors. There is a constant desire to improve the means for more people to obtain greater enrichment from a variety of recreational opportunity. Governments establish new areas and new programs; the private sector responds to markets.

2. Both sectors, as they develop land and provide programs for recreation, increasingly strive toward improving their own rewards. Private recreational business seeks greater freedom to create and to produce in order to obtain greater financial stability and less constraint in performing its role. Nonprofit organizations hope for greater realization of their organizational objectives. And the public sector seeks ways of gaining better support for its public service.

3. Finally, both sectors now must assume the national goal of greater environmental sensitivity and responsibility.

It is not a question of choice between these goals but one of reaching toward all three at the same time. But with the great number and diversity of decision
makers in recreation, the process of reaching toward these goals is neither easy nor simple.

On the surface, it would seem that much progress could be made if communication and even collaboration between the sectors and the many elements of each sector could be accomplished. However, several obstacles tend to keep them apart. There are semantic obstacles. To tourism developers the concept of conservation is interpreted to be antidevelopment. Park managers readily accept visitors but resent tourists in the belief that they are different. In spite of the fact that both public and private recreation interests provide for many of the same activities, government-supported recreation seems purer and more wholesome, whereas commercially supported recreation is less desirable. Institutions, both public and private, tend to foster boundary protection of their own agencies and organizations and resist contact with others, particularly those who might compete. The land-taking ability of governments tends to alienate the private sector. And lack of understanding of each one's role in planning, development, and management for recreation tends to keep the sectors apart.

Even so, it seems that recently a trend has begun toward more open relations and greater understanding of each sector's role. Perhaps this has been brought about by greater participation by citizen groups in public agency decision making. Maybe it has been fostered by the many pieces of land use and environmental legislation in recent years. Perhaps the higher levels of education and better awareness of environmental issues are fostering better understanding. It is possible that the "social reversals" of the late 1960's (26, p. 266) have introduced a new era of cultural determinism rather than blind faith in economic and technical growth. Whatever the causes, there is room for great optimism. The political climate now suggests greater opportunity for clarifying federal roles toward the private sector. It is possible that
some government agency operations can be returned to private enterprise. It is possible that the public welfare in recreation is better served by government assistance and programs than by government landownership, development, and management. It is possible that government constraint of private recreation can be relieved. It is possible that private institutions can take on even greater responsibility for social welfare such as safety, land use, ethics, and public satisfaction from leisure.

In conclusion, it appears that single acts of the public sector—such as major federal legislation—have much greater impact upon the public-private interface of recreation than do decisions of the private sector. It is for this reason that each federal and state act must be researched in depth before enactment. Furthermore, the private sector, in order to compete on the basis of social and environmental as well as economic reasons, must develop a stronger commitment to all acts of government that might affect it. At the same time, it must take on a greater social consciousness to avoid additional governmental control.
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