

total realization of all types of development inherent in the project. And perhaps the usual order of enumerating statutory objectives should read: the general public welfare—including flood control, recreation and forestry, navigation, power, and national defense. If wildlife enthusiasts endorse this order of listing they will undoubtedly insist on assuming the major share of the financing. Actually, the listing of objectives proposed here may not be as inconsistent with realism as one may think. In fact, it might be entirely logical. Certainly our aquatic resources should receive a high priority because (1) they are absolutely dependent on an aquatic habitat; (2) they were present in advance of dams, etc.; and (3) the large number of people who have a vital and legitimate interest in the conservation of our aquatic resources for either sport or profit. After the aquatic resources have been taken care of other uses should be accommodated on a natural priority basis. And when we proceed on this basis those human needs—real or assumed that cannot be satisfied except through the use of water would receive a higher priority than those needs that can be met by alternative means. (Examples are readily at hand.) This illustrates the manner in which society would act were it constituted of logical being. However, we are not logical. *And to date our greatest recreational values that have resulted from river developments have been derived as a secondary product from projects authorized for nonrecreational purposes.*

POLITICS IN STATE GAME AND FISH AGENCIES

By CLAUDE D. KELLEY
President, National Wildlife Federation

The organized sportsmen of this country have long worked to get their game and fish departments out of politics. It is one of our time-honored goals. Once having achieved a measure of freedom from politics, then our work becomes defensive as we try to keep that freedom. Or both defensive and offensive, as we try to hold the ground already won and make other advances toward the ideal of "nonpartisan scientific management of natural resources."

All of us have encountered the scoffers, who say we are pursuing an idle dream, a will-o-the-wisp, an illusion. "Politics," they say with reason, "is the very essence of government. You can't take anything in government out of politics."

In a way, of course, the scoffers are right. In a way we wouldn't want to take any part of government out of politics. It depends on how you define politics.

In its broad and classical sense, the word *politics* means the art and science of popular government. It comes from the Greek word, "politikos," meaning "of the citizen." In an old-fashioned kingdom or in a modern dictatorship, this would mean, I suppose, the ruling or the manipulation "of the citizen." The control of the masses.

But in a democracy like the United States it means government "of the people, by the people, for the people." In this country the people are sovereign. They exercise their sovereignty at the polling places. And no game and fish department, or conservation commission, no matter how insulated from partisan and legislative pressures, no matter how buttressed with constitutional authority and civil service laws, can escape or ignore its ultimate ruler—namely, the people.

Take the Missouri Conservation Commission, for example. The Missouri system is generally considered to be about the ultimate in freedom from partisan politics. But who established the present form of wildlife and forestry administration in the Show-me State? Nobody but the people. The voters. They did it by passing a constitutional amendment that created a four-member, bipartisan commission (and for practical purposes, a nonpartisan commission) as their agent for managing fish and game and forestry resources. They took all powers to make wildlife regulation, including the setting of license fees, out of the hands of the legislature and gave those powers to the new commission. They took all personnel matters out of the reach of the political patronage handlers and gave them to the commission. They gave the commission *almost* complete

control over wildlife and forestry matters, as far as state government can go—almost, but not quite.

The voters established the Missouri Commission by constitutional amendment and they can, by the same route, abolish the commission. They can change its form or clip its wings, if at any time it fails to do the kind of conservation job that is pleasing to the sovereign, namely, the people of the state. They also can harass the commission, or pressure it in a number of ways. They can use their elected representatives in the state legislature to withhold or delay appropriations—even though under the Constitution the game and fish license revenues cannot be used for any other purpose. They can launch investigations and keep the commission and its staff squirming on the hot seat for weeks or months.

Furthermore, for all its independence, the Missouri Commission has to operate within the general framework of government. It can make regulations but cannot prescribe punishment. Violators are punishable only by virtue of legislative enactment. Violators have to be tried in the courts according to judicial processes separately established by constitutional and legislative authority. The commission's educational programs cannot be truly successful without the cooperation of the State Department of Education and other state institutions. Other parts of the conservation program also depend on inter-agency relationships.

Neither Missouri commissioners, although quite secure in their six-year terms, nor the merit-selected personnel can afford to forget for a minute these political facts of life. If you look at the skillful publicity and public relations operations of the Missouri Commission, you can see that they are not forgetting them.

So our friends who say we can't take game and fish administration out of politics are, in this sense, quite correct. You can't escape responsibility to the voters. The legislature has to be dealt with, and worked with, under any set-up. The courts have to be dealt with, and worked with. Other executive departments have to be dealt with, and worked with. The conservation agency that tried to work in a political vacuum would soon smother itself to death.

But there are other and more common ways to define "politics." To the average American, the word means the organization and the methods of political parties and factions. It is the art and science of winning and holding public office, of getting and keeping government jobs. It is a system that depends on rewarding the friends and supporters of a party or a candidate—of receiving favors and granting favors. It involves, in the famous phrase of Andrew Jackson, the philosophy that "to the victor belongs the spoils." It is within this concept of the system as played to the hilt by robust politicians, that abuses have occurred. Abuses of the "spoils system," and of "patronage."

When we speak of taking conservation out of politics, we mean taking it out from under the crippling influence of such partisan abuses.

Before this audience, I do not have to prove that the conservation and management of natural resources is a scientific, long-range business. It cannot be accomplished under policies and programs that change every time a new party or faction takes over in the governor's mansion. It cannot be done with personnel that get their jobs as rewards for rounding up voters on election day. This business can be run only by trained technicians and high-caliber public servants who aren't likely to be attracted to the profession in the first place if the only future it offers is short-term jobs under partisan domination.

Wildlife management is a business that has to be run according to long-range biological principles and objectives—such as establishing cover on the land—and short-range biological realities—such as how successful was this year's quail hatch. Both the long-range principles and short-range realities have to be determined by scientific methods of research. It is not a business that can be run on the basis of responding to pressure groups or handing out favors to the folks in the home county.

Neither can a state conservation program be run on the basis of sectional or regional apportionment of jobs, expenditures and projects. In no state do the patterns of fish and wildlife habitat, or the hunting and fishing opportunities, sort themselves out according to the artificial boundaries of counties and senatorial districts.

Nor can the regulation of wildlife harvests—the setting of seasons, bag limits and methods of take—be most efficiently handled in the crowded, partisan atmosphere of the annual or biennial sessions of the state legislature. Regulation of the harvest is an essential part of the scientific business of wildlife management. And while the sporting customs and desires of the hunters and fishermen have to be accommodated to a degree, the regulations have to be consistent with the biological facts or the result may be either damage to the resource or a waste of harvestable crops.

So our purpose in taking conservation out of politics has been to eliminate the abuses of the spoils system, of sectionalism, and of regulations by pressure. Our goal has been to establish a climate under which wildlife resources can be conserved and managed according to scientific principles “for the greatest good of the largest number in the long run.” I guess the conservation-minded citizens of America have been working toward this goal for more than half a century. How well have we succeeded?

For the purpose of presenting this paper I tried to find out. At this point I want to acknowledge the invaluable assistance and counsel of Ernie Swift, the distinguished and able executive director of the National Wildlife Federation. Ernie, as all of you know, is exceedingly well versed in this subject. He came up through the ranks, starting as a game warden when a young man and serving seven years as director of the Wisconsin Conservation Department before taking the position of assistant director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He came from the Fish and Wildlife Service to head up the work of the Federation. He has, during his career, seen, felt and grappled with political pressures of all sorts. He has been a valiant warrior in the long fight to free conservation from the abuses of partisanship.

Mr. Swift prepared a questionnaire and sent it to the game and fish director or commissioner in each of the 48 states. In order to get frank answers, he promised to keep all the replies confidential and not to identify any of the data by states. So please don't ask me to show you the returns, or tell you the answers, from any state or group of states.

Neither will the returns be tabulated by regions or groups of states. The purpose was to get a picture of the degree of involvement in partisan politics, or freedom from political abuses, for the country as a whole.

Replies were received from 47 of the 48 states. This was a splendid response. We thank the directors for their cooperation.

Extra copies of this paper are available and the questionnaire forms as sent to the states are attached. You will note there are two forms. One is for the states having the cabinet type, or single-commissioner form of administration, as we have here in Alabama. There are nine such states.

The other form is for the states having game and fish programs headed up by, and more or less under the direction of, a multi-membered commission. In some states the commission is called a “board” or a “council.”

A few states have a combination of the two forms, where the fish and game commission or council has been created within, and as part of, an over-all natural resources department headed by a single administrator.

Actually we received 48 replies, as Pennsylvania has two separate commissions, one for fish and one for game, and both returned the questionnaire.

Some of the questions applied only to the single-commissioner type department; others applied only to the multi-membered commissions. Some directors left some of the questions blank, while answering most of them, so the tabulated totals of the various answers will vary in number.

Admittedly this survey attempts to measure only the outward forms of partisan control. It does not probe or pretend to disclose some of the more devious and subtle forms of political influence. But we think it provides a fair measurement of the degree of success we have attained, in the nation as a whole, in our long campaign against partisan abuses.

Frankly, we were pleasantly surprised by our findings. We have come a long way in elevating the management of wildlife resources to the status of a long-range, scientific business conducted in the best traditions of free America for the “greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.”

The survey also revealed the battle is far from finally won. We have plenty of work yet to do, but the successes to date encourage us to keep up the fight.

Most of us can remember when, in our states, the game wardens were outright political job-holders, beholden to the party or a political boss. They were supposed to enforce the game laws. But between times they did a variety of chores for the party, such as tacking up campaign posters, organizing or helping with political rallies, escorting voters to the polls, etc. In those days enforcement frequently was applied on a partisan basis; if one had pull with the politicians in charge, he could violate the game laws with impunity.

Today that picture has changed. Of the 47 states that replied, 43 said the conservation officers no longer did such political chores. Many said such activities are absolutely forbidden by law or policy.

In two of the questionnaires returned, this question was left unanswered. Two others said such practices have existed recently but have been eliminated under the present administration.

Other questions verified the improvement: Forty-three states said the wardens do not turn over with a change in partisan control of the state government. Four said the warden staff may partially turn over, and four admitted the enforcement officers are considered the patronage of either the governor or of state legislators.

In all nine of the states having the pure single-commissioner type administration, the commissioner or head of the department is a political appointee of the governor. The legislature has retained all or part of the regulation-making authority in all nine of these states. In seven of them the commissioner shares the regulation-making power.

In states having commissions, the director is nevertheless usually or always subject to replacement when a new governor takes over in ten of the states sending in replies. Two others said this was possible; nineteen said this never happens. Thirty-five states said the director, under their commissions, are not political appointees.

Only one state said section and division chiefs turn over with a change in political control; another said this sometimes happens. Only one state said such jobs as fish hatchery superintendents and refuge managers are patronage plums.

All staff employees are under civil service law in 25 of the states sending in replies; one said part of the staff is under civil service. Four others operate under their own departmental form of civil service or merit system, which may have some advantages, being more flexible than a statewide system. Fifteen said they have no civil service system and two did not answer this question.

Of the 40 state commissions represented in the replies, including two in Pennsylvania, 17 are bipartisan but only five are evenly so—that is, required to have the same number of Republicans and Democrats. Twenty-three said their commissions are not bipartisan and these include several so-called one-party states of the South and some of the similarly one-party states of the North, as in some of the New England states where Democratic governors are as unheard of as Republican governors in the deep South.

In only four states, according to the replies, does the governor have the power to completely overturn the commission, by firing the old members and appointing new ones, if he so desires. In many states, of course, during the course of his term and in the regular expiration of terms, the governor will appoint a controlling number of the commission.

In 34 of the 40 commissions the terms are five years or longer, and in 39 of them the terms are staggered. These are two devices for insuring continuity of policy and preventing a complete turn-over of the commission during the four-year term of a governor.

In one state, and I shall name it—Nevada—because this is no secret, the members of the game and fish commission are elected by popular vote, one from each county, 17 in all. The political implications and problems inherent in the Nevada system are apparent.

In another state, Tennessee, the nine members of the commission are appointed from a slate of five elected by the public in each of nine districts.

New Jersey, one of the few states having a combination of a single-headed department and a commission, has an interesting system of selecting the members of its first and game council. Six of the members are selected by the State Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs; three are farmers named by a state agricultural convention; and two are commercial fishermen selected by the governor.

The average number of members of state commissions is seven. In a few states the governor serves ex officio as a member of the commission and wields the balance of political power.

Thirty-seven of the commissions have all or part of the regulation-making authority. In forty-two of the states where the commissioner or a commission has regulation-making authority, 23 of the replies indicated that political pressures are brought to bear in attempts to influence the regulations. Twenty-one said this never happens. Four did not answer this question.

The members of only 12 state commissions are appointed from the state at large. Twenty-six said the commissioners were selected by districts. Of these twenty-six, twenty-three said the commissioners often or sometimes let sectional considerations influence them in making regulations and policy. Three said this never happens.

In decisions affecting expenditures, as in the placing of projects, sectional considerations occur "often" in two states, "sometimes" in 14, "never" in 10.

In hiring of personnel, sectional considerations enter "sometimes" in 9 states, "never" in 17.

Even in the 12 states having commissions at large, 9 said sectional considerations sometimes influence decisions. This is when a member of the commission feels he has to show the folks back home he can get projects approved for his county or his district regardless of the merits of the case.

We have to admit that in some instances the replies to this questionnaire may have been colored by the individual's own prejudices. Some no doubt are so close to their own situations they "can't see the forest for the trees." But on the whole, the frankness of the replies indicate a genuine understanding of the political problems faced by the state administrators. On the whole, they reflect an honest recognition of the abuses or shortcomings that still exist. And, I repeat, the sum total of the survey presents a hopeful picture. We have come a long way in our campaign to get rid of the political abuses. We can see the way clearly for further advances.

Complete and mail to:

Ernest Swift, Executive Director
National Wildlife Federation
232 Carroll St., N. W.
Washington 12, D. C.

August 20, 1957

QUESTIONS FOR COMMISSION-TYPE DEPARTMENTS

(Check replies)

1. How many members on your commission?..... Are they appointed by the Governor? Yes..... No..... Length of terms?..... Are the terms staggered or overlapping? Yes..... No.....
2. Is your commission bi-partisan by law or constitutional provision? Yes..... No. If so, how many members are required to be Republican?..... How many Democrats?.....
3. If not bi-partisan, does the political complexion of your commission usually change when one party replaces the other in the office of Governor? Yes..... No.....
4. Does a new Governor have the power to turn over the commission, if he so desires? Yes..... No.....
5. If the political complexion of your commission changes with a change in Governor, does that mean the director (or chief administrative officer) of the department also changes? Usually..... Never..... Sometimes.....
6. Even though you have a commission, is your director (or chief administrative officer) a political appointee and subject to replacement when a new Governor takes over? Yes..... No..... How about division or section

- chiefs? Yes..... No..... Do such employees as hatchery superintendents and area managers change? Yes..... No..... Does the enforcement staff turn over with a change in state administration? Yes..... No..... Partly.....
7. In practice, are the enforcement officers regarded as the "patronage" of the Governor? Yes..... No..... Of the State Senators or Representatives? Yes..... No.....
 8. Do your enforcement officers ever engage in such activities as:
 - (a) Tacking up campaign posters?.....
 - (b) Helping with political rallies?.....
 - (c) Transporting voters to the polls?.....
 - (d) Making political speeches?.....
 - (e) Collecting or disbursing party campaign funds?.....
 9. Does your commission have power to make hunting and fishing regulations? Yes..... No..... If so, are political pressures brought to bear, from the Governor or state legislators, or other political leaders, in an effort to influence the regulations? Never..... Sometimes.....
 10. Are your staff employees selected under, and protected in their tenure by, a state merit system or Civil Service law? Yes..... No.....
 11. Are your commissioners appointed from the state at large or from designated districts or regions of the state? At large..... From districts..... If appointed from districts, do they have a tendency to let sectional considerations influence their decisions in making regulations and policy? Often..... Sometimes..... Never..... Do they let sectional considerations influence them in approving expenditures, as for projects? Often..... Sometimes..... Never..... Do they let sectional considerations influence them in selecting or approving personnel, as in the hiring of enforcement officers or other field men? Sometimes..... Never.....
 12. If appointed at large, do your commissioners let sectional considerations influence their decisions? Often..... Sometimes..... Never.....
- Sign if you want to:.....

Complete and mail to:
 Ernest Swift, Executive Director
 National Wildlife Federation
 232 Carroll St., N. W.
 Washington 12, D. C.

August 20, 1957

QUESTIONS FOR SINGLE-TYPE COMMISSIONER OR CABINET-TYPE DEPARTMENTS

(Check replies)

1. Is the commissioner (or chief administrative officer) a political appointee of the Governor? Yes..... No..... Is he under Civil Service or state merit system? Yes..... No.....
2. Does the commissioner (or chief administrative officer) have the power to make hunting and fishing regulations? Yes..... No..... Are such regulations made by legislative enactment- Yes..... No.....
3. If the commissioner (or chief administrative officer) is a political appointee and changes when a new Governor takes over, do top staff administrators such as section chiefs generally change at the same time? Yes..... No..... Do such employees as hatchery superintendents and area managers change? Yes..... No..... Does the enforcement staff turn over with a change in state administration? Yes..... No..... Partly.....
4. In practice, are the enforcement officers regarded as the "patronage" of the Governor? Yes..... No..... Of the State Senators or Representatives? Yes..... No.....
5. If the commissioner (or chief administrative officer) has hunting and fishing regulatory powers, are political pressures brought to bear, as from the Governor or state legislators, in an effort to influence the regulations? Never..... Sometimes.....
6. Are your staff employees selected under, and protected in their tenure by, a state merit system or Civil Service law? Yes..... No.....

7. Do your enforcement officers ever engage in such activities as :

- (a) Tacking up campaign posters?.....
- (b) Helping with political rallies?.....
- (c) Transporting voters to the polls?.....
- (d) Making political speeches?.....
- (e) Collecting or disbursing party campaign funds?.....

Sign if you want to :.....

TECHNICAL GAME SESSION

FOREIGN GAME INTRODUCTIONS INTO THE SOUTHEAST

By DR. GARDINER BUMP

*Biologist in Charge of Foreign Game Introductions,
Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife*

In a certain sense the following discussion on exotic species is the strangest as well as the most controversial subject on this program. It is strange because everyone here is himself, in the not too distant past, a transplant from a foreign country. The clothes we are wearing, the food we ate for lunch and the orderly processes of our civilization all have their antecedents beyond the shores of North America. Their introduction and subsequent adaptation to our particular needs is one of the richest and most colorful sagas in the history of civilization.

Change is a law of life and changes for the better are the cornerstones of progress. Small wonder is it then that man's faith in bettering his lot with new things from beyond his own doorstep is deeply ingrained in all the world's progressive people. It is this combination of experience, faith and hope that, in our own field, sparks the hunters' search for new game species.

But not all changes are for the better and here the controversy begins between those who would chance the risks involved in change and those who prefer the status quo. As regards wildlife introductions both groups can present points worthy of serious consideration. Those in favor point to the success attendant upon the introduction of the ring-necked pheasant, the Hungarian partridge and the chukar and the constantly decreasing productivity of many game habitats under the pressure of modern agriculture, forestry and grazing. Those against remind us of the time, labor and money wasted in the many unsuccessful attempts, of the danger of introducing new diseases or of a species that might compete successfully with our native fauna or prove detrimental to farm or forest crops.

Faced with such a situation experience has indicated a logical course of action. Simply put, it is to determine the need, calculate the risks and, if action is indicated, formulate and carry out the project in such a way as to court success while reducing the danger of unfavorable results to a minimum.

Let us explore this course. The need can be set forth in simple terms. Year by year the number of individuals seeking relaxation through hunting is increasing. Yet the area available for this sport is slowly decreasing. Likewise, much of the habitat which mothers our game crop is becoming less and less able to produce shootable surpluses under the impact of clean farming, over-grazing, drainage, scientific forestry, urbanization and declining soil fertility.

Faced with this situation, common sense dictates the present all-out effort to increase habitat productivity. But there are many habitats which have been so thoroughly changed by man that native game species can no longer maintain themselves therein in numbers sufficient to provide good hunting. Competing interests and the cost of reversing this trend are such that only a fraction of these lands can be restored to reasonable productivity in the foreseeable future. There are other coverts which were never fully occupied by native game birds or mammals possessing the characteristics requisite to survival in the face of today's intensive hunting pressure. For these, new, adaptable species possessing