

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE



LAW ENFORCEMENT PHILOSOPHY INSTRUCTOR GUIDE

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
GLYNCO, GEORGIA

(8/82)

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAW ENFORCEMENT PHILOSOPHY
INSTRUCTOR GUIDE

PREPARED BY:

ANDREW E. HUTCHISON
USDI/NPS REPRESENTATIVE
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
DIVISION OF TRAINING
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER
GLYNCO, GEORGIA

INSTRUCTOR NOTE

THIS IS NOT A FORMALLY STRUCTURED LESSON PLAN. IT IS EXPECTED THAT THIS SESSION WILL DEVELOP INTO A FREE-FLOWING DISCUSSION PERIOD

THOSE POINTS IDENTIFIED WITH ASTERIKS (*) SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN CLASS WITH THE INTENT OF PROMOTING OPEN DISCUSSION RESULTING IN THE IDENTIFIED RESPONSE.

CONTROLLING FACTORS--NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT

LAW	94-458	<u>ANSWER TO:</u>
POLICY	DM 446	U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
GUIDELINE	NPS-9	SECRETARY OF INTERIOR
PHILOSOPHY	SUPERINTENDENT	DIRECTOR OF NPS
		SUPERINTENDENT

RECOGNIZE THAT PHILOSOPHY IS SOMEWHAT DISCRETIONARY AS LONG AS IT IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH LAW, POLICY AND GUIDELINE.

NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT (USE OVERHEADS)

WHY
WHO
HOW
WHEN

EMPHASIZE THAT THE WHY AND WHO ARE WELL ESTABLISHED BY STATUTORY LAW AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICY. THE HOW AND WHEN ARE PARTIALLY DETERMINED BY LOCAL POLICY AND ARE SOMEWHAT DISCRETIONARY.

HISTORY

/ / / / / / / / / / /
1872 1894 1905 1916 1933 1960 1970 1973 1975 1976 1980

1. Detail work of first ranger.....resource oriented.
2. Advent of military.
3. Authority provided by Act of 1905.....Joint FS and NPS.
4. Act of 1916.....Authority to promulgate regulations.
5. Act of 1933.....re-transfer of functions from War Dept.
6. 1960.....Enter recreation areas.
7. 1970.....Yosemite.....riot.....Earth Day.
8. 1973.....Ken Patrick.....Impact on management and field.
9. 1975.....Yellowstone Case
10. 1976.....Bicentennial.....Authorities Act

*QUESTION:

IS NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF OTHER AGENCIES?

RESPONSE:

PHILOSOPHY SOMEWHAT DIFFERENT...

NPS GOAL TO PROVIDE AND PROTECT (FROM ORGANIC ACT)...

TRADITIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES GOAL TO ENFORCE THE LAW...

EMPHASIZE LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A METHOD NOT A GOAL...

TO WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER METHODS, I.E., INTERPRETATION, MAINTENANCE, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT...

NPS DIFFERENT FROM OTHER LAND MANAGEMENT AGENCIES IN THAT NPS HAS STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT PERSONS.

*QUESTION:

IS NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT SIMILAR TO OTHER AGENCIES:

RESPONSE:

YES...IN THE METHODS EMPLOYED AND THE SYSTEMS UTILIZED, I.E., VEHICLE STOPS, DUI, CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS, NCIC...

NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT SHOULD BE CARRIED OUT IN A PROFESSIONAL MANNER ACCEPTABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A VISITOR SERVICE:

*QUESTION:

IS LAW ENFORCEMENT A VISITOR SERVICE?

WHO BENEFITS FROM AN EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM?

RESPONSE:

- A) REMOVAL OF DRUNK DRIVER FROM PARK ROAD...
- B) RECOVERY OF STOLEN PROPERTY...
- C) ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION TO FACILITATE CIVIL CLAIMS...
- D) PRESERVE AND PROMOTE RELAXING ATMOSPHERE, I.E., QUIET HOURS IN CAMPGROUND...

*QUESTION:

IS LAW ENFORCEMENT A METHOD OF RESOURCE PROTECTION?

RESPONSE:

- A) DISCOURAGE POACHING...
- B) ENFORCE SPEED LIMIT...MINIMIZE ROAD KILLS...
- C) ENFORCE CREEL LIMIT...
- D) ESTABLISH ORIGIN AND CAUSE OF FIRES...
- E) PROTECT CULTURAL RESOURCES THROUGH ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS...
- F) PROTECT BACKCOUNTRY...ENFORCE PERMITS...FIRES... TRAILS...LITTERING...

ORGANIZATION OF NPS LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

SIMILAR TO ALL OTHER NPS PROGRAMS...

DIFFERENT FROM TRADITIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES...

(NO CLEAR CHAIN OF COMMAND)

OPERATES UNDER MBO PHILOSOPHY COMPARED TO MBD (MANAGEMENT BY DIRECTIVE)...

MBO

GUIDELINES POLICIES

WEAK DISCIPLINE

GREAT DISCRETION

NON-LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISES
LAW ENFORCEMENT

GENERALIST

MBD

GENERAL ORDERS

STRONG DISCIPLINE

LITTLE DISCRETION

LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPERVISES
LAW ENFORCEMENT

ENCOURAGE SPECIALIZATION

DISCUSS LOW KEY (MANY PEOPLE TEND TO CONFUSE LOW KEY WITH
LOW PROFILE)

LOW KEY

ATTITUDE AND Demeanor

LOW PROFILE

IMAGE AND APPEARANCE

LOW KEY: LOWEST LEVEL OF ENFORCEMENT. ACTION TO RESOLVE
A PRESENT SITUATION AND PREVENT ITS REOCCURRENCE
IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE.

LOW KEY: NOT AN ABROGATION OF DUTY.

LAW ENFORCEMENT PRINCIPLES

(GO OVER NPS-9 CHAPTER ON PRINCIPLES)

EMPHASIZE THE FOLLOWING CONTRASTS:

1. GOAL VS METHOD

2. IMPERSONAL VS IMPARTIAL

(LAW ENFORCEMENT CONTACT OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLAIN
MISSION OF NPS AND RATIONALE FOR REGULATIONS)

3. ENFORCER VS PROTECTOR

NPS RANGERS NOT "SWORN OFFICERS"...

DUTY IS TO PROTECT...

OATH TAKEN BY NPS RANGERS TO UPHOLD CONSTITUTION...

IN CONTRAST, "SWORN OFFICERS" MUST ENFORCE THE LAW...

PERSON SOMETIMES MOST IN NEED OF YOUR PROTECTION

IS THE INDIVIDUAL IN CUSTODY.

4. THRILL VS CHALLENGE

*QUESTION:

WHY DO YOU LIKE DOING LAW ENFORCEMENT?

WHAT APPEALS TO YOU?

NOTHING WRONG WITH PERCEIVING LAW ENFORCEMENT AS A
CHALLENGE...

BRING UP CONCERN ABOUT THRILL SEEKERS...

IDENTIFY THRILL SEEKERS...VOCABULARY...SPEAK 10-CODE...
BLUE LIGHTS...LICENSE CHECKS..."SOLDIER OF FORTUNE"...

FINALLY, ASK THIS QUESTION:

HOW OFTEN DO YOU EXPECT TO ARREST INNOCENT PERSONS?

RESPONSE:

COMMON LAW DICTATES AND THE CONSTITUTION SUPPORTS THAT ALL PERSONS ARE INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY.

W H Y

94-458 (H.R. Report)

Law enforcement duties should be a function of the National Park Ranger along with a diversity of other protection concerns. It is not intended here that law enforcement should fall on a small number of individuals as their exclusive duty.

94-458 (16 USC 1a-6)

In addition to any other authority conferred by law, the Secretary of Interior is authorized to designate, pursuant to standards prescribed in regulations by the Secretary, certain officers or employees of the Department, who shall maintain law and order and protect persons and property within areas of the National Park System.

DM 446 1.3

All enforcement functions and programs within the Department shall adhere to the following guidelines and principles:

- (a) Where applicable and feasible, the organizational structure of the Department of Interior and its constituent bureaus and offices shall reflect a commitment to maintain effective and professional law enforcement programs on all lands it administers.

NPS-9 (Policy)

The policy of the National Park Service is to meet its law enforcement responsibilities by promoting an effective program to ensure the protection of human life, personal property and the resources. The Service will develop and maintain an effective program with competent, highly trained and well equipped personnel, using modern technological methods.

W H Y (cond't)

NPS-9 (Policy)

The National Park Service will conduct investigations of offenses committed within the National Park System thoroughly and expeditiously, in accordance with applicable state and federal law. Investigation is an essential and appropriate element of the overall National Park Service mission.

W H O

94-458

In addition to any other authority conferred by law, the Secretary of Interior is authorized to designate, pursuant to standards prescribed in regulations by the Secretary, certain officers or employees of the Department of Interior who shall maintain law and order and protect persons and property within areas of the National Park System.

94-458 (House Report)

Law enforcement duties should be a function of the National Park Ranger along with a diversity of other protection concerns

DM 446 (Chapter 4)

It is universally recognized that complexities inherent in the law enforcement function dictate the personnel so employed possess a high degree of intelligence, tact, sound judgment, emotional stability, impartiality, personality and other related characteristics. Thus it is essential that the selection, training, and performance evaluation processes as well as standards of conduct and discipline be established as set forth in 446 DM 4.

January 15, 1980--Director Whalen Memorandum

It is the intent of the National Park Service to fully comply with the Departmental standards disseminated through DM 446. The seasonal law enforcement ranger is recognized as a law enforcement officer. Therefore, personnel vested with this authority must also comply with those standards dealing with selection, conduct, defensive weapons, discipline and all other standards promulgated by the Department.

H O W

DM 446 2.2B

Each law enforcement officer shall be specifically identified as such and shall be individually authorized to make arrests and to carry firearms, and only employees assigned duties as law enforcement officers shall be authorized to carry firearms and to make arrests

DM 446 2.2K

All entry level law enforcement personnel and all criminal investigators shall satisfactorily complete the training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center or at any other comparable federal law enforcement training school

DM 446 5.6

Law enforcement officers in uniform will carry firearms and said weapons should not be concealed except when, due to weather conditions, an outside garment is worn that will cover the weapon. These garments must be designed so that the weapon is readily accessible.

NPS-9

The goal of all enforcement actions must be the safety of the park visitor, the protection of the resource, and the absence of crime. All of these actions must be within the legal parameters as established by law and interpreted by the courts.

All of our actions should be directed toward accomplishing our assigned mission. Enforcement of the law is a method to achieve this goal and is not a goal unto itself. The officer must relate to the spirit of the law, rather than solely to the letter of it.

H O W (cond't)

NPS-9 Supervisory Responsibility

A supervisor's responsibility includes insuring that law enforcement activities are conducted in a courteous and professional manner.

This responsibility includes the recognition of the fact that our visitors are often in unfamiliar surroundings and confronted with some regulations that are new or different. It also emphasizes the need for educating through enforcement by using the least stringent means to achieve compliance of the person contacted.

Inappropriate enforcement actions, demeanor, activities, and attitudes must be dealt with promptly by the supervisor. New enforcement personnel should be thoroughly oriented, carefully coached and regularly monitored. The supervisor must share his/her concern for proper law enforcement with the people who are doing the job.

W H E N

NPS-9 Management Responsibility

Any person in a park area should be entitled to reasonable, normal protection from accident, injury, theft or threat. In addition, all parks are established for a specific purpose. The park's significant resources must be protected, and the public must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to enjoy the resource in a manner intended.

The overall goal of park law enforcement is the prevention of harmful or unlawful acts. Park managers are expected to address the overall law enforcement needs within the area through the normal means of justification of personnel, money, and equipment. In addition it is his/her responsibility to supervise all enforcement activities in the area and to ensure that the program is neither too aggressive or permissive. Input and feedback from visitors, employees, concessioners, and other park residents are imperative in making this judgment decision.

18 USC 4 Misprision of Felony

Whoever having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other persons in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than three years or both.

LAW ENFORCEMENT PRINCIPLES

All law enforcement programs shall be formulated and executed in consonance with the fundamental mission of the National Park Service, which is "***TO CONSERVE THE SCENERY AND THE NATURAL AND HISTORIC OBJECTS AND THE WILDLIFE THEREIN AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF THE SAME IN SUCH MANNER AND BY SUCH MEANS AS WILL LEAVE THEM UNIMPAIRED FOR THE ENJOYMENT OF FUTURE GENERATIONS***"

The goal of all law enforcement actions must be the safety of the park visitor, the protection of the resource, and the absence of crime. All of these actions must be within the legal parameters as established by law and interpreted by the courts.

The Service must be ever mindful that as an agency with law enforcement responsibilities, it must be able to project to its community of visitors its willingness to serve with integrity and effectiveness. The ability to deal with people is the law enforcement officer's most important social skill. The manner in which citizens are affected and react to his actions and words reflects the degree of trust and respect they assign to him as a person, and to the entire Service.

Accordingly, National Park Service Law Enforcement Principles shall provide for the protection of the parks and visitors who use them, but they shall also stand as a guide to the personal conduct of law enforcement officers that will assure all visitors an enjoyable and meaningful park experience. People of all economic, social and political persuasions have an equal right to visit our national parks. Such visitors are enjoying their leisure time and often find themselves in unfamiliar and strange surroundings. They are away from home to escape the usual routine of their daily lives. It is for these reasons that the National Park Service Principles for law enforcement may differ from those of other law enforcement agencies.

I. Objectivity

All of our actions should be directed toward accomplishing our assigned mission. Enforcement of the law is a method to achieve this goal and is not a goal unto itself. The officer must relate to the spirit of the law, rather than solely to the letter of it.

II. Adaptability

Law enforcement operations within the Service offer as many unique assignments as there are areas within the System. It is essential that the officer have enough confidence and flexibility to adjust to the different attitudes and procedures as he transfers from area to area. He must be able to cultivate the support and cooperation of the public in the Service's operations; for citizen approval is essential to an effective program.

III. Integrity

Essential to any law enforcement activity is the respect of the public. To establish this respect the officer must render impartial enforcement of the law. He must keep his private life free from scandal and suspicion. Most importantly, he must honestly believe in what he is doing.

IV. Versatility

The National Park Service officer is much more than an enforcer of the law; he is a protector of the area and the public. He must possess the ability to perform the other challenges of his position. He must be adept in the many facets of visitor services and resource protection required by his assignment.

V. Compatibility

The role of the law enforcement officer is just one of several directed at the same mission. The officer must have the capacity to understand the purpose and function of these other activities. He must be able to work in concert with them in pursuit of the common goal.



United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

P.O. BOX 67

MOOSE, WYOMING 83012

Western Regional Office

OCT 12 '76

IN REPLY REFER TO:

W-34

October 7, 1976

Regional Director	
Dep. Regional Dir.	
Exec. Assistant	
Administration	
Operations	
Rec. Mgmt. Insp.	
Prog. & Budget	
EEO	
Public Affairs	
Mgmt. Appra.	
Action Taken	

Memorandum

To: Regional Director, Western Region

From: Law Enforcement Specialist, Grand Teton

Subject: Law Enforcement in the National Parks

Recently there has been a great deal of concern expressed about law enforcement in the National Park Service. Much of the concern seems to center on the image of the Ranger, either what he is, can be, or should be. I would like to reflect a minute on the evolution of law enforcement in the parks and try to put in perspective the concern expressed by some in the Service today.

Looking back at the early history of the National Park Service, it is apparent that law enforcement was one of the primary roles of the early park custodian, soldier or early ranger. As early as the creation of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, there was provision made for the Secretary of the Interior to make regulations and protect the resources from injury or spoilation. The Yellowstone Act further stated that the Secretary should cause all trespassers to be removed and "be authorized to take all such measures as shall be necessary or proper to fully carry out the objects and purposes of this act". It was apparent Congress was aware of human nature and was providing a means by which the valuable park resources could be protected. Congress again recognized that problem of resource protection and law enforcement in the parks when on May 7, 1894, the Secretary of the Interior was ordered to build a jail in Yellowstone National Park. All during this period, arrests for hunting, trespassing and other offenses were being made either by the Superintendent's designates or soldiers. In 1880, Superintendent Norris hired Harry Yount as a gamekeeper to keep poachers out of the park. This "first ranger" was little protection against poaching, so Congress increased the funding to support ten men. These ten men spent the majority of their time trying to prevent poaching, vandalism and highway robberies. These first "rangers" were heavily involved in law enforcement. It would seem that from our earliest beginnings, law enforcement has been a part of the Ranger tradition and a Ranger duty.



Further demonstration that enforcement of the law was basic to traditional park management and protection is noted in the fact that our first arrest authority was contained in Title 16, Section 10 which was passed by Congress on March 3, 1905. In addition, Congress placed major responsibilities on the Service by the language of the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916. The terms of the Act include leaving them "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" and "provide for the enjoyment by such manner or such means as will leave them unimpaired" or "promote and regulate the use". All imply the use of law enforcement as a tool. Regulation of use generally means the regulation of people and activities. In our society, one of the most accepted ways of regulation and maintenance of order is through the rule of laws and regulations and the enforcement thereof. I point out the above only because I wish to establish the premise that law enforcement, arrests, jails or fines are not new to the parks, or the park ranger, and were implicit in much of the early Congressional legislation and park history.

If we start with the premise that regulations and enforcement are not new, then what is the problem facing the Service today? There seems to exist within a segment of the National Park Service, a feeling that the word law enforcement is negative. Perhaps the problem is semantic, but I think not. Many people within the Service regard the enforcement of our laws and regulations as a very undesirable and negative activity to be avoided if possible. I would like to explore law enforcement as it pertains to the parks and determine what is negative. I contend that the enforcement of laws and regulations within the parks is very positive and proper. I am not talking about a few (very few) overzealous individuals who may be overly officious. I am speaking of law enforcement as an overall program.

My personal philosophy on park law enforcement hinges on what I would call the "park experience" for a visitor. I think of the National Park Service as a team. We all work together toward providing any given visitor with a quality "park experience". I would like to break down that experience into some of its component parts.

- Maintenance: Our maintenance staff provides good, safe roads, trails and bridges, clean restrooms, safe lighting and generally a clean park.
- Interpreters: Our interpreters enrich the stay of the visitor by helping them better understand the parks and help in planning side trips, hikes and giving general information.
- Concessions: Our concessions people try to assure the visitor quality food, lodging and services at a reasonable price.

We can provide a clean park with good concessions and enrich the visitors stay through interpretation, but what happens when:

1. A family after five wonderful days in a park is hit broadside by a drunk driver and one of the children is killed? What happened to their park

experience? What do the parents remember our park for? Do they remember our programs and clean restrooms and the fun they had? No; they remember that park as the place where they lost a child. Is this preventable? My contention is that it is preventable and is a ranger responsibility.

2. A family has spent a wonderful day in the park and returning to the campground for the evening, the family is exposed to foul language, loud music, and the throwing of beer bottles. Is this the type of park experience we want to provide the visitor?

3. What do people think of their park experience if during their stay, they return to their campsite to find sleeping bags and packs stolen? A common crime such as this, besides the loss of personal property and the loss of equipment, prevents a continuation of their vacation or an alteration of plans, not to mention sentimental value.

4. What does the effect of stolen cameras, binoculars, tape decks, etc., have on people who lose them? It certainly differs with individuals, but generally it is upsetting and affects their overall "park experience".

I submit that these examples are a small representation of a larger picture of incidents. The point of the above examples is to show that illegal or criminal activity is diametrically opposed to what we as park rangers want for our visitors. I would ask what is negative about removing a drunk driver from the road, or removing a thief and preventing the loss of visitor property. What is negative about protecting some of the greatest resources in the world from damage? I feel that we have a primary responsibility to the public to insure that their visit is safe, pleasant and that their parks remain unspoiled.

This brings us to the point of enforcement. I agree entirely with the Service policy of low key law enforcement. I agree more specifically with Jack Morehead's philosophy of lowest effective level that will prevent the recurrence of the violation in the foreseeable future. This does not mean that no action is taken.

I believe strongly that law enforcement should remain a ranger duty. I disagree with those who would establish a law enforcement career ladder. I feel law enforcement is one of the several ranger skills. Because I feel it is a traditional ranger skill, I don't think it should be contracted out or assigned to the U. S. Park Police. Contracting law enforcement would be like contracting fire control activities to the Forest Service and search and rescue to the County Sheriff. The following are thoughts on rangers versus Park Police or contracting.

1. Rangers are more versatile than Park Police and when not directly involved in law enforcement duties, which is some of the time, can assume duties in resource management, park planning, search and rescue, fire control and other visitor service tasks.

2. Contracting law enforcement is a calculated risk. Most U. S. Forest Contracts provide only superficial coverage to the National Forests and no resource enforcement. Besides being expensive, contracting opens the park visitor to law enforcement officers whose training, ability, and attitude may not be of the highest caliber. There are some excellent Sheriff's departments, but not many in the immediate vicinity of most of our areas.

It has been said by some that we should not have rangers as criminal investigators. I strongly disagree. I would like to examine some of those skills necessary for criminal investigation. To be a good criminal investigator, one must:

1. Know the laws, court decisions and procedures necessary to protect the rights of the accused and bring a case to a successful conclusion.
2. Must learn to look at a problem from all angles, look beneath the surface and avoid snap judgements.
3. An investigator must reduce all findings to writing and be able to communicate in writing an unknown event to a third person.
4. An investigator must develop inter-personal relations. He must learn to read human behavior and communicate with all types of people who may be despondent, sick, aggressive, angry, etc.

I would submit that criminal or just plain investigation is problem solving. I would also submit that all of the above elements are positive and needed by any manager in the Service today. I said before I don't believe in a career ladder for law enforcement, but I do believe that in any career, an assignment of two to three years in a specialist position may be healthy. If we start with the premise that the National Park Service is developing its managers from the field, then what is healthier for a manager than to have a broad background. We have specialties in resource management, concessions, fire control, search and rescue, backcountry and criminal investigation. I believe rangers should continue to fill existing, and any additional investigative positions. There is perhaps a more important aspect to keeping investigation a ranger skill. After leaving any specialty, be it fire control, resource management or investigation, and going to another position, the knowledge and skills gained during that specialization are passed on to subordinates and peers. A ranger/investigator could pass on positive skills such as report writing, incident investigation, interviewing techniques and knowledge of the law to his subordinates and raise the level of their overall performance.

There are rumors that the Service is about to reduce the amount of training given the field ranger in law enforcement. It is felt by many that the large number of hours is excessive. I believe we should remember several things:

1. Law enforcement, court decisions and the law is becoming more complex in our society, not less complex.
2. Three months formal training is not excessive when considered against a 30 year career.
3. What good does it do to remove a rapist, drug dealer, artifacts thief or poacher from the park if because through lack of training, a ranger violates the suspect's rights and the court suppresses its evidence or dismisses the case.
4. Much of the 400 hour training is not entirely law enforcement oriented. Large blocks are devoted to interviewing, driving, human relations, first aid, report writing and other subjects of broad application to the National Park Service.

Image

Perhaps the greatest concern has been directed at the subject of image. Has law enforcement affected the traditional image of the park ranger? The answer is probably yes, when viewed from within the Service, and no when viewed from outside the Service. It has been said by some that by allowing the park police to do the hard core felony enforcement, we could save the image of the rangers. I disagree. Few people object to arresting someone for theft, rape, murder, arson, assault or other felony crimes. Where the Service generally develops public relations problems is in misdemeanor enforcement. Parking tickets, dogs off leashes, illegal camping and closed area violations generate more ill will than any felony investigation. It is our own resource protection regulations that cause public relations problems and not arrests for crimes against people.

Defensive equipment is presumably at the base, either consciously or sub-consciously, for much of the present debate over law enforcement. Many look upon defensive equipment, and guns in particular, as offensive rather than as a tool. I think the decision to be armed or not should rest with the superintendent of an area, but I also think that upper management should supply some guidelines to prevent either overreaction or underreaction. I agree that there are areas in the Service that may present an overly aggressive stance. By the same token there are areas where because a given manager feels weapons are offensive, the field ranger must do without equipment based not on assessment of the field ranger's need or level of exposure to danger, but based rather on personal bias or fancy. I believe many should read "Demeanor While Armed in Uniform" by Lee Shackelton.

I have heard the phrases, "let's drop the term law enforcement specialist, the term law enforcement officer. Let's get back to basics--to what really counts--back to what we should be doing, visitor services, visitor protection, resource management and protection and let's not forget rangers". I think

these phrases sum up much of the present controversy. I would like to dissect these phrases and expose them for what they are, semantics and restricted views of the problem.

"Let's go back to what really counts, what we should be doing—visitor services."

What are visitor services?

1. Is recovering and returning stolen property to a visitor, visitor service?
2. Is maintaining peace and quiet in a campground a visitor service?
3. Is overall resource enforcement that results in a clean, pristine park experience a service to the visitor?

What is visitor protection?

1. Is removing a drunk driver from the road, reducing speed and other traffic enforcement, visitor protection?
2. Is removing an automobile burglar, rapist, exhibitionist, thief, public drunk or dope dealer, visitor protection?
3. Is enforcing regulations on boating, life preservers, closed areas, feeding animals, fireworks, and disorderly conduct, visitor protection?

What is resource management and protection?

1. Is limiting people in the backcountry or in a given zone to the number the fragile resource can tolerate, resource management?
2. Is enforcing fishing regulations, prohibiting hunting, preventing wood cutting, slowing speeders to prevent animal kills, preventing the dumping of waste, resource protection?

"Let's not forget rangers."

Agreed. Every one of the above activities is a ranger activity necessary for the proper protection and management of the parks and each activity involves the enforcement of a law or regulation. What is negative about any of them? Is the manner in which the enforcement is done negative? If so, then this is an administrative problem, not a philosophical one.

I am not saying that my previous comments encompass all ranger activities. To the contrary, I am saying that law enforcement from felony to misdemeanor is a ranger activity and should remain one. Rather than "appropriately orient" other law enforcement agencies, let's use and continue to improve what we have. They are already oriented.

Suggestions:

1. Carefully review GAO Report on law enforcement in national parks.
2. Review 1970 IACP Report on law enforcement in national parks.

Michael V. Finley
Michael V. Finley

