

THE HUNTING CONTROVERSY: A QUESTION FOR THE SOUTHEAST

by

Bob Campbell

South Carolina Dept. of Wildlife Resources

Read by Ted Borg, S. C.

The "Hunting Controversy" needs no definition. We all know basically what it's about. It involves both "Anti-Hunting" — those against sport hunting — and "Anti-Hunters" — those against the hunter. Both sentiments threaten wildlife conservation as we know and practice it today.

A good question for us to consider as wildlife agency representatives from the Southeastern region of the country, is where do we stand as a region in light of the current Hunting Controversy?

There may not be an available answer to this question at this time, but at least, perhaps it will stimulate discussions among us that will lead to eventual answers. This paper offers no answers, but will hopefully point out some of the objections to hunting and the hunter which we as wildlife information and education specialists will be obliged to respond - if indeed we aren't already.

It is generally recognized that the Southeastern region is "less developed," "less industrialized," "less urbanized" and "less populated" than other regions of the country, notably the Northeast and West Coast.

Speaking for South Carolina — which I think is fairly typical of the region — we have plenty of land available for outdoor recreation including hunting, an abundance of game, a sound hunting tradition and most of our citizens are "the salt of the earth" so to speak.

At this time we aren't facing an organized hunting controversy in the Palmetto state. There are some individuals who speak out and we will hear from several of them in a moment. But neither can we deny that a great deal of spill-over anti-hunt propoganda is reaching us from other regions through modern mass communications. And we as public relations or information and education specialists are going to have to respond to this spill-over sooner or later in a positive way and without a flinch. It is important that we guard against taking a defensive posture. We need to know what we are up against and what we are talking about before we can take the offense.

It seems to me that this sentiment can be loosely categorized into five groups. (Perhaps you can add to the list). 1. Emotional or moral, 2. fear of wildlife depletion 3. the Vietnam war, 4. urban man's increasing disassociation from the land and what is natural, and finally 5. humanitarian.

All but the last — the humanitarian sentiment — seems easy enough to respond to with facts and philosophy based on scientific knowledge with which we are armed.

One of the outlets we've discovered that the "anti-hunt" spokesman or spokesperson has found is through letters to the editor in our department published magazine SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE. Editor John Culler ran a piece written by Herbert Lundy, editorial page editor of the Portland "Oregonian," titled "Can The Sport of Hunting Be Defended?" Perhaps you have read Mr. Lundy's article as it was republished in several magazines across the country.

Mr. Lundy wrote a very good article which pointed out the now typical biological and philosophical responses to the anti-hunt sentiment. By running it in the magazine, John drew some of this anti-hunt thinking out of the woodwork. For example:

"This is my response to the article by Herbert Lundy entitled "Can the Sport

of Hunting be Defended?" in the Sept.-Oct. issue of SOUTH CAROLINA WILDLIFE.

"My contention is that hunting is a thing of the past and anyone who tries to preserve it and keep it alive as a sport or game is not justified in doing so.

"This is a planet of contradiction. One animal lives off of another and the vegetarian lives off of the plants. This is how it is on our planet but man should not add to it. Man is the intelligent being and can distinguish between good and bad, right and wrong, and life and death. Therefore man must assume the responsibility of being the caretaker of this planet. He must therefore do good, choose right, recognize life as a sacred gift and protect and preserve it in whatever form to the best of his ability.

"Replace a lust for blood with a desire to protect and cherish other creatures' right to live their lives as you protect and cherish your right to go on living. Look upon all wildlife not as "Game" to be tracked, outwitted and brought down with the insensitive squeeze of a trigger, but as fellow creatures who want only to be left alone to continue their lives. A coyote will kill a rabbit to survive. He can't reason, so it is an innocent act necessary to the life of the coyote. He's not out to collect a trophy or entertain himself or satisfy his ego.

"If a person has some sort of emotional problem or inner urge to kill or a compulsion and it gives him a lift to bring down a fellow creature than this urge should be replaced with something else that does not involve other's lives; this is too unjust. Because a man loves to hunt, innocent animals die. This is most selfish. Surely there must be some other "sport" to entertain and satisfy him. Skydiving is an excellent sport for a man to prove his virility and nobody gets hurt, unless himself, or would he be afraid to put *his* life on the line?

"Being out under the sky with nature with the intention of killing a part of it, destroying part of it, and giving nothing in return is not the way to enjoy nature. Spilling innocent blood on the forest floor is no way to show appreciation of nature. If this compulsion is part of human nature it is a part to be restrained or changed. This is how character is developed; by overcoming bad traits and not giving in to our compulsions.

"Hunting cannot be defended today, nor can it be done and then apologized for; if you kill, then you are a killer and this is unforgivable."

Notice how the writer equated "right and wrong" with "life and death." Any information specialists not able to respond to this letter isn't worth his salt. This writer is well-meaning, as are all persons who express the anti-hunt sentiment, but naive and misinformed.

You recognize that he's not only against hunting but nature and life itself. This letter, I think though not too reasonable, represents the emotional or moral argument.

But responding to emotion, as you know, is tricky and shouldn't be taken lightly.

Here is another emotional letter not based on fact:

"Recently, I picked up a September-October issue of *South Carolina Wildlife* in which Mr. Herbert Lundy asked the question, "Can the Sport of Hunting be Defended?" After reading his confessions the answer is still no, as even he admits. Still, I would like to share these thoughts with all Mr. Lundy's.

"The author's statements, "Man is a hunter" and an animal "endowed with the instinct — even the compulsion — to hunt," rank among the most ludicrous of declarations. While it is true that man is an animal, the truth of the statement ends there. Man is neither endowed with the instinct nor a compulsion to hunt. If Mr. Lundy will but ask, he will find there are those who have never hunted nor do they care to do so. There are others, too, who have killed but received no particular "big lift." In addition, these non-hunters seem to be surviving quite well without satisfying this supposedly uncontrollable compulsion.

“The fact that men spend hundreds of dollars for guns, ammunition, clothing, and vehicles to slay beings that intend them no malice is truly one of the all time great mysteries of man’s behavior. The writer says “they ‘hunters’ like to hunt - they get a big lift out of it, it satisfies an inner urge.”

What contributes to such an urge? Bad day at the office? Spouse problems? Please, the next time this urge builds, phone me; let’s talk things over. I beg, don’t take out your frustrations on a defenseless bird or other animal.

“Our distinguished author, Mr. Lundy, asks, “Who is this Jehovah who says that a coyote can kill a rabbit, but I can’t?” I’m not sure this question even deserves comment; however, I would like to ask the author to relate the last time he observed a coyote selecting a meal for her family at his local grocery. Or, to emphasize the absurdity of Mr. Lundy’s original question, who says Mr. Lundy can shop at a food store but a grizzly can’t?

“It is said also that it is a debasement sport to shoot an animal from a vehicle or those that are grounded. There are those of us who consider it a debasement of the species homo sapiens for one to sit two hundred yards from a feeding big horn ram and place a bullet between his eyes. It is questionable that this is even a sport.

“Mr. Lundy even admits he has this thing for bobcats, coyotes, and bears. It’s nice to learn he doesn’t massacre these animals; but remember others enjoy the songs of birds, their color and are fascinated by their aerial acrobatics. If the hunter can control his inner urges (we are a “reasoning animal”), think of those who enjoy the pleasures of a live bird the next time you blast a partridge from flight.

“It is sad to read that Mr. Lundy intends to pass his arsenal on to his children’s children with hopes they will enjoy his “particular brand of reverence.” I question though whether a mother deer nurses her fawn so one day Mr. Lundy’s children may sight them through one of his family heirlooms.

“No, Mr. Lundy, all men are not uncontrollable ravagers of wildlife. Those who do not hunt do not, as you suggest, even wish to hunt you. We only implore you to cease killing and to seek your “big lift” in some constructive endeavor.”

Finally there is the individual who somehow hasn’t gotten the word that game is plentiful and hunters hunt game, as illustrated by this letter:

“I am writing in reference to *South Carolina Wildlife*, Winter, 1971. It is with great regret that I must apologize for not reading the magazine sooner, not to you but to the wildlife of your state. I and my wife have been considering a move to South Carolina and I, being very much interested in wildlife, went to the library in search of wildlife indigenous to S. C. After reading your magazine, I felt too sick to go on and could only think of writing this letter.

“Three out of the six feature articles in that issue were concerned with hunting. “For More Quail Here’s What You Can Do to Help the Bobwhite, Our Greatest Game Bird”: Why not “What You Can Do to Help the Bobwhite”? Why must a wildlife magazine have to cater to hunters? Who cares about the first goose hunt in South Carolina? People who are truly concerned about wildlife want to know when the *last* hunt is going to be — before or after there are no longer any geese to watch. When I look at a wildlife magazine, I don’t want to see *dead* wildlife. A fox does not need to be chased from here to kingdom come to learn that he is not a dangerous animal and that he *is* a beneficial and essential species.

I think that if people are interested in hunting, they can get good coverage of the continuing extermination from *Field and Stream* and other such magazines concerned with “tips” on conserving wildlife for killing, mismanaging, and harassing. Please don’t advocate such things in a state publication. Why not concern yourselves more with wildlife protection instead of management.”

Recognizing that someone who takes the trouble to pen a letter to the editor

has some pretty strong convictions, we must take these letters seriously. Also the communications theorists tell us that one person's thinking expressed in writing to a magazine represents X number of silent individuals with similar attitudes. What is interesting here is the fact that this one response - type article resulted in drawing out some of these ideas.

These letters to the editor at this point are about the only hard information available to us in South Carolina on the anti-hunt sentiment in our state. It should be pointed out, however, that these letters in turn stimulated a backlash response that seemed much stronger. We received several pro-hunt letters in rebuttal to the first letter above.

We know the sentiment is out there, but if we respond to it we seem to be in the position of striking out at "a phantom" at this stage of the game.

While researching material for this paper I wrote to the National Rifle Association. They referred me to Ronald Frodelius of the State University of New York and Dale Shaw of Fort Collins, Colorado. Both have just recently completed extensive research on the anti-hunt subject which each has compiled into a thesis to satisfy requirements for academic degrees. Their research and findings don't tell us all the answers to our question, but what they have to tell us is nevertheless very interesting and informative.

Mr. Frodelius' masters' thesis is titled: "Determination of Anti-Hunt Organizations By Content Analysis of Their Literature." A copy of his thesis is here for your inspection. Mr. Shaw's doctoral dissertation is titled: "Basic Influences Which Cause Anti-Hunting Sentiment In America's College Students."

I wrote to both of these gentlemen asking their assistance in preparing this presentation and both returned my requests with detailed letters. In fact, their letters are so good that I want to inject them into this discussion at this point, but first, so that you will understand their comments here in part is what I wrote to them.

'Anti-hunting in this part of the country, it seems to me, is rather a phantom as it is not organized or vocalized. There is a good deal of spill-over from other parts of the country, however. Perhaps a good tact for our agencies and organizations to take would be to "let sleeping dogs lie." If we begin campaigns striking out at this phantom thing, might we only cause it to solidify as it has done in other regions? What do you think?

'We must of course in any event, identify and understand the anti-hunter and why he/she feels the way they do. Perhaps that is what I should attempt to do through this presentation.

First Mr. Frodelius' reply:

"Great timing! The day your letter arrived I just finished putting together several copies of my thesis (and I have sent you one under separate cover). I'd like to make it clear that my thesis does not *qualitatively* analyze, but rather quantitatively analyzes *how* the Anti-Hunt message is put out, and by whom.

"Most researchers have tried to understand who anti-hunters are, and why they are. Unless you are a trained psychologist or psychiatrist I'd discourage your attempting to present this angle of the situation. An individual can only give a singular opinion. That is why I discounted the many personal letters I received from anti-hunters and concentrated on organizational *published* literature as representing the whole membership.

"Your audience of P. I. specialists is a prime target for receiving my thesis revealings. I want them to realize how "Anti-Hunt" is spread, and to encourage Pro-Hunt sides to adopt similar tactics and methods, as may be honestly applied. As to the S. E. U. S., if Washington, D. C. can be counted on to influence your area, you have a sizeable portion of A-H groups around. St. Petersburg, Florida and Hialeah, Fla. also have one group each. I'm sure you have several smaller groups than ones I was concerned with.

"In reference to "letting sleeping dogs lie," I'd like to see less attacks on each other by Anti- and Pro- sides, with more cleaning up of their own ranks.

"Why not push the hunter, trapper, and fisherman as a beneficial management tool? To argue with Anti's- only puts Pro-Hunt on the *defensive*. Get some offense going, second guess what will be next under attack and beat Anti-Hunt forces by a quick, widespread push *for* Pro-Hunt, *not against Anti-Hunt*.

"The battle will be won as I see it, not by present Pro-Hunt or present Anti-Hunt, but by the "side" that can secure *in the future*, the various "neutrals" that are ready to be swayed. I say go for neutral groups to win their support for Pro-Hunt, and stop spending so much effort defensively answering Anti-Hunt charges. Anti-Hunt forces often get all Pro-Hunt groups busy fighting (in over-reaction sometimes) simple little Anti-Hunt statements, thus leaving few man hours left for positive action, or offensive action."

And Mr. Shaw's:

"Actually, the hunting controversy is so complex and involved that it would take lots of time and space to do it justice, so I'll only be able here to hit the high points. I have had so many requests for copies of my dissertation that I do not have any available right now. The dissertation is 173 pages, contains 110 tables and over 200 references, so you can imagine how impossible it is to cover it in this quick letter. Chapters cover an introduction, man's evolution as a hunting animal, primary arguments for and against hunting, a study of organizations opposed to sport hunting, results of the nation-wide study on attitudes about hunting, summary and conclusions, and recommendations.

"Sentiment against hunting and hunters apparently is increasing in this country, as has been voiced by nationally-recognized people who are interested and involved in the sport. For example, Ralph McMullan, late president of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, said that combatting the rapidly-increasing anti-hunting in this country is the biggest challenge facing that organization in the 70's. Evidence of increasing anti-hunting and anti-hunter sentiment includes formation of organizations to stop hunting, increasing numbers of TV programs and movies carrying social commentaries against hunting, increasing amounts of dialogue relative to the subject at wildlife-oriented meetings such as yours, appearance of legislative proposals to limit or ban hunting, and increasing space devoted to the defense of hunting and hunters in publications aimed at the hunting public.

(Notice that I separate *anti-hunting* and *anti-hunter* sentiment. My observations and the results of my study convinced me that two different and separate components of the hunting controversy do exist — anti-hunting and anti-hunter. Anti-hunting sentiment deals with the philosophical issues, while anti-hunter sentiment is negative attitudes toward the sport generated by hunter misbehavior such as disregard for and damage to property, game law violations, and the wounding or killing of people.)

"Anti-hunting sentiment involves an individual's value system and is concerned with philosophical concepts or abstracts such as morals, ethics, ideals, and religion. Anti-hunting sentiment is almost totally anti-kill. Anti-hunting value systems differ from those of the pro-hunter in the areas of killing wild animals for sport or pleasure, cruelty to animals, sacredness of life, the rights of man in relation to nature, points of view on the environment, and appreciative vs. consumptive use of natural resources. In general, there appears to be an increasing shift in social values in this country away from consumptive use and toward appreciative uses. This is reflected not only in the hunting controversy, but also in areas such as clearcutting, wilderness, and mining. Many reasons for this have been postulated: the primary of these is the shift from rural life to urbanization *where people grow up insulated from the realities of nature*. The

animals they see are cute, cuddly creatures on TV, in the movies, or in a zoo.

"The core of philosophical opposition to sport hunting often is not whether wild animals should or shouldn't be killed, but *how* and for *what* motivation. This is an interesting phenomenon in itself and is difficult for people with backgrounds and training such as you and I have to fathom.

"I can't agree with the concept that the hunting fraternity can afford to "let sleeping dogs lie." For example, the hunting of doves was outlawed (at the polls) last year in South Dakota. To me, this is a blow to every hunter in the country for a number of reasons; it sets a precedent for one thing and provides great encouragement for those in other geographical areas who may wish to stop hunting. Also, I understand that hunters mounted little opposition before a vote was exercised by the citizens; maybe this was because there are relatively few dove hunters in S. D. However, it seems to me that hunters must realize that today it's doves, tomorrow squirrels, and the next day it's deer and elk. What hurts one hunter hurts all hunters.

"When a hunter in Colorado shoots two small boys off a motor bike (this happened three years ago), word gets around and people are slow to forget. The same when a hunter shoots a small girl who is waiting by the family mailbox for the school bus (this happened in Idaho last year).

"I am not as familiar, obviously with sentiment in your area as are you. I would guess that both anti-hunting and anti-hunter sentiment are not the problem that they are in some other areas. I visited two colleges in the southeast last January and got reactions concerning hunting with students, and, as elsewhere, found that students *who hunt* were very critical of hunters. Also, as elsewhere, students who don't hunt, and who were against hunting, were that way for philosophical reasons. In other words, those who hunt were critical of hunters and those who don't hunt were critical of hunting (that is, those who expressed negative attitudes toward the sport and toward hunters). Overall, three-fourths of all students surveyed across the country expressed some degree of anti-hunting or anti-hunter sentiment. A third of the boys registered *strong* negative sentiment while 54 percent of the girls registered strong anti-hunting and anti-hunter sentiment.

"I fully agree with you that striking out at a "phantom" is wrong. It is also foolish. It may also not be wise to *assume* that no problem exists -- possibly your group may want to conduct some basic research in your region to find out exactly what the situation is and then act accordingly. If nothing else, you should continue to remind hunters that the future of their sport depends on how they act when in the field.

"In general, (and for whatever they're worth), some of my overall conclusions after spending a couple of years doing the college student survey and talking to and with hundreds of hunters, are:

"Philosophical opposition to hunting is present but does not pose the threat that misbehavior does. (This is not a very popular concept with some hunters but I'm sincerely convinced that it's true).

"Most hunters are not aware of nor do they understand what the hunting controversy is all about. (I would think that you and men in similar positions could do a tremendous service to hunters by becoming very familiar with all facets of the argument and then passing this on to hunters).

"The hunting controversy, like other "environmental" disputes, reflects a change in social values. This should be clearly recognized by the hunting fraternity and intelligent responses made.

"Anti-hunting (not anti-hunter) sentiment involves value systems and can be countered by other value systems. The American tradition is that each individual has a right to his own value system.

“There is no valid defense for gross hunter misbehavior and thus it cannot be successfully countered.

“Attacks involving emotionalism should be avoided when arguing about hunting. Experience has shown that personal and highly-emotional attacks only damage the attacker’s cause. The loss of influence by Alice Herrington’s Friends of Animals is a good example of this.

“Wildlife management agencies are almost totally hunter-oriented and have done little to meet the needs of the wildlife-oriented non-hunter. This should be remedied. *There must be wildlife benefits for all people.*

“Hunters and wildlife management agencies talk mostly among and to themselves. There must be better communication with non-hunters.

“More cooperation is needed between states in an attempt to elevate the status and prestige of hunting.”

Copies of these works would be very useful on our reference shelves. Also the National Shooting Sports Foundation has a folder of anti-hunt response compiled which could be very useful. Their folder contains two speeches, one aimed at sportsmen’s groups and the other at general audiences. This folder is here for your inspection, but is available from the foundation upon request.

To continue, we’ve covered the emotional and scarcity of game sentiments briefly. Perhaps enough has been said about the increasing dissociation of urban man from the natural environment or what they believe to be the natural environment to create some discussion. The Viet Nam war is over and probably didn’t have as much impact in our region as in others except on the college campuses...and that brings us down to the humane argument against hunting and the hunter.

I believe the humane argument is the hardest to which we will have to respond. Because, as defined, sport hunting could be more humane. Do I hear any arguments?

Frodelius researched 25 anti-hunt organizations in his study, but said, “theoretically at least 41 more anti-hunt organizations may exist.” He stated that their numbers are growing “at an increasing rate.” As he mentioned above, only a few of these organizations are located in the Southeast.

But what is interesting about these organizations is that a number of them object to hunting and the hunter because of humane reasons.

Several of these organizations are listed in a little booklet available through the National Shooting Sports Foundation titled “What They Say About Hunting.” A copy of this booklet is here for your inspection.

To pick out one of these organizations as representative isn’t easy, but I ran across some of the literature being put out by The Humane Society of the United States and what they are saying is interesting.

This statement was sent to the organization’s membership under the president’s signature:

“No sight is more distressing to an animal lover than that of a magnificent looking deer strapped to the hood of a proud hunter’s car. All of us who appreciate the beauty and majesty of wild animals wish that it were possible for all animals to live full and carefree lives, without fear of injury or death at the hands of man. The Humane Society of the United States seeks to teach Americans respect for all forms of life by pointing to the important role each animal plays in our ecosystem.

“Yet The Humane Society cannot dispute the fact that there are simply too many deer in certain parts of this country to be sustained by the natural environment. We believe, therefore, that an instant death is better than a lingering one from starvation. But members of the public who do not have to prove their marksmanship to obtain a hunting license rarely bring an instant death. In too many cases, the number of animals that are wounded or maimed equal or out-

number the animals killed. These less fortunate animals may linger for days or weeks before dying of starvation, loss of blood, or gangrene.”

From this statement we see that this humane association isn't against *hunting* but the *hunter*.

A special report on hunting was issued by this organization in September of 1972 apparently to reinforce their “court challenge,” as they put it, to prohibit hunting on three National Wildlife Refuges. As you know, they lost the case but here's what they were promoting in that case.

Item—“The Humane Society is strongly opposed to any method of culling herds of deer that does not deliver an instant and reasonably merciful death.”

Item—“Archers, by limiting themselves to the antiquated bow and arrow, knowingly commit each living thing they hit to lingering agony.”

Item—“The Humane Society contends that the use of amateur hunters to reduce an overabundant deer herd does not conform with the principles of sound wildlife management.”

Luckily, the court felt differently.

But this report continues with some ideas that we need to take seriously. Because, even though they are partially represented, there is an element of truth in them.

Some excerpts from the Humane Society's special report on hunting are:

“The Humane Society of the United States, while recognizing there is sometimes a need to cull herds of deer and other wild animals to prevent death by starvation and overbrowsing of habitat, is strongly opposed to any method that does not deliver an instant and reasonably merciful death. It has long been opposed to permitting untested, less-than-expert hunters to act as game managers for the nation's animals. It is equally opposed to permitting the use of antiquated weapons, such as the bow and arrow and the muzzle loading gun.

“It is a cruel method of wildlife management that permits the use of a weapon with only a fraction of the shocking power of a high powered rifle, such as the bow and arrow. “An arrow has virtually no shocking power,” concedes the Bowman quoted above. “It makes an ugly, cutting wound like a knife. An animal struck by a *well-placed* arrow bleeds to death.

“Equally as ineffective is the *buckshot* which produces an irregular pattern of wounds. When buckshot fails to kill an animal upon contact, it stays embedded in the victim. It can cause infection that will eventually bring death from weakness and fever. In the buckshot shooting of black tailed deer in the Chaparral in California, career conservation officials estimated crippling losses at 40% of the take-home kill. A recent winter count of dead deer by the Michigan Department of Conservation showed that of 74,000 deer carcasses found, some 30,000 apparently had died slowly from hunting wounds.

“If proof of inaccuracy isn't enough to disqualify most sport hunters from the role of game managers, the government should consider hunters' penchant for “trophy” animals. Any well-educated game manager will tell you overpopulation of deer can be reduced only by removing the females. Yet it is the buck, with his majestic antlers, that every hunter wants. The U. S. Department of the Interior reported that of animals crippled and later found dead from gunshot wounds, 42% were fawns, 25% does, and 7% bucks, which the department interpreted as meaning that hunters made a greater effort to recover antlered animals. When a state fish and game department declares a “does only” hunting season, many sport hunters and *hunting clubs refuse to participate*. In a does-and-bucks season some hunting clubs go as far as encouraging their members to buy the limited number of doe permits and not use them. Such action belies the hunters' own claims of acting as game managers. And there is good reason to believe that many hunters do not follow the rules set forth by state or federal regulatory agencies.

"State fish and game commissions are so tightly controlled by hunting interests that wildlife conservation and management points of view are seldom represented. In New Jersey, for instance, Mrs. Basil Peter Andrews, a member of the HSUS New Jersey Branch board of directors, sought membership on the state fish and game council but was rejected because she did not represent hunting or fishing interests. Among changes non-hunters such as Mrs. Andrews would make in the New Jersey law is raising the minimum age qualification for a hunting license from the present 10 years (if application is made by parent or guardian). Under Virginia law, there is no minimum age for the issuance of a hunting license.

The above statements should give us all food for thought.

Archery hunting is growing in popularity throughout the nation and Southeast "as a more sporting way to take deer." But what the humane society says is true...it isn't as humane as a rifle projectile (if administered by a capable marksman.)

Buckshot is also being recognized as a poor method for taking deer. It tends to create more cripples and is more dangerous in most cases than rifles and shotgun slugs to other hunters. (South Carolina has prohibited buckshot experimentally on two game management areas this year.)

Most wildlife commissions are loaded with hunting and fishing interests. It seems wise at this point for our agencies to be moving away from a more or less total commitment to the hunter and fishermen.

And we all are aware of the problems we've encountered in getting hunt clubs to take doe deer...they want the trophies as the humane society says. Is this good management?.....

I might throw this out in conclusion for comment, argument, discussion or whatever. It seems to me that a response to the anti-hunt sentiment...that is as well argued as the humane society's...is going to require not just a step-up in the amount of propoganda we put out about how essential is hunting and how great are the hunters, but rather a realignment of our agencies' approach to the total wildlife spectrum.

The arguments set forth by the humane society, in my mind, reinforce the need for good intensive hunter safety and hunter education programs which most states now have. (South Carolina doesn't). Through statewide hunter safety programs we should not only be increasing safety but making better, more efficient hunters as well. And is it such a bad idea to certify hunters according to their proven ability much the same way we prove our ability with an automobile for a drivers license. And how about a hunter's eyesight and marksmanship?

It appears to me that these are some of the questions which are a part of the big question facing us today in the "Hunting Controversy." I'm sure there are more. We need to discuss these questions because I think we will need the answers sooner than we think.