

tion and one semester hour in First Aid (HPER). They also receive training in methods of communication.

This college credit is of no additional expense to the department. When an employee wishes to claim his credit he must present his departmental record to Central Missouri State College with a letter of good standing, pay \$3.00 per semester hour and upon completing 10 hours of resident work, may receive 30 hours of transferrable credit.

What other values are received? Perhaps the most important — lesson outlines are prepared in more detail and presented more thoroughly. Perhaps the agent values his training more highly since it has college status. The public may view his job with more respect and dignity.

Our resources are as vital as our liberties, one must fight for his resources as he would for his liberties — one is dependent upon the other — the best safeguards must be achieved and maintained. College credit is another attempt by our department to give the people of Missouri the best return on their investment.

## **ENFORCEMENT'S ROLE IN INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS**

By **ROBERT S. BAKER**

*Coordinator of Law Enforcement*

Georgia State Game and Fish Commission

Probably the greatest question facing wildlife conservation agencies today, outside the field of finances, is "what should be the relationship between enforcement officers and wildlife biologists." This has been a problem faced by conservation agencies for years and as the demand of sportsmen for increased services clashes head on with the fact that most agencies do not have adequate operational budgets, this problem becomes even more acute.

The whole problem of interdepartmental cooperation is made up of many small problems dealing with specifics and I shall attempt to briefly go into some of these problems since a knowledge of the problem is a prerequisite to finding a solution.

One problem which must be overcome is that of distrust. The distrust which so often arises between enforcement personnel and biologists. Neither group can claim a monopoly on this feeling and usually neither group is willing to make a real conscientious effort to better the situation. A great deal of lip service is constantly being paid this problem but only when enforcement personnel and technical personnel are willing to recognize the inability of one group to exist without the other, can real progress be made toward solving this problem.

Regardless of whether or not we approve of this label and regardless of how justified such a label might be, the enforcement officer is still "Mister Game and Fish Department" to most people. Even though he may bear the title of game protector, warden, wildlife ranger, or conservation officer, he is expected to be a combination policeman, lawyer, referee, game biologist, fisheries biologist, and diplomat by those he serves. The game protector is asked as many, or even more questions, which deal with Zoology and Ichthyology than he is asked dealing with law enforcement. As the "front line" of the conservation agency, the enforcement officer must bear the responsibility of being able to answer common questions dealing with game and fish management as a normal part of his job and to this end he must attempt to learn all he can about the why's and wherefore's of wildlife management. It should be noted here that the why's and wherefore's of wildlife management can not be mastered overnight and that the enforcement officer's reply to questions dealing with this subject can be only as good as his source of information. With this in mind, biologists should make every effort to keep the enforcement officer informed about the latest management programs and must impress on the enforcement officer the reason behind the need for an effective management program. Most wildlife technicians view

wildlife as a renewable crop subject to regulated production and harvest. They feel that only a "seed crop" should be protected and the balance harvested. In contrast, many of the old enforcement officers are men who are genuinely dedicated to shielding wildlife from gun and hook in order to insure the propagation of the species. Simply because a few biologists cared enough to take the time to explain to the enforcement officers that wildlife can be harvested just as a crop can be harvested and that over-protection can lead to over-population, we are now experiencing a radical change in the thinking of enforcement officers on this subject.

One of the natural instincts of society is to separate themselves by financial status. Just as bank presidents tend to live apart from common laborers, so do some of our biologists who are making two or three times the salary of a conservation officer separate themselves from the enforcement officer. Salary differences has long been a bitter pill for some enforcement officers to swallow even though they are well aware that the educational requirements of a biologist are quite high. Yes, the education gained at the "University of Hard Knocks" may be adequate for a conservation officer but all of us will have to admit that this education is much less expensive than a degree obtained at Auburn or some of our state universities.

Let's look at one or two areas where biologists can play an important part in fostering better interdepartmental relations. Divisional friction is less common in those areas where biologists have made an effort to foster good relationships with enforcement personnel through sharing information and problems. The biologist can expect to find a much more cooperative enforcement officer if he will take the time to explain his need for a certain research project and how this can be expected to improve hunting or fishing in a particular area. Most enforcement officers do not mind assisting on fish population studies or track counts if they are made to realize that this is a vital part of wildlife conservation. Even on projects where additional help is not actually needed, biologists could, from time to time, invite enforcement officers to accompany them so that they might exchange information and ideas and get to have a better understanding of the other's job.

One area where cooperation between the biologists and the enforcement officer is absolutely necessary is in recommending the various regulations to the regulatory authority. Such regulations must be based on sound biological data but at the same time they must be regulations which are practical and can be enforced or else they are not worth the paper they are written on.

There are also areas in which we as enforcement officers could be more cooperative. We can make it a point to try to understand the problems of wildlife management. I believe we have reached the point where all of us realize that management is a vital part of wildlife conservation and that research is a vital part of management. While we expect biologists to not look down their noses at us, we must, in return, resolve to accept management technicians as a working partner in wildlife conservation. Limited budgets require the full utilization of all personnel and we as enforcement officers have no more right to resent being asked to assist biologists in research problems than the biologists have in resenting being asked to assist rangers during peak hunting or fishing seasons.

Enforcement officers who are political appointees and out to create their own little "kingdom" have often been used as a basis for criticism of the whole enforcement division of conservation agencies. Well, I've got news for those people who would so criticize us. Those of us who have made a profession out of enforcement do not like these political parasites any better than they do, and we are all working just as hard to prevent this kind of appointment as we possibly can. It will be a great day for law enforcement when these political appointees can be replaced with able, qualified and competent personnel.

I told this same section at our Clearwater meeting last year that the gun-toting, man-hunting game warden of yesterday is fading away and in his place will come a competent enforcement officer trained in enforcement, management and public education, and I feel this could

possibly be the solution to our overall problem of interdepartmental cooperation. Why not consider setting up three phases of an employee's probationary period. Two months could be spent working with a game biologist, two months with a fisheries biologist and two months with an enforcement officer. At the end of this six months period we should be able to evaluate this man's work and determine if he is the type person who could be counted on to cooperate with other divisions within the department.

Interdepartmental cooperation is no longer a desirable trait of an employee. It has now become a required characteristic. Only those enforcement officers who are willing to assume this characteristic can expect to have a future in wildlife conservation.

There are those who will tell you that complete cooperation between the various divisions of a conservation agency can never be accomplished. That this is an impossibility. Each time I hear this I think of a sign I once saw which read . . . "According to the theory of aerodynamics, and as may be readily demonstrated through wind tunnel experiments, the bumblebee is unable to fly. This is because the size, weight and shape of his body in relation to the total wingspread makes flying impossible . . . but the bumblebee, being ignorant of these scientific facts, goes ahead and flies anyway . . . and makes a little honey every day."

## ENFORCEMENT PROBLEMS RELEVANT TO JUVENILE LAW VIOLATIONS

By JAMES L. BAILEY

*Superintendent of Protection*

Missouri Conservation Commission

My talk concerns juvenile delinquency in relation to wildlife law enforcement. First — I want it *clearly understood* that my remarks are not intended to reflect in any manner on the many fine boys and girls of good character and excellent behavior, who are engaged in various worth-while activities, particularly wildlife and forestry conservation. The youth groups and individuals who are doing a tremendous job in assisting us in many areas of our responsibility in the conservation of our outdoor resources and who *understand* that our most difficult task is to restrict the behavior of persons who seek to *destroy* what we are attempting to *preserve*. Without the encouragement, help and understanding of these youthful citizens, conservation law enforcement would have a much darker future.

It is unfortunate that many good kids often bear the brunt of adult misunderstanding, suspicion and criticism as a result of the shameful actions of the "incorrigibles" of their own age group.

I am reluctant to use the term "juvenile delinquent" in reference to the teenage "rabble rousers" who have little interest in anything *except to cause trouble*. It doesn't seem to emphasize in strong enough language the vandalism, the destruction of property, the atrocious and despicable crimes committed by this ever-increasing number of "misguided" young humans who, under the protective blanket of statutory and judicial impunity, roam our streets, our alleys and highways and prowl our fields, our streams, our forests, and back roads in search of someone to rob, or assault; or something to steal, deface, kill or destroy.

The hardened individuals, the ruthless gangs or the immoral groups that cause other law enforcement officers to tear their hair in despair are usually the same ones that we must deal with, *often single handed*, in our efforts to control the behavior of our resource users and in our attempt to protect the facilities provided by our agencies for the enjoyment and use of fishermen, hunters, campers, and others who seek outdoor recreation.

If you're 40 or older, you can recall when the teenagers were referred to generally as "adolescents" and their behavior depended to a great extent on the kind of parental management and home life they