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This paper is a descriptive analysis of the most dangerous aspect of the job of game warden: the apprehension of poachers. Based on data from interviews with 31 game wardens, the author describes the actions of game wardens in attempting to enforce wildlife conservation laws. Extensive quotes from interviews with game wardens are presented. The analysis is focused around their responses to several guiding questions regarding those characteristics that distinguish poachers in terms of probability of apprehension. These include (1) experience in poaching, (2) the number of people with whom the poacher works, (3) remaining seclusive, (4) geographic mobility, and (5) hunting in a familiar area. Additional questions were intended to facilitate the description of the law enforcement aspect of the warden's job. Comparisons between game wardens and urban police officers are made, including the dangers of the job and the use of informants.
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INTRODUCTION

The police officer has received much attention from scholars (Ritzer and Walczak 1986; Pavalko 1988). The history of the police (Kuykendall 1986), their place in the American system of criminal justice (Alpert and Dunham 1992), styles of policing (Wilson 1976), police subculture (Skolnick 1975; Burbeck and Furnham 1985), police deviance (Sherman 1978; Lundman 1980; Larson 1984), police discretion (Brooks 1989), police organization (Stone and DeLuca 1985; Cole 1992), and the hazards of police work (Schmalleger 1991) have all been well researched. But these studies have been almost exclusively devoted to the urban police officer. With this concern over the plight of the urban police officer has evolved the notion that crime is largely an urban problem (Abadinsky 1987). Commensurate with this overemphasis on urban police officers and criminals has been an almost complete neglect of law enforcers and law breakers of other locales. This research will focus on the participants in one of these neglected arenas of crime: game wardens and poachers.

The sociology of work has devoted little press to the occupation of game warden (Calkins 1971; Palmer 1977; Palmer and Bryant 1985; Reisner 1991). Research on poachers, one of the major reasons for the game warden’s existence, has also been relatively neglected by both criminologists and scholars of deviant behavior (Green 1990; Wilson 1990; Curcione 1992). The neglect of these related areas may be due to the rural and therefore isolated setting for this illegal activity. This makes it appear to be less of a problem. Palmer and Bryant (1985, p. 128) suggest the disregard of game wardens is owing to the perception that they do not do real police work nor apprehend real criminals. Perhaps another reason for the lack of attention to this topic is that, traditionally, rural crime has received scant attention (Bankston and Jenkins 1982). The animal rights movement has shown some interest in poaching, but surprisingly little interest in game wardens (Jasper and Nelkin 1992).

THE ROLE OF THE GAME WARDEN

The forerunner to the occupation of the modern-day game warden began in Europe. The evolution of the occupation
from medieval Europe to the present-day United States is described by Palmer and Bryant (1985, p. 111):

[In] Europe, fish, birds, and wild animals were chattels of the sovereign. In some instances, the king or ruler permitted the taking of some game by his subjects, at certain times under certain circumstances. Some game, however, such as stags, were considered to be "royal" game and the hunting of such was a prerogative reserved to the king. Agents of the sovereign undertook to enforce his proscriptions and prescriptions concerning the hunting of small game, and to protect the "royal" game from unlawful hunters. Such agents—the "Keepers of the King's Deer"—were the forerunners of today's game wardens.

In much of Europe the custom of the king retaining ownership of wild game evolved into the practice of game being the possession of the landowner. . . . In the United States the ownership of wild game evolved into a "commonwealth" ownership arrangement with some wild game being considered the common property of the state as the agent of the citizenry living there, and some game (essentially migratory birds) seen as the legitimate property of the nation and its citizens. The occupational specialties of state game warden and federal game warden evolved in response to the conceptualization of wild game as collective property. Hunting, accordingly, became regulated by the state and federal government.

The modern-day game warden performs many duties and functions: conservation of wildlife, public relations and education, and law enforcement. Among these roles, law enforcement activities take up the majority of work time and are regarded as the master role of the occupational status of game warden (Palmer and Bryant 1985). The techniques used by game wardens in the performance of the law enforce role are strikingly similar to those of the urban police officer: observation and patrol, stakeouts, ad the use of informants. In addition, like urban police officers, game wardens see their job as dangerous and differentiate among the threats posed by various violators of the law.

This research is a descriptive analysis of the most dangerous and perhaps important aspect of the game warden's role as a law enforcement officer: the apprehension of poachers. Several issues are addressed that affect the "chasing" and "catching" of poachers and the types of poacher most and least likely to be caught. Comparisons between game war-
dens and urban police officers are made. Similarities between poachers and other types of criminals are also discussed.

METHODOLOGY

The author of this study used a qualitative approach. The data collection for this project began in January 1991 and ended in June 1992. A total of 31 current and retired Louisiana game wardens were interviewed. These tape-recorded interviews ranged from one to three hours. Respondents were interviewed in their homes. Each respondent was asked the following questions: (1) Who gets caught poaching? (2) Who is the easiest poacher to catch (both generally and specifically)? (3) Who does not get caught? (4) Who is the hardest poacher to catch (both generally and specifically)? and (5) Describe the most dangerous situation you have ever been in with a poacher. Additional questions were intended to elicit general responses about poachers and/or game wardens. Questions were intended to be guides to discussion rather than mechanisms for generating specific responses. Wardens were identified through the personal contacts of the author. Additional respondents were identified using a snowball method (Babbie 1992). As such, the game wardens for this research represent an available sample. Although some researchers have questioned generalizations from such a sample (Babbie 1992), the findings of this research are consistent with those of a larger, more extensive study (Palmer and Bryant 1985).

CHASING AND CATCHING POACHERS

This research found several characteristics that distinguished poachers in terms of probability of apprehension. These include (1) experience in poaching, (2) the number of people with whom the poacher works, (3) remaining seclusive, (4) geographic mobility, and (5) hunting in a familiar area. The interviews with the game wardens also demonstrated the use of informants to be a very potent weapon in the apprehension of poachers. Both game wardens and urban police officers routinely use informants. The data also revealed many additional similarities between game wardens and urban police
officers regarding the dangers of their jobs. The comments of the game wardens also revealed several commonalities between poachers and other types of criminals. This paper will integrate description, discussion, and analysis of these findings into the remaining sections.

A Dangerous Job

The job of game warden has many of the elements of the work of urban police officers (Palmer and Bryant 1985). Although danger would seem to be a negative side of their occupation, police officers do not always attempt to avoid dangerous situations. Indeed, they often seem to enjoy the thrill and excitement surrounding danger (Westley 1953; Piliavin and Briar 1964). Research seems to indicate that routine and confining jobs are rated low on the hierarchy of police job preferences. For most officers, crime control is viewed as the only important and necessary part of police work (Bittner 1978). The police officer may enjoy dangerous situations, especially the excitement associated with it, even though simultaneously fearful of such situations (Skolnick 1975). It is their violent death at the hands of criminal offenders that police officers and their families fear most (Schmalleger 1991). Game wardens also rate routine aspects of their job low in comparison to the law enforcer role. But they, like the urban police officer, are also aware of the dangers that accompany that role (Palmer and Bryant 1985).

In the following quotes from interviews with game wardens, each warden commented on the dangers to himself or herself and others involved in the apprehension of poachers. As one warden succinctly put it, "Wardens and poachers are unique breeds of humans always at each other's throat."

Agents have been hit with pipes, pieces of lumber, tree branches, and . . . fists. Others have been shot at . . . most are missed, but some are shot at and hit. There have been attempts to run over officers with boats and cars.

I consider it as dangerous as your big-city policeman who on a day-to-day basis apprehends murderers, rapists, and other such criminals.

Apprehending night hunters . . . you have to startle them at close range to catch them. . . . That situation is bad. . . . They
may shoot you and not mean to do it just because they are scared.

Part of the danger involved in the job of the police officer concerns social isolation. The following statements from game wardens vividly depict both the isolation and fear that they routinely encounter. Such fear is produced by animals, poachers, and others engaged in various outdoor activities.

I always carry a gun. Well, this time I forgot it. Don’t ask me how or why ... I just forgot it. I was just checking on something on the way home. I ran into these two guys setting a trap for wolves. I ... made a run for it and they fired at me .... They missed .... If I would not have been in good shape, they might have caught me.

About a week before season opened I went to the swamp and it sounded like a war .... I could hear someone calling wood ducks. They had found the roost and were going to kill every duck they could. I tracked them to the edge of the bayou and found where they entered the woods and saw their boat. I waited for three hours ... until they came out of the woods. There were four of them. I told them to stop, and they chambered their shotguns and said, “If you are a game warden, you’re going to be a dead one.” I backed up and called in for help .... We got all but one of them .... We had to chase them about two miles.

Once while tracking a hunter I came upon a KKK ritual .... I am a black man. They were ... out in the marsh. I came across them at precisely 7:32 p.m. and did not move until after 3:45 a.m. They were doing chants and burning a cross. There was 22 of them along with four women who each had a turn [some form of sexual contact] with each and every one of the klansmen. The whole time I was praying for them not to see me. I had a .38 caliber ... but only six bullets .... Normally I feel safe, but not that particular night.

Once I got caught between two wolves fighting. It was about 6:00 a.m., and I heard noises like dogs barking, but when I made it to this clearing two gray wolves came running towards me. They were chasing each other to fight, but I was frozen, I could not go anywhere. I was finally able to get away from them .... I shot ... them both [with a tranquilizer gun] so I could get away free.
Danger occurs every time you go out into the woods. You become accustomed to it, but you never can relax. Once I was caught in a breeding area for deer and I was attacked by two bucks. . . . I was able to get two shots off into the air to scare them off.

Baldwin (1961, p. 62) vividly describe the social isolation and danger faced by the white police officer in a black ghetto. He refers to the officer as an occupying soldier in some hostile area. The game warden's social relationship with the poachers can be described in much the same way. But the physical isolation experienced by the game warden is much more extreme than that of the urban police officer. A chief complaint of police officers concerns the lack of public support and the high degree of public apathy toward them. This apathetic public further isolates the urban police officer despite the fact that the drama is played out in densely populated areas. The public does not see the officer in need of help or assistance. If a police officer gets into a fight with several tough kids, citizens may pass by and look, but they will seldom lend a hand (Skolnick 1975, p. 53). The isolation of the game warden is somewhat different and perhaps is even greater because there is little possibility that a helpful stranger will emerge in these unpopulated areas. Nor will there be a witness who can be used in later legal proceedings.

Factors Influencing Apprehension of Poachers

As we will see below, there are several factors that directly influence the likelihood of detection and arrest of poachers. These are (1) the use of informants, (2) level of experience at poaching, (3) poaching alone and being seclusive, and (4) remaining mobile and becoming familiar with the geographic area in which one poaches.

The Use of Informants

One of the major organizational requisites for successful policing is the presence of an informational system. Without a system of civilian informants, police cannot operate (Skolnick 1975, p. 120). The informant is also an essential factor in the game warden's catching of poachers. As it is with the urban police officer, it is possible for the game warden to catch criminals by cruising in unmarked vehicles or by routine observa-
tion and patrol, but such actions are likely to uncover only minor violations. Minor violators, while not immediately significant in the uncovering of major crimes, are useful in the production of informants. When game wardens patrol remote areas, they sometimes encounter people who have sought out the area for a variety of activities. Although the game wardens are not empowered to make arrests for violations of all criminal statutes, such situations do produce informants (Palmer and Bryant 1985). As the following comments of game wardens indicate, informants were often necessary to their success in apprehending poachers.

It never fails.... I let someone off [do not arrest or charge them] ... show them some understanding ... they return the favor a thousand times [by becoming informants].

Ordinary people who brag [are easy to catch]. ... Most of them are a damn good shot with a gun or bow and arrow. They take chances that they don't think are chances and love to brag about what they do and how they do it. This usually leads to informants [hearing about their activities and] giving us this information and us acting on it.

[One who gets caught] is a person who has been doing it for a long time and gets too careless and ends up bragging once too many times ... one time to the wrong person [who then informs on the poacher].

[Who is likely to get caught?] Anyone who decides that they can just go out and kill what they want and when they want to. We might not be that well equipped with paid personnel, but we have enough informants out there who keep us informed.

Those who are caught ... like to brag about how bad they are. Eventually they put their foot in their mouth once too many times [talk to an informant]. Those are the fun ones to catch. You go out and scope them doing their business ... you got them red-handed. But not for long ... [due to] the overcrowding ... of jails.

A guy who has been an informant called me and said this fellow had caught three alligators earlier.... He had been over to his house and had been bragging about what he does and never gets caught.... I got two agents and three state troopers to come with me. We got a search warrant and proceeded to enter the house. There it was [the hides and remains of three
alligators] sitting at the table. Upon further review of the house they found 45 pounds of pot.

As indicated by these statements, most game wardens used informants and most of them found the information vital to the performance of their role as a law enforcement officer. Game wardens spent a great deal of their time on routine tasks, riding around in a specific area on the alert for violations of game laws.

The wardens, like their urban counterparts, become familiar with their territory and the people who inhabit this bucolic environment. The confronting of individuals in compromising situations or committing minor infractions is a routine part of the game warden’s job. Although routine and perhaps mundane, finding such individuals is necessary in the capture of more serious offenders. Wardens also seem to enjoy the production and use of informants. Chasing the informant links these mundane, lowly regarded trivial tasks to that of the more serious, challenging, and exciting job of crime control, that is, catching real criminals. This may, in part, explain the delight that wardens expressed as they used criminals to catch criminals.

Level of Experience
The level of experience of those engaging in a particular criminal activity has always been a factor in the apprehension of criminals (Shover 1985). Game wardens all agreed that inexperience was a major factor in catching poachers. This perspective is apparent in the quotations offered below.

Unfortunately the habitual offenders are hard to catch because they know the ropes.

Old-timers will not be caught. I know of two old men who live together out in the swamp. They have no income . . . have nice boats, best guns . . . all stuff good for poaching.

I would have to believe it is the occasional offender that is caught most often.

Occasional offenders walk into this type of situation and . . . they are caught. But the one we are really after [the experienced professional poacher] slips away.
[Some who get caught are] people new to the game of poaching. These people don’t know any rules that you have to abide by.

We will catch all of the stupid ones eventually.

[Some are] rookies at this criminal activity. These people are usually doing it for the hell of it. They go out to get something, and while they are in the act, boom, we got them. It is always fun to catch them because they squirm, plead, and beg for forgiveness, but you know down, deep inside your heart you will hang them out to dry.

[One who get caught] is someone who just ... will do something stupid [is easy to catch] ... kill a doe when it is not deer season ... then drag it to a camp or until someone sees them.

The inexperienced poacher is easy to catch owing to the poacher’s lack of knowledge regarding both the formal and informal rules of the game. Stupidity, as in all other criminal activity, is not an excuse when one is caught poaching. Poachers caught in the act are “easy arrests” for the game wardens and apparently make up the bulk of arrests for poaching. Specific stories about poachers also reinforce the part inexperience plays in the catching of poachers.

[An easy person to catch was] the guy who hunted deer while riding around in the back of a truck. This is stupid enough, but he did two other things. First he fired at deer grazing about 30 yards from a forestry agent’s house.... It wasn’t even deer season. Second, he got out of his truck to pick up the deer, which happened to be a doe, right next to the forestry agent’s home.

We had stopped at a store on the way out. There were hunters in there, and my partner knew one of them. So we went inside to get some cold drinks and a little something to eat and to see if he had killed anything. Well, don’t you know that he said he had a trunkful? I said, “Nobody killing anything, but you killed a trunkful. You expect me to believe that?” Well, we just laughed along with them and walked back to the car. I tell you, I could have thrown the book at them.

[There were] two young fellows spotlighting [a portable light powered by batteries] in my pasture.... About two in the morning I woke up.... I couldn’t go back to sleep, so I decided to go and sit out on the back porch.... I heard a truck
and saw some spotlights in the pasture behind my house. I put
some clothes on and went out and arrested them for spotlight-
ing and criminal trespassing. That was an easy one.

This landowner stopped and asked this poacher if he had
killed anything. He told him that he had killed two wood
ducks. He said, “Good. Wait right there and the game wardens
will be here in about 45 minutes.” [After the landowner con-
tacted me] I came, booked him, took his license, and im-
pounded his gun, the whole nine yards. . . . This poacher has
been elected to first place by six veteran game wardens as per-
haps the most cooperative poacher during 120 years of collec-
tive service.

[An easy poacher to catch was] the one who fell asleep in the
back of his truck with three does. He claims that he was set up,
but we doubt it because of his past drug and criminal history.
He had been clean and off of drugs for six months, but we also
found $4,500 stuck in the pocket of his blue jeans.

These stories about specific poachers support the idea that
the lack of experience is the major reason why poachers are
cought. It appears that many poachers are caught owing to
their mistakes rather than to the “good police work” of the
game wardens.

Poaching Alone and Being Seclusive
Those poachers who are very experienced, never talk about
their poaching activities, and work alone are least likely to be
cought. Like the career poacher, another career criminal, the
successful check forger, works alone and must also remain
seclusive.

The vulnerability of the forger to recognition and identification
impels him away from unnecessary contacts with other per-
sons. Furthermore he must, if he is to remain free from arrest,
keep himself from progressive involvement in social relation-
ships, for with intimate interchange of experiences there
comes the danger of inadvertent as well as deliberate exposure
by others. Free and unguarded interaction, even with persons
whom he likes and trusts, becomes an indulgence (Lemert
1972, p. 384).

Game wardens readily admit their difficulty in apprehend-
ing seclusive experienced poachers:
The ones not getting caught are the ones who keep their mouths shut. . . .

People who are street smart and know how to keep their mouths shut [are never caught].

Old-timers will never be caught because they are smart enough to do it alone and keep their big mouths shut. Never brag because you really don’t know who you are bragging to or who they might know.

Ones poaching for survival and quiet ones will not get caught. It is so hard to catch someone without any leads. If they leave no tracks or debris, then the chances are slimmer than slim. Maybe within the next 20 years we will have improvement.

[Something] very important to remember is that if you want to be successful as a poacher, then you need to work alone. . . . That way you only have to worry about yourself.

People who like to work in groups [are easy to catch]. For some strange reason these people like to stand around in their little poaching group and talk about how they evade the law. . . . They seem to brag to the wrong people.

Involvement in crime demands much of the offender. The most obvious is that one must live with the fear of arrest, possible confinement, and the risk of personal injury or death. Another characteristic of the criminal lifestyle is that one must routinely deal with others who are likely to be unreliable or treacherous (Shover 1985). The successful poacher may appear as a desirable target of the criminal designs of others. Crime partners may talk to the wrong people or talk too much. If arrested, partners may bargain with wardens or prosecutors, informing on others in return for more lenient treatment. As one game warden commented,

Your best friend will always rat on you no matter what you think.

If poachers can contain all information regarding their illegal activities, they can virtually erase any potential advantage the game warden gains through covert operations. Without this advantage the game wardens are severely hampered in their attempts to stop poaching.

Both wardens and poachers pride themselves on being
sneaky (Calkins 1971; Palmer 1977). “Due to the nature of wildlife law violators, sneakiness constitutes the basic theme of wildlife law enforcement” (Palmer and Bryant 1985, p. 123). Poachers must continually alter their routines in order to avoid detection. Game wardens must continually change their schedules so that the poacher cannot anticipate their location at any specific time. The use of undercover operations and informants is also part of this theme of law enforcement. Several wardens commented on the use of covert operations in apprehending experienced poachers:

One of the problems associated with habitual offenders is that they often have been caught once or twice before, so they know the tricks, and are like a fox. You have to see the crime and catch them in the act to really make it stick. Special task forces are set up for habitual offenders.

Only the inexperienced poacher is easy to catch. I have watched some [experienced poachers] for weeks and never seen them doing illegal things. They are all so tricky and smart.

Unlike experienced poachers, the inexperienced are easily caught by even the most routine of undercover operations.

Those who are fairly new at this spot, tend to do it in groups. That may be more of a factor than their lack of experience. One of them will brag or show something to the wrong person. One time a kid met up with his poaching buddies with a friend. The friend he took poaching was a game warden.

Undercover operations, including decoy operations, stakeouts, and covert surveillance, are also a routine part of urban police departments (Abadinsky 1987, pp. 184-91). Likewise, because undercover operations are so vital to the success of the game wardens, all wardens commented about the advantages, for the poacher, of working alone and leading a seclusive lifestyle.

**Mobility and Knowledge of an Area**

The geographical mobility of the poacher is associated with experience. The poacher who does not confine hunting to the same small area, and hunts in areas well known to him or her is also less likely to be arrested. The successful poacher does not confine hunting to a small area, but also does not hunt in an unknown area. The successful poacher must find an area
that is small enough to master geographically, but also large enough in which to remain undetected. Such an area should also be uninhabited. In addition to knowing the physical geography of a place, the poacher must also know the movements of game wardens of the area. This kind of knowledge is associated with experience. The career poacher is similar to the career check forger. The poacher, like the check forger described below, uses mobility to avoid detection.

... he must move out, out of the vicinity of his crime or crimes. This, of course, can be said for other kinds of crimes, but mobility is more or less "built in" the check forger's situation.... In large part his daily activities are geared to the tempo and rhythms of banking and business, which demarcate the length of time he can pass checks and remain in a given area, ending in a critical time during which danger of arrest is ubiquitous. Experienced check forgers develop an almost intuitive sense of these points in time which punctuate their periodic movements (Lemert 1972, p. 384).

The following comments of game wardens indicate just how elusive the experienced poachers are in areas familiar to them. These wardens admit they are no match for the mobility and knowledge of poachers in such areas.

Full-time poachers are not going to be caught. Especially if they decide to move around every once and a while. I think there are quite a few who poach full time, but it seems we never can catch up with them.

The hardest to catch ... may be those two old men in the middle of the swamp. ... No matter how hard we try, we cannot get close enough to bust them. I have been on five different stakeout situations and ... have not been able to catch them doing anything wrong. They are always in the same general area, but that area is too large for us to cover. They move around in an area that they know like the back of their hand.

In contrast to the full-time experienced poachers are the inexperienced ones hunting in unfamiliar areas.

Someone who is poaching for the first time ... in the wrong area ... is easy to catch.
If inexperience was the chief culprit of the poacher, then combining that factor with maneuvering in an unfamiliar area makes arrest almost a certainty.

Young kids who are out on a dare. They go out in what they think is an unpopulated area and all of a sudden they are shooting at houses. We then get a complaint about some house being shot. Once we get out there we find the kids shooting at rabbits. This is not bad, but they are spotlighting them at night and that is illegal.

Despite the pitfalls of a career in poaching, it remains attractive to some. A game warden commented on why some continue in this deviant occupation and why others are drawn to it:

[With] alligator skins you can make up to $10,000 on a good day, then you can sell the teeth for about $2.50 a tooth, finally you can sell the meat for $700. The grand total is about $11,000 for one day of work. It takes me five months . . . to make that kind of money on my salary.

As long as the rewards of poaching remain relatively high, individuals will be enticed into this illegal activity. The above comments of a game warden indicates he understands this lure.

SUMMARY

This research has drawn parallels between game wardens and urban police officers, and poachers and other criminals. Given the different geography each must negotiate, game wardens and poachers are very similar to their more urban police and criminal counterparts. This finding helps substantiate the results of previous studies on game wardens and poachers (Palmer and Bryant 1985).

According to current data, those who get caught poaching do so because they are either inexperienced or talk to a person who later acts as an informant. Those who do not get caught are very experienced at poaching, work alone, and do not talk to anyone about their activities. Also, the more one associates with other poachers in social relationships, the greater the likelihood that person will talk to someone who
has been caught poaching and consequently may act as an informant in order to maintain a favorable position with the game warden. Those poachers who are geographically mobile are also less likely to be arrested. This research suggests that these marginal criminals are similar to other, more recognized types of offenders. The inclusion of these kinds of criminals within the academic domains of deviance and criminology will allow for the drawing of greater explanatory inference.

Game wardens work in an environment as dangerous as any of those working in the inner city. Compounding that danger is the fact that wardens normally work alone. Urban police officers may feel alone in a crowd, but game wardens find themselves absolutely alone. The lack of recognition of the important role of the game warden is owing to its being a rural occupation in an urban society. Game wardens are therefore judged unimportant. Small towns and rural areas, however, are served by the vast majority of police departments. Almost 90% of the police departments in this country serve areas of less than 25,000 people. More than 10,000 of these have 10 or fewer police officers, and many of these are served by only one officer (Alpert and Dunham 1992). Whether in the urban streets or rural woods, police work allows for generalizations. The occupational requirements evoke characteristic responses and similar patterns of occupational concerns.

In recent years society has extended its concern with regard to the consequences of human behavior and has outlawed a variety of these behaviors. Many laws have been enacted that prescribe or proscribe behaviors in the areas of air and water quality, the protection of certain species, and the maintenance of an ecological balance. This special concern represents an expansion of regulatory control. New laws and legal constraints have been established to monitor or prevent a wide range of behaviors as a means of protecting or preserving a variety of newly recognized valued resources and rights. What at one time was little more than a frontier of social control has now become an expansive area of regulation and law enforcement. Considerable societal effort will continue to be directed at the prevention of such crimes (Shoemaker and Bryant 1985). As such, new forms of policing and police officers will continue to emerge to meet these needs and to challenge the traditional urban cops-and-robbers image of law enforcement.
Researchers will be more able to "synthesize . . . findings, and to articulate more meaningful theoretical insights," by including other types of police work within the sphere of police studies (Palmer and Bryant 1985, p. 134). It is hoped that this paper will serve as a heuristic means of encouraging further research into specialized policing and the criminals encountered by this somewhat neglected officer, the game warden.
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