

“Mallards and Messerschmitts”: American Hunting Magazines and the Image of American Hunting During World War II

Thomas L. Altherr
Professor of History
Metropolitan State College
Denver, CO

When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the United States immediately entered the world war, American hunters and the hunting magazines such as *Field and Stream*, *Outdoor Life*, and *Sports Afield*, found an opportunity to regloss the somewhat tarnished image of American hunting. During the previous four decades, American hunters had encountered mounting criticism of their sport. In modernizing America, where by 1920 over half the people resided in urban environs, hunting had seemed to become increasingly outdated, inefficient, and irrelevant. A small number of vegetarians and animal rights proponents had always criticized hunting as immoral, cruel, and barbarous, and in this period, anti-hunting sentiments increased among the more numerous middle-class meat eaters. For this group, farming, ranching, and hunting had existed mainly as tales from older male relatives. Purchasing wrapped chops from the corner market had seemed more and more preferable to stalking venison in the cold and dangerous wilds. Although some city-dwellers and suburbanites had continued to join their rural cousins for a few fall hunts, most knew that outside of a few backwoods poor poachers, Americans no longer depended upon game to fill or supplement their diets.

Other changes in American attitudes about nature had also affected the image of hunting in the twentieth century. Indulgence in anthropomorphism (ascribing human traits to animals) had increased, as fables, children's books, and eventually Disney-type cartoons attested. Burgeoning enthusiasm for nonhunting outdoor recreation, park-oriented activities such as picnicking, bicycling, baseball, and other games, and for woodsy pleasures such as bird-watching, camping, hiking, and outdoor photography, had replaced the former widespread urge for hunting. For many Americans the yard, the garden, or the patio gave them close enough proximity to nature. The movement to preserve national parks and monuments had also contained a strong streak of anti-hunting feeling (despite the fact that some early supporters such as Theodore

Roosevelt had argued for the parks as national training grounds for the strenuous life, which included hunting).

The new science of wildlife management likewise had signalled other changes for hunting in America. From the Lacey Act of 1900, which had outlawed such market hunting, to the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916, which had instituted international cooperation, and to the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937, which had established federal control and fees on waterfowl hunting, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and its state counterparts had gained and exerted stricter control over American hunting. While not anti-hunting *per se*, the wildlife managers, the biologists and the wardens, had campaigned against the current slob hunters and reminded the public of the greedy shooters and market gunners of the previous century. Without wildlife management, the managers had hinted, the unbridled hunters would repeat the extinctions and near-extinctions of American fauna. Although many, if not most American hunters had conformed to the new game laws, the actions of violators confirmed the non-hunting public's suspicion that hunters were irresponsible louts. Even farmers and their lobbying organizations had grown to fear the hunters and had removed more and more of their land from the hunters' domain.

American hunters responded to this criticism in various ways. A few undoubtedly took it to heart and stopped hunting; some ignored it and continued hunting. Sportsmen wrote defenses of their sport in the popular press and in letters to each other. The shrill tone of some of these articles indicates the depth of the pressure the hunters felt. Some old-timers who remembered the days of "free taking" bristled at the new game laws; newer generations accepted the new reality and hunted within those limits. Some hunters reacted by forming exclusive clubs with their own private hunting lands, hunting on commercial reserves, or taking safaris abroad, emulating the colonialist Great White Hunters. But overall the image of the hunter had become somewhat tattered, definitely less vibrant than in the old Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett myths. The absolute number of American hunters during those decades had increased because of the general rise in population, along with the money involved in hunting and the outdoors equipment industry, but the actual percentage of American men and women who hunted in the woods, fields, and wetlands had declined. No wonder then that the hunters and the hunting magazines seized the chance to restore hunting to some "golden age" status, to declare hunting a patriotic duty, to capitalize on the assumed connection of hunting and national defense.

When the United States went to war in 1941, American hunters rose to support the war effort. Many thousands enlisted in the Armed Forces, became firearms instructors, or otherwise offered their hunting and gun-handling knowledge to the government. Yet others became woodcraft or survival-skills instructors. Some of those who could not, or chose not, to enlist formed civilian militias dedicated to warding off any invasion. At the homefront, keeping game herds trimmed down, chasing off predators from necessary agricultural commodities, and providing game for meals to ease meat boycotts and other food

rationing all became duties as patriotic as buying war bonds and saving metals. Although the sportsmen objected to ammunition shortages and the rumored possibility of gun confiscation, they angrily denounced the Axis powers, not the U.S. government, for interrupting their favorite outdoor recreation. For their sacrifices and efforts, hunters felt justified in promoting hunting as patriotic and useful for national defense. And if the war brought along new improvements in hunting weaponry and outdoor equipment, courtesy of military research and development departments, so much the better for postwar hunting.

Joining in the swelling chorus of support for the war were such hunting magazines as *Field and Stream*, *Outdoor Life*, and *Sports Afield*.¹ These periodicals catered to hunters and sporting goods companies, serving as hunters' forums, information clearinghouses, and, through advertisements, mouthpieces for the hunting industry. In their wartime issues, these magazines advanced all of the above themes about the contributions hunters were making to the war effort. Unabashedly at times they trumpeted hunting forth as a form of national salvation. In less sanguine instances they cheered on the war-weary hunters and homesick soldiers with promises of fantastic postwar hunting. Editors wedged quite a few war-related articles and editorials in between the standard fare of hunting and fishing rhapsody, adventure, and know-how stories. Covers and other illustrations visually reinforced the magazines' commitment to the war effort and the promotion of hunting. The magazines also provided the place for firearms, ammunition, and hunting paraphernalia companies to proclaim their patriotism, explain the shortages for hunters, and smooth over the ruffled feathers of those grouching about the lack of shot and shells. Generally the magazines stressed the long held assumptions that American freedoms had depended upon a close connection between hunting prowess and military might, and that hunters had always been the best soldiers and patriots.*

1 For sources for this article I have concentrated on the three major hunting and fishing magazines published during World War II. *Field and Stream* (abbreviated in the notes as FS), *Outdoor Life* (OL), and *Sports Afield* (SA). There were also several other magazines with smaller circulation, such as *Fur-Fish-Game*, *Outdoor America*, *Outdoor Unlimited*, and *Hunting and Fishing* but I was unable to research complete runs of these magazines for the war years. I also examined the wartime issues of *The American Rifleman* and found much material which corroborates the themes from the three major sporting magazines, but as *The American Rifleman* was not strictly a hunting and fishing magazine, I chose to omit information from it.

2. This longheld assumption that hunters have made the best soldiers is perhaps open to debate and not within the province of this research. What matters is that hunters and the hunting magazines assumed that there was a direct connection between hunting prowess and soldierly might. There have been throughout American history some examples of former public figures making this connection. The American painter Charles Willson Peale wrote to a friend in 1775. "All the people declare for Liberty or Death. They are much used to hunting and are all good marksmen even our children. Is it to be supposed that such people thickly settled at least 1400 miles length can be conquered by all the Troops England can send here'? No it is not probable." Peale to Edmond Jenings, August 25, 1775, quoted in Joseph J. Ellis, *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture* (New York: Norton, 1979): 51. A few decades later Andrew Jackson, that old warhorse of New Orleans fame, remarked:

England has used us ill from first to last: but after all, she has conferred upon us, as a race, some signal advantages. And among those, I mention the ardent and passionate desire for hunting and wild-sports which animates the vast bulk of our citizens in every section of the States. We have been taught—and have been apt scholars, too—to use the rifle, not solely for the pleasure of taking heads off the ranks of British officers who have invaded our shores. Had we not been such good marksmen in our wilds and prairies, we should not have taught our enemies such a severe and so salutary a lesson as we have recently done. I would conjure you, my friends, not to let your rifles rust. They are first-rate instruments for extending your power and consolidating

In the late 1930s, as America maintained an official policy of neutrality as Europe lurched toward and into war, the sporting magazines reflected little concern with the possibility of American entrance into the war. One minor exception was an advertisement for Laird's Apple Brandy which appeared in the December 1939 issues of *Field and Stream* and *Outdoor Life* and the January 1940 issue of *Sports Afield*. Under an illustration of a happy hunter and an unhappy soldier, ran the following commentary:

Let's be THANKFUL! Thankful that we are Americans . . . thankful for a grand country . . . and another hunting season. Once again we enter the field of SPORT and not the field of BATTLE. Let's remember the dangers of foreign entanglements . . . so that our entanglements may be only those of the briar in the field. While some nations revel in the open season on men and drink of hatred and despair give us a sane and happy hunting season Good hunting the American way . . . and may we have the fortune and strength of a strong people to stay out of a weak war.³

Interestingly this comment, resembling an America First isolationist speech, distinguished between hunting and war, a distinction that a couple of years later would disappear from the magazines. Aside from that advertisement, there was no editorial recognition or comment on the approaching state of hostilities until early 1941. In the January issue of *Sports Afield*, Col. Charles A. Ranlett, in an article entitled "Sportsmen and Military Training," advised sportsmen to begin "now to acquire knowledge and experience which may prove valuable if you are called upon to be soldiers." Ranlett, a veteran officer who had seen action in World War I, did not posit an exact equation between hunting and battle, but he thought many of the skills involved in hunting could have application in war. Hunters should practice taking cover, studying ground signs, and making accurate observations. They should also gain familiarity with all sorts of weaponry, because, although Ranlett admitted that most casualties in battle resulted from long-range fire, skill in close-range shooting built up confidence. He concluded that hunting would be very good preconditioning for war: "Long days in the open, hearty food, and sound sleep at night build the firmest foundation for the strain of intensive military training and war." Later that year,

your liberties. (Jackson quoted in "The Literature and Philosophy of Hunting and Field Spats," *Eclectic Review* 99 (1854): 740

Later in the century, *Field and Stream* gave hunting as the reason for the American victory in the Spanish-American War.

All young America, practically, are sportsmen. As soon as a boy is big enough and strong enough to bear a gun, he finds business to do. at least for a few weeks of each year in the fall, along the sloughs and fields and marshes of his native State or some adjoining one He is a campaigner, with good, tough, muscular legs, no nerves, a quick eye and a sudden trigger finger, before he has reached the second book of Euclid or can tell a Latin verb from the Hellespont. He can make camp, build a fire and do his own cooking. He is a soldier in the rough before he knows enough to stand to attention, and all that has to be done is to smooth him off, like a clay model. teach him to march in step, and send him out to give any casual belligerent points on hitting bull's eyes. (FS 4 (July 1898): 230)

Even some of the victims testified to this American prowess. During World War I. Americans with Pershing's expeditionary force recovered a diary from a dead German soldier and found the following notation within: "God save us from these Americans. They shoot like devils. They kill us like animals. They are the best marksmen in the world." (Incident and diary entry cited in Arthur Grahame, "Making American Soldiers the World's Best Rifleman." *OL* 94 (July 1944): 13.)

3. FS (December 1939): 9; *OL* 84 (December, 1939): 9; *SA* 103 (January 1940): 13.

the October issue featured veteran hunting writer Archibald Rutledge anticipating a great hunter response should a belligerent attack America: "Because of her hunters, America is a better place. If America is ever attacked, an army of 10,000,000 hunters stands ready to defend her; and it will be an army that possesses the essential qualification of knowing how to shoot."⁴

When Ranlett's and Rutledge's worst fears came true at Pearl Harbor, sporting magazines all rushed to urge hunters to use their expertise to support the war or civil defense efforts. In February 1942, the editors of a smaller-circulation hunting magazine, *Hunting and Fishing*, called on American sportsmen to aid the mobilization and boost homefront morale:

Never before has the sportsman been able to do so much for his country as he is doing today. Everyone can help, but none so much as the man who has kept himself fit through outdoor living, who owns guns and knows how to use them, and who doesn't get panicked when things go wrong. No other single group can offer as much as that.⁵

The editors then pointed to beleaguered England as an example of a nation that had neglected its hunting tradition. America, instead, could rely on the "moral fiber—guts is a better word for it—" of twelve million sportsmen to fight the battles, protect domestic security, and train the Armed Forces. The editors applauded the fact that one-fifth of the trainees were sportsmen: "We can't help thinking what a pleasant surprise it must have been to the range officers at [Forts] Devens, Edwards, Dix, Bragg, and Benning when some of their rookies grabbed a Springfield or Garand and began to pour .30 calibre slugs into a target like veterans."⁶ And those men out of uniform, "America's great army of sportsmen," should keep themselves in physical and mental health by hunting and also keeping the victory spirit vibrant.

Sporting magazines of wider circulation also stepped into the foray and stressed the importance of hunting and the war effort. In May 1942, *Field and Stream* printed an article on how skeet shooters were training soldiers; two months later *Outdoor Life* followed with a similar report. This theme appeared again in *Outdoor Life* articles by outdoors writer Arthur Grahame in November 1942 and July 1944.⁷ Both *Field and Stream* and *Outdoor Life* published monthly honor rolls of those sporting goods firms which were making major contributions to the effort. *Field and Stream* ran a monthly feature called "Give 'Em Guns," a report on its own fund-raising activities on behalf of arming the troops and keeping domestic hunters also well-armed. Both magazines urged the public and other hunters to buy war bonds.

Sports Affeld paralleled the other two magazines in effort and included articles which dealt more directly with the close ties of hunting and the war

4. Charles A. Ranlett, "Sportsmen and Military Training," SA 105 (January 1941): 14-15; Archibald Rutledge, "Oh, Those Hunters," SA 106 (October 1941): 14.

5. "Sportsmen in the War," *Hunting and Fishing* 19 (February 1942): 19.

6. *Ibid.*, 19.

7. Bob Nichols, "Skeet-For Victory," FS 47 (May 1942): 88-89; Francis A. Marvin, Jr., "Crack Skeet Shots Train Air Fighters," OL 90 (July 1942): 10-13; Grahame, "Ace Marksmen Teach Our Fighters to Shoot," OL 90 (November 1942): 22-24; Grahame, "Making American Soldiers," 13-17.

efforts. Col. Ranlett was back again in the February 1942 issue with an article entitled "Sportsmen and the War: The Outdoorsman's Part in Civilian Defense." Ranlett saw the sportsmen's role as vital: "The sportsman's familiarity with firearms, his experience obtained by elemental living on stream and trail, give him special knowledge which because of the war suddenly has become important to immense numbers of people who never before thought of guns or shooting." Sportsmen, thought Ranlett, bore a heavy duty:

Finally there is an obligation that the sportsman has in war which is not material nor is it mawkishly sentimental. It is the deep sentiment, rather, of the man who has slept on mother earth, who has tramped his native hills, and who would rather die than lose his heritage to aliens. We sportsmen are, or ought to be, the soul of this country's manhood.⁸

In the March issue, Ranlett moved on to the similarity of duck-hunting to shooting at invading parachutists. Part of his comments displayed the militaristic side of hunting attitudes: "It's a safe bet that every experienced wing shot in the United States has entertained a secret hope that the day might come when he would be out in the open, a swaying enemy 'chutist descending overhead, a favorite rifle in hand to deal with him." That June, Ranlett was back yet again, that time in a piece called "The Rifle and Moving Targets." Once again he made the connection of hunting and war performance: "On the big game hunt or the field of battle, the best gunner is the man who can shoot his rifle skillfully at targets which do not stand still. In the November 1943 issue, *Sports Afield* continued its emphasis on warfare as a theater for hunting skills. Arms and ammunition editor Major Jim Crossman depicted the sniper as a proficient hunter: "The sniper is a big game hunter, and the game he hunts is the most dangerous in the world. A war of machines hasn't outrun this traditional rifleman's art." "Basically," Crossman chortled, "sniping is nothing but hunting with a considerable number of chills thrown in. The man who is an experienced hunter should take to sniping like a housewife takes, nowadays, to a hunk of steak."⁹

Editors of these sporting magazines were especially vociferous about the war and hunting. Paul K. Whipple, editor of *Sports Afield*, in the April 1942 number, urged support for the war effort, but also defended domestic hunting against possible wartime restrictions. Hunting, Whipple claimed, was necessary recreation for a populace anxious about war. Also Whipple warned against using the patriotic emergency as a license for environmental destruction. He wanted the woods and fields in shape for postwar hunting. But perhaps the most persistent and insistent of cheerleaders and watchdogs was David M. Newell, the editor of *Field and Stream*. His editorials repeatedly declared the valuable military training inherent in hunting. In the October 1942 issue, Newell forcefully argued this connection:

8. Ranlett. "Sportsmen and the War: The Outdoorsman's Part in Civilian Defense," SA 107 (February 1942): 29, 72.

9. Ranlett. "Rifleman and the New Warfare." *ibid.*, (March 1942): 38; Ranlett, "The Rifle and Moving Targets." *ibid.*, (June 1942): 14; Jim Crossman. "The Most Dangerous Game." SA 110 (November 1943): 17

Wars are fought with guns, and a nation of gunners is a strong nation. Hunting is a survival of one of man's earliest instincts. In the first days of the race he had to be a good hunter, or starve. Present-day hunting breeds physical fitness and resourcefulness. It produces a knowledge of firearms, and we have come to see once more the terribly vital importance of such knowledge.

This knowledge was obvious and practical to men of the same mind as Newell: "A youngster who has grown up with a gun has a tremendous advantage in the field. If he can hit a running deer, he can hit a running Jap. If he can swing fast enough for a mallard, he can knock down a Messerschmitt." The following



Courtesy and permission of *Field and Stream*.

May, Newell expanded his argument to dwell on the recreational and economic boons of hunting: "Armies and big business have found that healthful recreation is necessary to the human system. Fishing and hunting come right up at the top of the list. They lay the groundwork for military training and have very definite economic value in war time." And, in December 1944, Newell returned to his theme: "We have repeatedly stressed the importance of the fact that millions of American boys knew how to handle guns and were good shots when this war hit us . . . No other sport training has been as valuable as this knowledge of guns."¹⁰

In addition to editorial comment, hunting magazines carried many advertisements and illustrations by firearm and ammunition companies that buttressed the connection of hunting and the war effort. "You know, anti-aircraft gunnery and duck-shooting have a lot in common," ran a Remington Arms Co. advertisement in the October 1942 *Outdoor Life and Sports Afield* issues. "Hunting has greatly contributed to the war effort," concluded those blurbs.¹¹ "It's Messerschmitts, not Mallards today, Bill!" shouted a Winchester Arms Co. advertisement in *Sports Afield* that same October. The caption came right to the point with more detail:

Today, when warbirds swoop and circle with deadly menace, American familiarity with firearms is paying big dividends. . Men who yesterday trained themselves to swing a gun smoothly and accurately at wildfowl . are today the guardians of our safety. For now their peacetime skill is helping rid the sky of Messerschmitts and Zeros.¹²

Two months later, Winchester pictured a patrol boat anti-aircraft gunner saying, "Here's where my hunting pays off."¹³ Western Ammunition Co. followed suit. In the June 1943 *Outdoor Life*, Western asserted that "millions of boys, like many Americans in our armed forces, learned to be straight shooters with .22 Western cartridges." Next month Western assured the homefront hunters, "Now your ammunition is getting bigger game." And in August, Western continued the idea: "Many thousands of our fighters learned to shoot in the nation's duck marshes." In April 1944, in *Sports Afield*, Western rounded off the theme: "Cracking down on fast-flying targets wasn't new to lots of our aerial gunners. They'd spent many a great day, bird-shooting."¹⁴ Remington had perhaps the most poignant advertisement in the December 1943 *Sports Afield*. A caged hunting dog, who claimed to know "What Freedom Means," tried to understand why his master, "Boss," was shipping him to another farm; "Boss" was going "running for varmints . . . Two-legged ones." Perhaps the most

10. Paul K. Whipple, "The Sportsman in Wartime: An Editorial," *SA* 107 (April 1942): 34; David M. Newell, "Food for Thought," *FS* 47 (October 1942): 15; Newell, "Why Fishing and Hunting?" *FS* 48 (May 1943): 31; Newell, "Editorial," *FS* 49 (December 1944): 15.

11. *OL* 90 (October 1942), inside of front cover; *SA* 108 (October 1942), back cover.

12. *SA* 108 (October 1942), inside of back cover; see also the Remington advertisement on the back of the back cover of the same issue: "That old greenhead never guessed he'd be helping the U.S. Army some day."

13. *OL* 90 (December 1942): 55; *SA* 108 (December 1942): 43.

14. *OL* 91 (June 1943): 66; *OL* 92 (July 1943): 67, also, in *SA* 110 (August 1943), inside of back cover; *OL* 92 (August 1943): 53; see also the Western advertisement on the back cover of *SA* 108, (November 1942): "It's Western. Bob! Our old reliable hunting brand."

forceful advertisement of this kind was again a Remington one which appeared in the October 1943 *Outdoor Life* and again in the November 1943 *Sports Afield*. A strapping adolescent sat in his room in the midst of his hunting gear and mused, "Wonder where I'll be hunting next season . . . Bet it's some place I'll be glad I'm not such a lousy shot."¹⁵

Gun and scope companies also tailored their advertisements to the war and hunting spirit. In June, 1942, in *Field and Stream*, Weaver Scopes Co. advised the nation's hunters, "Keep your shooting eye in trim. Uncle Sam may need it!" Next May, Weaver asked rhetorically, "Why do American snipers score so high?" For Weaver, the answers were obvious: "1) Americans have always been handy with rifle or shotgun and 2) they're using the world's finest today in their grim hunt for the enemy." In February 1945, Redfield Gunsight Co. announced, "NEXT! Jap, Nazi . . . or Big Game!"¹⁶ Stevens (Savage) Arms Co. ran a series of advertisements entitled "Able Defenders of America," which portrayed at the top a current-day hunter or old-time minuteman and at the bottom a World War II soldier shooting.¹⁷ All of these advertisements showed the pervasiveness of the hunting as war spirit. None of these companies, given the extremely high demand for their products, would have had to run any such advertisements. Some apologized for the lack of available guns and ammunition and begged the reader to look forward eagerly to the postwar years when production for peacetime use would boom once more and products would benefit from wartime technological improvements.

The magazines' covers during the war years often departed from the traditional formula of hunting or fishing scenes or sketches of harrowing outdoor danger to ones reinforcing the war support. The covers for both *Field and Stream* and *Outdoor Life* for July 1942 exclaimed "United We Stand" and showed hunters and soldiers together, or hunters raising a flag. *Sports Afield* for that month paired a hunter and a frontier minuteman together. The August 1942 *Outdoor Life* cover featured a soldier's face outlined with a montage of hunting scenes double-exposed within the image. The November 1942 issue of the same magazine displayed a soldier and phantom hunter on its cover. In September 1943, *Sports Afield's* cover had two soldiers smiling while watching a V-formation of wildfowl fly over their foxholes. In July, 1944, *Field and Stream* and *Outdoor Life* chose covers which urged "true sportsmen" to buy war bonds. In the last year of the war, the magazines returned to the previous format, but for the first few years of the war, the hunter-as-soldier theme frequented the covers.

Yet the sporting magazines did not focus exclusively on the message of hunting as the best training for future soldiers. The magazines also spoke out on behalf of the homefront hunters, for keeping hunting at prewar levels. Although the rumored governmental confiscation of private guns for the war did not occur, editors and correspondents remained deadset against such an action.

15. SA 110 (December 1943), inside of front cover; *OL* 92 (October 1943), inside of front cover; SA 110 (November 1943), inside of front cover.

16. *FS* 47 (June 1942): 77; *OL* 91 (May 1943): 81; *OL* 95 (February 1945): 53.

17. See, for example, the Stevens advertisement in *OL* 90 (October 1942): 61.

Field and Stream's David Newell sounded the typical alarm in May 1942, when he argued that confiscation would leave the country open to fifth columnists, revolutionists, and invasion. Newell otherwise urged sportsmen to endure the hunting restrictions and ammunition shortages until peacetime hunting returned, but he and others were adamant about what they considered as any abrogation of Second Amendment rights. Instead of surrendering their weapons, hunters exhorted each other to form local militias, which were illegal in many states at the time. In his article, "Minute Men of 1942," in the June, 1942 *Outdoor Life*, Andrew Boone reported on attempts by retired U.S. Army General Paul B. Malone to organize hunters' armies in the Los Angeles area. Boone also noted similar movements afoot in Oregon, Maryland, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Maine, Washington, and Connecticut. The July 1942 *Sports Afield* reported on the formation of model sportsmen's defense units in California and Massachusetts. In *Field and Stream*, Newell likewise gave the movement coverage and boasted that an aroused hunter population could stave off any Japanese invasion.¹⁸

Along with describing these attempts to form hunters' militias, the magazines also narrated the campaigns to teach woodcraft to future soldiers and the homefront public. The idea behind these courses was that the populace should be prepared to live in the woods in case of an invasion. The April 1943 *Outdoor Life* described such efforts in courses taught in Buffalo and Ithaca, New York. Famous hunter-naturalist Edwin Way Teale explained the rationale of this instruction:

Long before the birth of our republic there developed a great American type: the woodsman. It was he and his successors who pushed back the wilderness frontiers, became the vanguard and protector of settlers who surged from East to West. Courageous, shrewd in the ways of wildlife, the woodsman needed nothing but his gun and his knife; nature provided all else. That heritage of self-reliance has been handed down from one generation of sportsmen to the next. Now, in this war year of 1943, as battle rages from glacier to jungle, it assumes a new and vital importance. Learn here how men of the outdoors are imparting age-old knowledge to both civilians and fighting men, and why other modern woodsmen are needed to help in the work. Wars are fought outdoors-trained outdoorsmen will win them!¹⁹

Although peaceful pursuits such as hiking, camping, or Boy Scout outings could have provided a sufficient amount of woodcraft training, sporting magazine writers emphasized hunting as the best course of outdoor education.

The magazines also addressed the matter of keeping the nation's farms and ranches supplying food for the troops and the homefront. Hunting to prevent browsers and varmints from despoiling the crops and preserving livestock from

18. Newell, "Give 'Em Guns," *FS* (May 1942): 14-15; Newell, "Editorial," *FS* 47 (December 1942): 13-14; Andrew R. Boone, "Minute Men of 1942," *OL* 89 (June 1942): 26-28; Model Sportsmen's Defense Units," *SA* 108 (July 1942): 39; Newell, "Editorial," *F.Y* 47 (January 1943): 12-13; see also "Sportsmen in the War," *Hunting and Fishing* 19 (February 1942). 19: "As forest patrolmen, guarding the woods against incendiary saboteurs, woodsmen are worth a dozen men who are not at home in the wilderness."

19. Edwin Way Teale, "Woodcraft Goes to War," *OL* 91 (April 1943): 9.

predators also became a patriotic responsibility for the hunting fraternity. So claimed Arthur Grahame in his article, "Hunting Is Now A Patriotic Duty," in the October 1942 *Outdoor Life*. Similarly, Newell, at *Field and Stream*, recommended no letup in harvesting the duck flocks that threatened grain crops. A Remington advertisement in the June 1943 *Outdoor Life* supported this point. "I'm sorta in the army now!" bragged a boy who hunted coyotes on his father's ranch to keep the livestock safe.²⁰

Sporting magazine publicists also tagged hunting as patriotic on the basis that every game animal killed supplied meat for domestic consumption and therefore theoretically freed more farm-fed meat for the troops, or also provided fats, hides, and down for military purposes. Remington pleaded with hunters to save those animal by-products, in an April 1943 *Spurts Afield* advertisement. Newell also touched on this game meals issue in his editorial, "Why Fishing and Hunting?" but the best illustrations of this point came in Peters Ammunition Co. advertisements. In the November 1943 *Outdoor Life* and *Sports Afield* editions, Peters showed a typical American family eagerly awaiting roasted game birds, while in an insert Adolf Hitler glowered. "The meal that Hitler hates!" ran the blurb. "Every game dish is one less purchased from the butcher." "But Hitler also hates wild ducks and geese, partridge and quail, deer steaks and rabbit. He hates every sort of table game that's served in American homes. Next month in *Sports Afield*, the Peters advertisement claimed that killing a deer saved ration tickets and saved meat for the Army. In the October 1944 *Sports Afield*, Peters returned to the theme: a killed game animal, in this case again a deer, meant meat for ten bomber crews. In the same vein, an advertisement for Deepfreeze refrigeration equipment in the November 1943 *Spurts Afield* reckoned that the "annual game kill in this country of 435,000,000 pounds of game and fish" was "sufficient to feed an army of 5,000,000 men for more than 77 days."²¹

As with other wars that accelerated technological research, World War II provided its share of new advances. Hunters would be able to use some of these products in peaceful applications in postwar hunting, beamed the hunting magazines. As early as February 1943, veteran waterfowl hunter Gordon MacQuarrie heralded jeeps as the sportsman's woods vehicle of the future. In December, 1943, Arthur Grahame previewed new equipment ranging from rifles to parkas to prepared food rations. In May, 1944, outdoor writer Rob Sanderson predicted in *Outdoor Life* that small planes would become available for hunters' uses after the war. A February 1945 *Outdoor Life* article speculated on the possible merits of the M-1 carbine as a deer-hunting rifle.²² If the war and

20. Grahame, "Hunting Is Now A Patriotic Duty," *OL* 90 (October 1942): 13-15; Newell, "Editorial," *FS* 47 (February 1943): 12-13; *OL* 91 (June 1943): 75.

21. *SA* 109 (April 1943), inside of front cover; *OL* 92 (November 1943): 70; *SA* 110 (November 1943), inside of back cover; *SA* 110 (December 1943): 58; *SA* 112 (October 1944): 55; *SA* 110 (November 1943): 53.

22. MacQuarrie, "Here Come the Jeeps," *SA* 109 (February 1943): 9-11; Grahame "New Gear That Sportsmen Will Use," *OL* 92 (December 1943): 13-17; Rob F. Sanderson, "You Can Have Your Own Plane," *OL* 93 (May 1944): 17-19; *OL* 95 (February 1945): 22-23.

service in the Armed Forces had deprived hunters of continued good hunting, these new advances promised to provide some compensation for such sacrifices.

As the tide of war turned favorably for the Allies, the hunting magazines turned their focus to the question of postwar hunting in America. Much of the advertising made this concern visual in formats of soldiers dreaming of hunting back home. Remington showed a soldier dreaming of duck-hunting and wished him, "Let's hope it's soon, soldier," in a July 1943 advertisement. The next January, the company pictured a sailor and his dog watching mallards in flight out of season. The furloughed sailor mused, "Maybe next year, Queenie." Western also played heavily on this nostalgia for hunting back home. An *Outdoor Life* advertisement in December, 1943 featured a soldier dreaming of pheasant hunting. *Sports Afield* ran a Western contribution showing a modern Indian guide assuring a soldier that there was "Plenty Game" at home, that the returnee would "Gettun Soon." In November, 1944, Western continued to whet the anticipation of peacetime hunting with a blurb, "Target . . . Ringnecks!"²³

But much of the concern for postwar hunting centered on practical matters such as how to accommodate what hunting publicists were certain would be a tremendous surge in the hunter population. Arthur Grahame expected a thirty per cent increase in hunting licenses sold in the upcoming postwar period. As early as March, 1944, Maj. Jim Crossman and Maj. Charles Askins, queried in *Sports Afield*, "After the War, What About Shooting?" Both expected a big boom in hunting because soldiers would have had acquired a taste for shooting and would now wish to apply those skills to outdoor recreation. Six months later, Grahame in *Outdoor Life* and Newell in *Field and Stream* advocated expansion of existing government programs for sportsmen to meet the expected crush of new hunters. There had been murmurs during the war that funds from the Pittman-Robertson licenses were lying idle in the Treasury. Activate those funds now, urged Grahame and Newell, and appropriate even more. Grahame predicted a horde of twenty-two million hunters for the immediate postwar period, on the order of one and one-half times as many hunters as before the war. Newell agreed and called on the federal and state governments to create outdoor-related jobs for these veterans.²⁴

Those veterans, freshly mustered out, did not find a welter of new government warden jobs, but they found the image of hunting in America more positive than before the war. Many of the ex-servicemen resumed their subscriptions to *Field and Stream*, *Outdoor Life*, and *Sports Afield* and feasted on the usual fare of hunting articles. The war as a subject virtually disappeared

23 SA 110 (July 1943), inside of front cover; SA 111 (January 1944): 45; OL 92 (December 1943), inside of front cover; SA 112 (August 1944), inside of front cover; SA 112 (November 1944), back cover, and also the following from the same advertisement: "Today the enemy is his target, but he's longing, as you are, for peaceful hunting grounds where the target will be pheasants, or other upland game."

24 Grahame, "Farmland Game Will insure Our Future Hunting," OL 95 (March 1945): 11; Jim Crossman and Charles Askins, "After the War, What About Shooting?" SA III (March 1944): 78, 80, 82-83; Grahame, "What We Must Do to Provide Fish and Game for Twenty-Two Million Postwar Sportsmen," OL 94 (September 1944): 13-15; Newell, "Editorial," FS 49 (September 1944): 15.

from these magazines' pages in 1945. Perhaps the editors and contributors chose not to remind the veterans of the ordeal which had deprived many of them of pleasurable peacetime hunting. Probably those returnees, in their rush for a return to normalcy and their scramble for consumer goods and houses, preferred not to dwell on the war and hunting connection. Most likely the sporting magazines and their readers rested assured that hunting had contributed substantially to the defense of liberty worldwide, that only the most vitriolic vegetarians would now dare to criticize the men stalking the game in the russet hues of postwar American autumns.