

paid tremendous dividends and has allowed us to keep pace with changing and increased hunting and fishing activities. We are convinced that this direction is the only way to go within the obvious limitations of present and anticipated resources. We are sufficiently impressed with the results that we wholeheartedly recommend this approach to all wildlife law enforcement agencies.

THE FUTURE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT IN WILDLIFE CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

By David H. G. Gould *Deputy State Chief*
Law Enforcement Division Georgia Game and Fish Commission

The theme of this year's meeting, Planning for People, Places and Wildlife, is certainly appropriate. The increasing pressures being exerted by people in our expanding population are creating a critical need for additional places to hunt and fish and for intensified management of our wildlife resources.

The 1965 National Survey of Fishing and Hunting revealed that 33 million people in these United States actively engaged in hunting and fishing and that they spent 4 billion dollars in 700 million recreation days while traveling 31 billion passenger miles in pursuit of these worthwhile activities. This was an increase over 1955 of some 8 million sportsmen, 133 million recreation days and 1 billion dollars in expenditures. Projections for the year 1975 indicate that there will very likely be 45 million hunters and fishermen, or even more. Prospects are strong for a future work week of even fewer hours than the 40-hour week which is presently widely accepted, thus accounting for many more millions of recreation days which will be spent in field or stream by people.

Existing places for people to hunt and fish, and the resources which make these places suitable are limited. In many instances they are already threatened by excessive use or actual destruction. The ensuing decades will surely be demanding ones for all who engage in the tasks of maintaining and improving our nation's wildlife. Those of us who fail now to plan for the future will permit our already complex responsibilities to be compounded into insolvable problems.

I strongly feel that law enforcement is an integral part of the total program of wildlife management and that in order for us to properly evaluate its position, we should consider the over-all wildlife program. Each phase is dependent on one or more of the others and without a high degree of coordination and cooperation, the entire program will falter or fail.

Wildlife law enforcement has received attention in varying degrees throughout most of mankind's history. Records of the first attempts to administer game and fish are lost in the unwritten history of primitive tribes. P. A. Taverner, in his *The Law and the Prophets*, developed the theory that tribal taboos which were effective in preserving the game supply helped the tribes using such measures to survive and prosper. Coming down to the first written records, the Mosaic law of Moses is the first restriction on the taking of game in the sense of leaving breeding stock. Then a long step forward in wildlife development is represented by the game laws of Kublai, "The Great Khan", who lived between 1259 and 1294 A.D. He enforced closed seasons during the breeding seasons of important birds and mammals of his empire and also provided winter food for them.

The administration of wildlife as we know it stems from the legal codes of England. From the time of the Norman Conquest in 1066 until the signing of the Magna Charta in 1215, the King owned the wildlife and distributed it as a personal prerogative. The Magna Charta provided that the King still owned the wildlife, but only in his sovereign capacity in trust for his subjects.

When the first colonists arrived in America, they were forced to place dependence on wildlife as a source of food. Therefore, it is not surprising that some of the earliest laws of the Plymouth Colony were concerned with hunting and fishing. As early as

1623, provision was made that these activities were to be free to all members of the colony. In 1646, the town of Portsmouth, R. I. ordered "that there shall be noe shooting of deere from the first of May till the first of November; and if any shall shoot a deere within that time he shall forfeit five pounds; one half to him that sueth, and the other to the Treasury".

At the time of the American Revolution, 12 colonies had enacted limited closed seasons. Georgia's first wildlife conservation law was passed some seven years after the end of the Revolution, in December of 1790. This law declared that it was illegal to hunt deer at night with "firelight" and provided a penalty of five English Pounds and 30 lashes, "well laid".

As human populations increased and those of game and fish decreased, the states developed widely varying laws and organizations to handle wildlife law enforcement. However, even severe restrictions or closed seasons were not bringing back harvestable numbers of game and fish. It therefore became apparent that law enforcement alone was not the entire answer.

There followed eras where emphasis was placed on different phases of management in the hope that each would provide the magic solution to wildlife preservation.

Predator control was perhaps the first of these and dealt more with the predators of big game than with enemies of small game and fish. These early efforts were primarily designed to benefit domestic livestock and the results which may have benefited wildlife are not clearly substantiated.

Soon after predator control was initiated, the refuge era also came into the limelight. The first of these was Yellowstone National Park which was established in 1894. These wildlife sanctuaries were considered areas where game would become abundant, eventually moving outside the established refuge boundaries to produce hunting. This did not prove to be the case and now this practice is usually recommended in the case of waterfowl, rare species, or other circumstances where special control measures are required.

Artificial stocking came next with every state participating in hatcheries to provide more game and fish for the public. However, research soon indicated that very little of the original stock was ever recovered. Today, this "put and take" type of stocking is limited to fill special needs, such as managed trout streams.

All of these early methods were only partly successful. This has perhaps prompted a turn to habitat improvement. The interests displayed in this presently emphasized phase of management are well founded on sound principles, but its potential will only be realized to the extent that land-use and water-use practices can be influenced to conform to the welfare of wildlife.

Wildlife management has been described by R. E. Trippensee in his text on the subject as having many sides and many angles. He states that it is fundamentally the process of making land and water produce sustained crops of wild animals and that while the goal is clear and definite, the roads toward that goal are several and follow numerous byways. He relates that it includes the manipulation of widely varying environments, is concerned with many occupations, and may include encouragement or restraint of both animal populations and human activities.

Due perhaps to the limited area in each state where wildlife conservation agencies can exercise control over the habitat, regulations governing the managing and taking of game and fish are of a nature designed to regulate individuals participating in hunting and fishing activities. In practice, then, wildlife conservation amounts to managing the people who use the resource, rather than managing the resource.

The importance of all of the other skills employed in the management of game and fish resources notwithstanding, it is still necessary to recognize the fundamental principle that without adequate protection of wildlife, no amount of research, development, or habitat management can satisfactorily maintain game and fish populations. Nor can I foresee the day that education measures can accomplish the feat of eliminating the need for guarding our fields and streams against those who would wantonly and intentionally destroy our wildlife.

The wildlife enforcement officer has been serving on the front lines in the battle

for wildlife conservation throughout history. The future promises no "Shangri-La" for these men who form the backbone of the conservation program. Instead, it will require them to accept additional responsibilities in their agency's research and education activities as well as having to cope with more complicated enforcement problems. They will have to meet higher physical and education requirements and complete a rigid training period prior to their field assignments. A merit system will permit those who are capable and conscientious in their profession to receive in-service promotions and, at the same time, eliminate the incompetents or those unwilling to carry their share of the load.

There will be millions more hunters and fishermen appearing each year with more leisure time, faster transportation, and new gadgets which will make increased demands on the available supply of game and fish. Furnishing new and greater supplies of wildlife and suitable places for these animals as well as the people who will demand them will be a challenge to the courage and resourcefulness of administrators, research workers, land managers, education personnel, and enforcement officers alike. Cooperation of all who are engaged in the job of wildlife conservation will be necessary to attain that end.

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN ENFORCEMENT

By Johnie Roy Beam Conservation Officer II

Specifically, public relations is the business of getting along with people, with family and friends, with working associates, with groups of citizens, and with individuals. Sometimes all of us tend to lose our perspective. We forget that the responses we evoke in those around us are almost as important to our successful lives and work as are our own.

Public relations in Conservation Law Enforcement has just as wide a scope as public relations in any other field. But, from the point of view of resource law enforcement personnel, this broad subject can be broken down into four areas:

1. Personal habits
2. Education
3. Communication
4. Cooperation

Just as all of us sometimes do in our everyday lives, it is easy for the game and law enforcement officer to lose his perspective. That is, he forgets that the hunter and fisherman are his "bread and butter", and without them he would be out of work, in fact, he would not be necessary at all. A conservation officer must conduct himself as a public servant. He must regard himself as an active and reliable link between his director and the public he meets in the field.

First, let's discuss personal habits. In order to function effectively, the conservation law enforcement officer must be respected, he must be intelligent, and courteous toward his public while displaying leadership and firmness in carrying out the duties of his position. His chief aim must be to promote public confidence in his Department and respect for the resources of his state and the laws which protect them. In the daily performance of his duties, he should be alert to finding ways of improving this respect; for without it his job would be impossible.

In all supervisory positions, the officer should strive to improve public relations among the men under him. He should receive complaints about his men or their job in a tactful manner, and he should convince the person giving the complaint that the matter will be investigated and appropriate action taken if needed. The way a supervisor receives and handles complaints either makes or breaks him in the eyes of the public and in the eyes of his men. If the public realizes that it can have confidence in the officer, then it will often provide valuable information on violations that are occurring in the area. Without this cooperation, it will be almost impossible to keep things under control. This is one of many reasons why it is