

An interesting highlight developed during the court proceedings in this case. The officer who was in charge of the area when Bill was employed by our Commission was present at the proceedings. Bill remarked to this officer, "When you were here in charge of this district we used to call you *foxy*, but since this development I am convinced you couldn't carry a candle to these fellows." This remark obviously was prompted by the technique used to apprehend these individuals.

While we are on the subject of court proceedings involving special investigation cases, I wish to point out that the defense, without exception, always attempts to establish *the defense of entrapment*. I am pleased to inform you they have been totally unsuccessful in their efforts. Obviously, their reason for using this avenue of approach is because they have no other defense. They recognize that the evidence is *overwhelmingly against them and their only hope is to establish entrapment or procedural technicalities*. The fact that the defense of entrapment has never been sustained by the Courts is a commendable record for the investigators and certainly reflects their proper training on this vital subject.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I can only evaluate our special investigation program in Pennsylvania as having been a *total success*. We have reached law enforcement objectives *far beyond* our expectations. As we evaluate our present and projected law enforcement needs, we are indeed confident that our special investigation program has adequately met our law enforcement needs of today and the projected future.

I thank you for this opportunity to discuss our special investigation program in Pennsylvania. We stand willing and ready to lend every possible assistance to any of you in organizing such a program.

At this time I will be pleased to entertain questions.

THE ANTI-GUN MOVEMENT AND ITS POSSIBLE EFFECT ON WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

By David Swindell

Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Some 179 years ago the drafters of our Constitution deemed it necessary to guarantee rights and protections to the citizens of our new nation. This Bill of Rights was designed to protect the people against encroachments upon the rights of minority groups by majorities; to insure protections to majorities from unjust treatment by minority groups; and to guard against the erosion of the rights of the people by government. Among the ten guarantees of this Bill of Rights is the second, which provides "...the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

The shooting of Senator Robert Kennedy in early June by an assassin — who incidentally, violated no less than five laws of the State of California relating to the possession and carrying of a pistol — unleashed a period of public reaction which at its peak has bordered on mass hysteria. This reaction was, without question, born in the revulsion of society to the horrifying knowledge that the violence of assassination had again struck our nation. Our society in its anguish seized upon an inanimate object—the gun—as its scapegoat to the problem.

There followed a mounting drive against the gun as a symbol of violence which had, in the minds of many, no purpose except to kill fellow human beings. Legitimate recreational uses of the gun for hunting, target shooting, collecting by hobbyists, as well as the equally justified and Constitutionally protected right to gun ownership for personal protection were completely forgotten. Since early June the people of this country have been subjected to a barrage of antigun arguments and persuasion which mounted to one of the most massive propaganda campaigns ever launched. Antigun feeling reached the stage of hysteria as it was fanned by television programs throughout the nation, by radio, by newspapers, and by magazines. Magazines such as *Reader's Digest*, *Time*, *Life*, *Newsweek*, and *The New Yorker*

joined the drive to abolish guns as tools of evil. Even *McCall's Magazine* counselled its readers to dispose of their guns and to disarm their children of their toy guns! The leading Russian newspaper also added its voice to the clamor to disarm Americans. Cries against guns were raised by national, state, and local political figures and by those aspiring to political office; by movie actors — many of whom achieved their fame by purveying violence; by ministers both protestant and catholic; by local civic groups and youth groups; by various labor unions, and by a former astronaut. Not surprisingly, many organizations who are linked with subversive activities in this country also supported such efforts. As the nationwide antigun feeling grew, major gun manufacturers, among them Winchester, Remington, and Savage, abandoned their early resistance to severely restrictive gun legislation and extended their support. In this campaign, all sorts of fallacious and distorted arguments have been used by the antigun forces. Distortions ranging from the quoting of fabricated statistics, accusations of the criminality of gun owners to the charge by one Northern politician that gun owners are displaying their sexual impotency by opposing gun legislation. Unquestionably, many persons have joined the drive as an opportunity for personal publicity and notoriety rather than because of personal convictions.

In the early days of the movement, the objective was "control" and pledges were frequently made that no intent existed to restrict or hamper the ownership of guns by law abiding citizens for legitimate purposes. However, as support grew "control" became "registration," "required permission to acquire or to own" and finally as presently proposed by some over-zealous legislators today, to confiscation and the ultimate abolishment of guns in private ownership.

As feeling against guns was fanned by these zealots, attacks were carried further to abolish the toy guns of children as symbols of violence which would undoubtedly lead our youth to become criminals. When I consider that toy guns were unquestionably my favorite childhood toy, I must shudder at my own narrow escape from a life of crime. Many department stores achieved wide publicity by their announcement of the removal of such symbols of violence from sale.

In the ensuing months, the tempo of already accelerated restrictive firearms legislation has increased tremendously. Laws have been enacted by Congress, by the State legislatures, and by every form of local government. Indeed, the numbers of such acts presently under consideration for possible adoption will unquestionably number in the thousands. In my home state, several large cities have recently adopted firearms registration laws. One of the cities not only required the registration of handguns, rifles, and shotguns; but also saw fit to include underwater spear guns as well.

Through this whole period the sportsmen of the nation have been relatively silent and their interests are in jeopardy today. For this reason we should consider the probable impact of severely restrictive gun laws upon wildlife conservation and recreational hunting in our Nation.

The history of wildlife conservation in this country is one of belated and often minimal efforts in the early years. Awareness for the necessity of careful regulation and management of the resources has grown into a potent force within the last 50 years. Along with this awareness came the establishment of Wildlife Commissions in each state. Wildlife conservation today is a reality and through the efforts of dedicated members of these state commissions, many species of wildlife are more abundant today than they were a century ago. In almost all cases the funds for such operations have been provided, not from revenue derived from general taxation, but by the hunters and sportsmen of the country who have themselves financed the programs through their purchase of licenses and equipment. Few other branches of outdoor recreation can claim such a record.

Perhaps the greatest happening of the wildlife conservation movement came in 1937 with the enactment of the Pittman-Robertson Act which provides funds to the states to develop and implement sound wildlife management practices. Monies for this act are derived from a federal tax on the sporting arms and ammunition purchased by sportsmen. It has been rightly said that this act opened an era of modern wildlife management practices which have resulted in the return to relative

abundance by many wildlife species formerly bordering on extinction in many areas.

Without doubt, the financing of wildlife conservation activities derives primarily from money spent by our sportsmen for the privilege of enjoying the sport of *hunting*. In my home state, Florida, as in many others no funds from general state tax revenues have ever been provided to finance the operation of our game and fish commission.

Under severely restrictive gun laws, the sale of sporting arms and ammunition will most certainly be drastically reduced. The direct result will be that wildlife federal aid funds allocated to the states will be sharply cut and many desirable programs will be forced to discontinue for lack of operational funds.

Two proposals presented to the Congress directly relate to these Pittman-Robertson monies. One of these will withhold such funds from any state which fails to enact gun control laws in compliance with Federally established requirements. The other will simply take over both Pittman-Robertson and Duck Stamp monies for the Federal operation of a national system of gun registration and control. The fact that these funds, which come almost wholly from recreational shooting by law abiding citizens of the nation will be used to handicap and harass such recreational use under the guise of controlling criminal use of firearms is a supreme irony. We can only regard the passage of either of these acts as a direct blow to the conservation movement since they divert funds provided solely by our nation's sportsmen for wildlife conservation and restoration.

Unquestionably state funds from the sale of hunting licenses will suffer serious reductions. This decline in license sales can be expected from two sources: First, the restrictions and harassment to which the sportsmen will be subjected will undoubtedly cause many to turn to some other form of recreation. Secondly, many youth and other persons who otherwise might take up hunting as a new recreational pursuit will be turned from this sport by the massive propaganda which has presented guns as instruments of violence whose only purpose is to kill fellow humans.

A look at firearms sales outlets is revealing. Throughout the nation, hundreds of large department stores have discontinued the sale of all firearms; many have likewise stopped the sale of ammunition. In my home city, every chain department store which offered firearms for sale last May has made significant changes in the sale of firearms. . . usually amounting to a total discontinuance. Both Montgomery Ward and Sears Roebuck — the traditional source of supply for the rural residents' needs for over 50 years — have through their present policies made it impossible for the customer to take delivery of even a 22 rifle or ammunition by mail. In Chicago, the gun racks of Abercrombie and Fitch are bare. The loss of tax monies from these sales outlets alone will make serious reductions in future wildlife conservation funds.

When we look at the results of a questionnaire sent to randomly selected independent gun dealers, however, the picture becomes less bleak. Surprisingly, most dealers in the Southeast report that their sales since May have not declined as compared to a similar period last year. Many of these dealers indicate increases in sales; few have made any changes in their sales policies since last January; and some are optimistic regarding sales throughout the remainder of the year. The diversity of these replies seems to indicate uncertainty regarding the future. Because of the very poor response to the questionnaire, no conclusion could be reached regarding anticipated trends, but it appears that increases of sales may be due to a fear of future controls. In fact, it is perhaps a significant commentary on the times to note that one large distributor reported a sales increase of about 50% on rifles but an increase of 80% in hand gun sales.

Finally, let us consider the gun, not as a source of operating funds vital to wildlife conservation, but as the essential tool of wildlife management. Guns in the hands of the nations' hunters are the only effective means available to us to efficiently manipulate wildlife populations. The conservation and management of wildlife requires that surplus animals be harvested. Many states today are facing problems of over-populations of deer, and such herds cannot be effectively controlled without the gun. Some states have deer populations which are presently difficult to harvest properly with the present number of hunters. Consider the plight of such an area if

hunting pressure were reduced by 50% or more. Without reasonable hunting pressure available as a management tool, the problems of over-populations of game species with the attendant over-grazing, destruction of habitat, starvation and major die-offs will become frequent problems facing our conservation agencies.

The sportsmen of this nation are not assassins, not murderers, not robbers; they do not commit crimes of violence, they are essentially law abiding members of our society. This fact can clearly be substantiated by the records of the game law enforcement officers of this nation. Rarely indeed do any of our officers encounter any game law violator who resorts to his gun to resist apprehension although he be under cover of night and in a remote area.

Efforts toward the control of crime are badly needed in this era of increasing lawlessness; but such efforts should properly be directed toward the control and punishment of the lawless members of our society. The problem of guns in crime can never be adequately solved by control measures directed at the tool rather than at the criminal who uses a firearm unlawfully.

The sportsmen of this country presently have the greatest threat to their future enjoyment of the wildlife resources before them; and their failure to act to protect their interests may result in the eventual abolishment of hunting as a recreational pursuit. Wildlife conservationists and sportsmen alike must raise their voices to counteract extremist views against guns. They must reiterate that guns have a proper and legitimate use in our present society, and assert their views to their elected representatives.

Justice Brandeis many years ago made a statement which seems particularly applicable to this issue:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty, when the government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are particularly alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in the insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning but without understanding."

SOME GENERAL ASPECTS OF HUMAN MOTIVATION

*By Major Brantley Goodson, Chief
Law Enforcement Division*

Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Knowing what a person can do if he used his abilities is one thing but getting him to use those abilities is quite a different and more challenging problem. The answer lies in the fact that people differ not only in their abilities and training but also in their "will to do" — their motivation. Performance depends on ability and motivation. If motivation is low, performance will suffer just as if ability is low.

MOTIVATION

A practical definition of the word *motivate* is "to cause a person to want to do that which is required." Too often, the assumption is made that an officer's pay will automatically induce him to want to do his job well. This is probably true when a man begins employment. But as he becomes more comfortable in his job environment, other factors begin to play a role which will influence whether or not he gives his best effort.

Actually motivation is a form of job persuasion. Years ago, coercion was the common rule of thumb in managing employees. Such an approach assumed that the average human being had an inherent dislike of work and would avoid it if he could, that he preferred being directed and wished to avoid responsibility. Fortunately, this approach is for the most part a thing of the past. Today, the most effective leaders of men are those who make the following assumptions about each of their subordinates:

1. Under proper conditions, he will not only accept but seek responsibility.