

not great; and (4) rapid reduction in the proportion of harvestable fish in the population by angling led to an unbalanced condition.

LITERATURE CITED

- Swingle, H. S. 1950. Relationships and dynamics of balanced and unbalanced fish populations. Auburn University (API). Agri. Expt. Sta. Bul. 274: 74p.
- _____. 1956. Determination of balance in farm fish ponds. Trans. N. Am. Wild. Conf. 21: 298-318.
- _____. and E. V. Smith. 1947. Management of farm fish ponds. (revised). Auburn Univ. (API) Agri. Expt. Sta. Bul. 254: 30p.

COOPERATION BETWEEN ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

BY LT. COL. CARL L. MILLER
Arkansas State Police

It is a pleasure to appear before this law enforcement section of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners. I feel like I am more familiar with your problems as Game and Fish Enforcement Officers than the average police officer because of my earlier close association with the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission which dates many years back, and while we are talking about many years ago, I am reminded of an early experience that brought about a better understanding between my own agency, the State Police, and the Game and Fish Enforcement Officers.

If Orville Swope is here he will bear witness to this story and I am ashamed to tell exactly how long ago it has been, but it was back when the Game and Fish Commission first started trapping deer in the overstocked area of the Scylamore Forest and transferring them to other sections of the State. The Scylamore Forest, as some of you know, is located up near the North Ozark section of Arkansas and back in those days, was pretty much of a wilderness. The natives living in the area of the Scylamore Forest at that time resented the Game and Fish Agents coming in there and trapping *their* deer as they called them. Today, of course, we would wonder why the people would feel that way about the matter of conservation, but then we can go back when our forefathers came into the wilderness of this country and were few and far between and usually wanted to move on whenever they saw the smoke rising from the next settlement camp. Every man was on his own and every man as good as every other man and a whole sight better in those days—they had to be in order to survive. He was a law unto himself until neighbors with the same idea moved in close enough to cross each other's paths, step on each other's toes and get into each other's hair. At this point the law for one had to become the law for all and liberty within the law became the slogan for survival.

It is not strange that men with this pioneering background would oppose the taking of the deer from the lands they called their own, even though it belongs to their government, because they had been shooting them any part of the season as the need arose. It is not strange that they should oppose conservation when they had been making cider out of their own apples and wine out of their own grapes and lightening out of their own corn. They opposed the transfer of these deer because they lived in a land of plenty and probably didn't want the rest of the people in the State to share the wildlife that they considered theirs.

This resentment grew and they posted signs in the Forest warning the Wardens to stay out. They even chopped up a number of the deer traps and took some random shots at some of the Agents.

I was sent up into the Forest to work with the Game and Fish Commission in resolving their difficulties. Orville Swope and myself camped out in the Forest for about 10 days and finally one morning found where some deer had been killed and the investigation developed

some tracks of horses that we were able to trail out of the Forest for some 15 miles where they forded Buffalo River to a path that led up to a log house on the side of a mountain where we were able to obtain enough evidence to make a case and took them to court, where justice was done in mountain style. I don't believe that they ever paid a fine, but in our dealings with them they were convinced that we meant business and, I am sure, had a better understanding for the work that the Game and Fish was doing. Through the cooperation of our agencies, the problem was resolved.

Although the broadened term of law enforcement applies to both criminal and civil aspects and the rights and remedies are about parallel, and since we in this group are more interested in the minor criminal aspect, my remarks are being directed along this line.

Let us examine violations for a minute and then we can better appreciate our joint mutual problems. Without quoting statistics at any great length about the increasing traffic fatality toll, let us reflect on some of the comments made by recent senate investigation criminal committees on the trend of lawlessness in our country, and that if it is not checked and thrown into reverse, there can be no question about the outcome. Here then, is not only our problem but our challenge. You are a group of enforcement officers and your oath of office commits you to the side of civilization, and you are natural enemies of law violators. Although this is true, it does not naturally follow that we alone as officers are the prime target of the violating forces, but the job itself is. Unfortunately we cannot always be provided sufficient funds to meet the proportionate need for additional personnel and equipment to assist us in its battle, and those of you who live in Arkansas and read the newspapers know that I speak from experience. It is therefore necessary for us to improve our own agencies and constantly be alert for better improvement methods. What then is the answer? What is our best combative equipment against our common law violators?

In searching for new methods, the effect of establishing a centralized inner-jurisdictional law enforcement agency at one time was advocated. We certainly, in America, do not want one single jurisdictional agency. History has taught many grim lessons illustrating a single Police Unit. It is no better than its leadership. Today, in this unsettled world, we can look around and see numerous examples illustrating this viewpoint.

This is not the answer to the enforcement problem. It is obvious that the key to successful enforcement might be attached to the theory of cooperation and teamwork executed by the fellow officers at all levels and between the public which we serve.

I once heard that the definition of cooperation was "Let's get together and do something for me." Certainly this is selfish reasoning but I believe if we were to change this slightly to say, "Let's get together and do something for each other," we would get straight to the heart of our problem and the community would benefit. This would apply not only to ourselves as officers, but between ourselves and the public as well. The old saying that two heads are better than one would certainly apply toward effectuating effective enforcement action, so let's get together and assume this matter of cooperation as we agree that it is the tool that might provide the stop to rising traffic and conservation violations. We should first consider cooperation among ourselves as officers. The need has been explained and the next step is implementation to get started. This meeting here today is another step in that direction. We can exchange ideas and thoughts if we talk before any mutual problems develop, while getting better acquainted and certainly better acquaintances promotes friendship and assist in the development of a common bond. If we can do this before any other problems develop, it will be easier for us to work together when other problems arise. It will be an opportunity for better communication and we can transmit ideas for the most effective solution. I have noted sometimes among enforcement officers that there is not a free flow of cooperation because the officers asking or accepting help or assistance from another agency is afraid he is laying himself

or his agency open to the domination of the agency from which the help is being requested. A voluntary free flow of information between agencies should be established. I don't believe there is any agency here that fails to have sufficient work in their own jurisdiction and in most cases more than they can do, so it would appear to be a baseless fear of losing jurisdiction to fail to ask for cooperation on this ground alone.

The public measures us more by current service than by past experiences. We must, then, present a good image of enforcement to them. We must let them know who we are, what duties and services we perform, how we operate and why it is necessary to enforce the laws. This is our responsibility to them. If we do these things in a proper manner, then each citizen will want to help the enforcement program and be more inclined to cooperate with us. Our job then resolves itself to a matter of education. To help the citizens with this education, we must always bear in mind that every contact with the public puts enforcement on trial. Here again, comes the police image or public relation. It can be good and reflect favorably, or reflect adversely, depending on the contact. I think it is important that we officers keep in mind three principles: 1. Courtesy, 2. Reasonableness and 3. Consideration. If these are foremost in the enforcement officer's mind, then in most cases it will be met by understanding and acceptance. We will then have a favorable atmosphere and common ground for meeting. Usually, the public will then accept us as the guardian of fundamental rights and will come to our aid in the performance of these duties. It is then that we must guide and direct this willingness to help since we are so much more aware of the benefits to be derived.

I feel that here in Arkansas our relationship with the Game and Fish Commission has been one of the best. We have met together, we have talked together, and worked together for the mutual benefit of ourselves and the public that we serve. The Game and Fish Commission here in Arkansas is a highly respected enforcement unit which is evidenced by the fact that Aubrey Fowler, their Chief Enforcement Officer has served as President of the Arkansas Peace Officers Association, and I can go a little bit further and say that he is one president that continued to work after he vacated the office.

I certainly hope that you will have a most enjoyable conference and we realize the importance of this meeting here in Arkansas. We in the Arkansas State Police Department will do everything possible to make your visit here a most pleasant one.

To those of you who may not have visited around Arkansas very much, we hope that you may have that opportunity before you leave. To those of you who have not visited the east central part of the state where rice fields, white river and ducks are very much in evidence, I would say that you are missing something.

It has been a pleasure to be with you today.

PREPARATION FOR UNDERCOVER WORK IN PURCHASING GAME AND FISH

BY RALPH HARRIS

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Undercover work is an important tool in enforcement due to local agents being known by the public. The local agent may have knowledge of what sales violations are taking place but unable to apprehend due to tipoffs and, as I said before, being known in the area.

Planning for undercover work should start at least a year before an agent begins operation in a state. Information from field agents should be assembled at state headquarters as secretly as possible to avoid knowledge of agents that an undercover program is planned. This secrecy is not because you do not trust your own employees, it is