

V. Geist

Geist, V. 2009. „Let's get real. Beyond wolf advocacy, towards realistic policies for carnivore conservation. *Fair Chase* Vol. 24. No. 2. pp. 26-30.

Draft 21st Dec., 2008.

Essay No. 3 Fair Chase

Misleading Advocacy, the Kenton Carnegie Tragedy and a Realistic Carnivore Conservation Policy.¹

Investigations into the Kenton Carnegie tragedy unearthed matters that are deeply troubling. First it showed how political advocacy captures the carnivore issue to mislead the public. In the Carnegie case, attention was quickly diverted from wolves to black bears, banking on the authority of science as well as prestigious organizations such as the *National Geographic Society* and *National Wildlife*. With that deed accomplished, it matters little what subsequent inquiries conclude. This preemptive strike insures that there will always be a residue of true believers, which will always proclaim that not wolves, but bears killed Kenton Carnegie, white-washing wolves. It succeeded to the distress of the Carnegie family and the coroner, Mrs. Rosalie Tsannie-Buseth¹ who first investigated the scene of the Kenton Carnegie tragedy the day it occurred. The first casualty of advocacy is the public's faith in the disinterestedness of scientists. Unfortunately, there are more.

The North American myth of harmless wolves is deadly! Belief in it has killed at least three persons in North America alone in the last decade, two of which were bright, educated young people. There were also cases of children under parental care sticking fingers towards captive wolves in the innocent belief that wolves harmed nobody. Yet, I must confess that I too embraced that myth throughout my academic career and four years into retirement due to my years of experience with painfully shy Canadian wilderness wolves, till a misbehaving pack on Vancouver Island², and a review of historical matters, taught me differently³.

The advocacy in favor of the “benign wolf” myth is so powerful, that the better educated the persons, the more likely it seems that they are to become true believers and endanger themselves⁴. Exceptionally well-educated people have become victims of lethal attacks. Kenton Carnegie is not the only victim. So was 24-year-old Wildlife Biologist, Trisha Wyman, who was killed on April 18th 1996 by a captive wolf pack in Ontario. I had a long phone conversation with Dr. Erich Klinghammer of Wolf Park. He was called in as an expert witness to examine the case, and discovered that there was surprise at her death, as wolves are not supposed to attack people. Ms Wyman had visited the park previously and spent some time studying the wolves. She was given the dream job of looking after and interpreting the wolves. She lasted three days. A similar fate befell a lady keeping wolf hybrids, and for similar reasons⁵. A captive pack of nine wolf hybrids, kept as pets,

killed its owner, Sandra L. Piovesan, of Salem Township, Pennsylvania, on July 17th 2006. Linda Wilson Fuoco and Chico Harlan, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette wrote that Ms. Piovesan treated her wolves like children, and said as much when neighbors asked about them. Ms. Piovesan said that "*they (the wolf-hybrids) give me unqualified love*". She fed the animals' road kills that sometimes caused the nearby neighborhood to smell. She said that she liked the wolf-dogs because they were pretty. While the notion of the "harmless" wolf is here not explicit, it is implicit.

The view that, in the absence of rabies, wolves do not attack people has taken hold so severely in current times, that even after an exploratory attack by two wolves on two camp personnel at Camp North Landing, the threat posed by wolves was not recognized⁶. Currently, reintroduced wolves in the western USA are giving indications of targeting people, but their intentions continue to be misinterpreted. The widespread view of the "harmless wolf" may have prevented North American wolf specialists, though not students of urban coyotes, from developing an understanding of the circumstances when wolves are dangerous to people and when they are not. In North America, unlike in some European and Asiatic countries, the circumstances when wolves pose a danger to humans is rare, but it is not absent.

However, the above is but part of a much greater advocacy on behalf of predators which appeals to protective emotions and does sterling service for riveting attention on various organizations who proclaim to do battle on behalf of seals, whales, wolves, mountain lions, grizzly bears etc. The hallmark of such operations is access to public media via sensations, the use of orchestrated showmanship as well as stars of pop culture combined with justifications based on the prestige of science. The political objective pertaining to gray wolves is to spread the species throughout its historic range including "*in multi-use landscapes surrounding houses, farms, villages and cities*"⁷ Central to this goal, and the legislation derived there from, is the myth of the "harmless wolf" who does not harm people, a myth that has been repeated and repeated to the point of transforming it long ago into a politically correct "truth". Moreover, it's a myth that is – apparently – upheld by science. Combined with this myth is the mirror image counter claim, namely, that all information pertaining to dangerous wolves is an outgrowth of the misleading fairy tale about Little Red Riding Hood, a fairy tale – so it is claimed – based on ancient, primordial, irrational fears and gross misinformation about wolves.

The Coroner's inquest in Saskatchewan, unfortunately, did not touch on policy matters. It only answered the narrow question who killed Kenton Carnegie, to which the answer is: *wolves*. Change the question slightly to what killed Kenton Carnegie and the answer is: *the myth that wolves do not attack people*. The inquest did not dwell on this myth or its origins, or the scholarly deficits that generated such, nor on what circumstances lead to the habituation of wolves to humans beside the availability of camp refuse. It, therefore, did not inquire about the scarcity of natural prey and its causes, or about escalating livestock losses. The inquest was not made aware of the likelihood that in British Columbia, thanks to legislation quite different from that in Saskatchewan, the tragedy would very likely not have happened. My letters detailing this to the media were ignored. In British Columbia habituating wolves are readily removed as any licensed hunter may

take three wolves in a long season. In Saskatchewan there is no general season on wolves. Only trappers may take such or people suffering wolf depredation – provided they get prior permission. I am well aware that my conclusion was an irritant. There is thus more to the matter than became available to the public through the inquest. The policies that led to Kenton’s death thus escaped critical examination, and criticism pertaining to such was suppressed by the news media.

How could one uphold the view that wolves are harmless to people, despite centuries of recorded experience to the contrary in Russia⁸, Finland⁹, France¹⁰, Italy¹¹, Sweden¹², Germany¹³, India¹⁴, Afghanistan¹⁵, Korea¹⁶, Japan¹⁷, central Asia¹⁸, Turkey¹⁹, Iran^{20,21} or Greenland²²? Peter Freuchen, an explorer of Greenland, in *Arctic Adventure* reports that he lost a companion to wolves (p. 23, pp. 329, 332); he had harrowing experiences with Greenland wolves trying to break into his cabin (pp. 16-19); he shot a wolf stalking his children (pp. 347-348) and his outpost could not be provisioned by dog sled as every attempt was halted by wolf attacks. He reported an observation made by a long time resident and hunter in Greenland: where there are wolves, there are no people and vice versa! And while details in Hazaribagh, Northern India, may be different²³ the causes of wolf predation on humans are much the same: scarcity of prey or opportunity to kill livestock, *de facto* protection of wolves, followed by systematic targeting of peoples as prey, mainly children.

One can trace the origin of the “harmless wolf” myth to a highly respected Canadian biologist, Dr. C. H. Doug Clarke²⁴. He investigated the killing of people by wolves in Europe and concluded in an unpublished paper “*The Beast of Gèvaudan*”, that while such attacks were real, rabid wolves caused them all. In exonerating healthy wolves, Clark fell back on his experience with Canadian continental wilderness wolves (Clark’s experience is much the same as my own)²⁵. And yet he erred. Clark failed to notice that in the days before modern medicine *normal* survivors of wolf attacks could not have been bitten by rabid wolves. Secondly, he was apparently not aware of the distinction in behavior between attacks by rabid and attacks by non-rabid wolves. Even so, rabid wolves are lethal.²⁶ What is puzzling is why Clark did not see this distinction where as others, who examined much the same material, scientists, historians even laypersons, did differentiate between the attacks of rabid and non-rabid wolves²⁷? Flemming (1724 p. 113) also knew of rabid wolves, and described how the tracks and habits of such deranged wolves differed from those of healthy wolves.

Historically, the most frightening aspect of being bitten by a rabid wolf was the near certain death of the victim from rabies within about six months, or temporary survival in a “mad” state²⁸. Consequently, no *normal* survivor of a wolf attack could not have been bitten by a rabid wolf. Rabid wolves, as noted historically, attacked swiftly with great ferocity, bit multiple victims as well as livestock and non-animate objects, and aimed their bite at the face and head of the victim. That is, rabid wolves do not stalk, sneak or hunt, nor complete an attack, nor drag the victim away for consumption. Yet some victims were saved just in time after having been attacked, subdued and dragged away by wolves. Therefore, these were attacks by non-rabid wolves²⁹. Such occurred with sufficient frequency that a pattern of selectivity emerged: in predatory attacks, wolves targeted primarily children. Rabid wolves made no such choice³⁰. Also, adults could

escape most attacks by single wolves, but never that of a pack. Subsequently historians such as Moriceau found that in France about one third of the attacks were by non-rabid wolves³¹, the same proportions as were found by biologists such as Linnell et al³². The fairytale by the brothers Grimm of Little Red Riding Hood is, alas, not based on myths, ignorance or a misunderstanding of wolves, but on very terrible experiences with wolves throughout the centuries³³. Excepting historic Japan, where unarmed peasants cultivated and revered wild wolves so that these might destroy crop-raiding deer and wild pigs, I have not found instances where wolf packs lived unchecked peacefully cheek by jowl with people. And even in Japan tolerance ended when wolves became infected with rabies and inflicted this dreaded disease on humans. Wolves were then persecuted and exterminated by 1905³⁴.

Clark's conclusions were picked up by North American wolf biologists³⁵, who, due to language and cultural barriers, and premature insights based on *young* captive wolves, did not investigate historical material. Even those who did³⁶ failed to see that such investigations require in the first instance a background not in science, but in the scholarship of historians. Moreover, they were blinded by the fact that wolves, unlike bears or cougars in North America, apparently did not cause casualties. The answer to this is that wolves, like coyotes, take a long time to target humans as alternative prey. And when they do they become conspicuous and are quickly eliminated, as in North America wolves normally meet people who carry arms. Bears and cougars have no such conspicuous targeting behavior. Also, to the claim, that there is no evidence for wolves preying on people, a native hunter responded with. "*Evidence? Wolves eat the evidence!*" (*Wolves not only devoured Kenton, but also some of his clothing. They were interrupted from completing that process by the search parties*). Wolves also disperse and bury the evidence³⁷! Native people, one discovers, are much less enamored of the myth of harmless wolves than are urban environmentalists. To the above one must add two factors, the first being: the global impact of a very popular book by a famous Canadian author, Farley Mowat, depicting wolves as harmless, lovable mouse eaters. While Canadian biologists did not fall for this prank³⁸, the literati did and are still falling for it.

Moreover, this book was most welcome to the Communist Party in Russia, which had systematically suppressed information about man-killing wolves since it came to power and which had generated "scientific" propaganda in favor of the view that wolves were harmless, probably to forestall the call for arms by the public. So western environmentalists and eastern communists shouted with one voice praising the harmlessness of wolves. The Russian scientist Pavlov disclosed the matter in a book on wolves³⁹. His work upon translation into Norwegian was denounced with furor leading to the responsible ministry destroying the translation. It was subsequently published in Swedish⁴⁰. An English translation lingered unpublished, as no publisher wanted to touch it. It has recently been published⁴¹.

The second problem is that accounts of wolf attacks are, of course, not scientific data. They are usually reports by witnesses as recorded second hand by the police, priests, doctors and county clerks. In an illiterate society one cannot expect many first-hand accounts of wolf attacks. The available records are most subjective. Moreover, while

church and municipal record are indeed a good source of wolf attacks on people, few such records survived the frequent and destructive wars in Europe. One cannot limit oneself to such records and first-hand accounts and hope to do justice to the subject. There is also the suspicion that some reports, especially in newspapers, may have been padded or are somehow not trustworthy⁴². Whether it is so is not for scientists to decide, but for historians.

Records of predation on humans require the expertise of historian scholarship to locate, verify, clarify and place into perspective. For instance planner and scientist Johnny Løe and Elvin Røskraft⁴³ reported a total of 607 humans killed by wolves from 15 countries. The French rural historian Jean-Marc Moriceau reports on over 3,000 fatalities from France alone⁴⁴. Scientists in Linnell et al⁴⁵ did much better, but also failed to match Moriceau. Scientists, no matter how sincere or competent in their respective fields are not equipped technically to deal with historical scholarship. What scientist can do subsequently is to winnow historical research for patterns and trends that relate to what happens to be known about wolf biology. However, our modern understanding of wolf biology has been and is changing.

North American wolf biologists did not seek the assistance of historians. They also faced language and cultural barriers. They were prematurely enthralled by early insights based on young captive wolves, and had an abiding respect for Clarke's sterling authority. Consequently, they did not investigate foreign historical material systematically. Had they done so, they would hardly have concluded that the fairytale of Little Red Riding Hood was based on ignorance, misunderstanding, malice or an exaggerated fear of wolves! Where wolves are de-facto protected by an unarmed populace, where the prey base is diminished and livestock is not abundant, wolves focus on humans – then as now - with frightening consequences. No sovereign would expend the high costs, accept the losses in economic activity or the meager results of wolf control in centuries past were it not for telling reasons⁴⁶.

McNay testified that aggressive encounters with wolves in North America are on the increase with current wolf recovery⁴⁷. The historical and current evidence indicates that one can live with wolves where such are severely limited in numbers on an ongoing basis, so that there is continually a buffer of wild prey and livestock between wolves and humans, with a concomitant removal of all wolves habituating to people. The notion now enshrined in law in North America and Europe is that wolves can be made to co-exist with people *in multi-use landscapes surrounding houses, farms, villages and cities*⁴⁸ is not tenable. Under such conditions territorial wolves will confront people when such walk dogs or approach wolf-killed livestock. In addition even well fed, habituated wolves will test people by approaching such, initially nipping at their clothing and licking exposed skin, before mounting a clumsy first attack that may leave victims alive but injured, followed by serious attacks. While a healthy man who confronts an attacking wolf aggressively and with determination can fight off even choke a lone wolf with some chances of success⁴⁹, a lone person cannot defeat a pack. And all this assumes the absence of rabies!

The most important sign that wolves are targeting humans as prey is wolves patiently observing humans. Such wolves may be short of natural prey or they may be well fed on garbage and already habituated to humans. Wolves patiently observing humans have begun the process of slow and steady familiarization with humans, that finally leads to an attack on humans. (Urban coyotes targeting children do much the same!) Such wolves need to be taken out. In British Columbia any licensed hunter can do that. It's a safety valve. Healthy free-living wolves are virtually un-huntable⁵⁰, and the most likely candidates to be taken out are wolves disadvantaged by age or condition or rejected by their pack. Consequently, even liberal hunting laws need not result in a threat to wolf abundance.

Comprehensive policies of wolf and large carnivore conservation.

The goals of any wildlife conservation policies need to be the preservation of native, unadulterated genetic stocks in environments that support their native adaptations, as well as generate tolerance, acceptance and public support. Wildlife cannot thrive without substantive public support. And in this instance we must fall back on history, for it teaches that wildlife is supported politically only when it is either used by a large segment of the population or is revered as an icon. North American history teaches that as long as wolves are maintained at very low levels they are harmless to livestock, pets and humans and become romantic idols. Since wolves are capable of severely reducing or destroying wildlife populations, as indicated not only by the historic Japanese experience, but also by rigorous studies⁵¹, let alone my personal experience and that reported in historic accounts, unregulated predator population threaten the very existence of the public ownership of wildlife. That large predators in North America kill by an order of magnitude more game than do hunters⁵², has not yet sunk in. Nor have the consequences that follow. Historically, wildlife has been a treasured resource, one that generates substantial wealth and employment, and one, which has been viciously defended by their owners. Consequently, we must be aware that with a public becoming increasingly uninterested in wildlife, the conditions are set to transfer wildlife and its habitats into private ownership. Consider what all that entails! Among others, the public will have no more say over private bears and wolves than it has currently over private deer. It follows that our goal has to be maintaining genetically pure stocks of predators in native landscapes, while maintaining a high level of wild game for public use and for public safety.

1. If predator conservation is a serious issue, then the policy of conserving wolves *in multi-use landscapes surrounding houses, farms, villages and cities* is untenable. It must lead to the generic extinction of wolves via interbreeding with domestic dogs, changing wolves into feral dogs. Lone wolves trying to find company and thus fraternizing with dogs produce this problem. In North America there is also fraternization with coyotes and the mixing of wolf and coyote genes – and all the conservation and legal problems this entails⁵³.
2. Predator conservation requires a well thought out *Continental Carnivore Conservation Strategy* negotiated between Canada and the United States within the context of a *Terrestrial Wildlife Conservation Treaty*. While the primary purpose of such a treaty would be to enshrine the *North American Model of*

Wildlife Conservation in treaty law, another objective would be to negotiate a continental Endangered Species agreement. Continentally, or globally, wolves were never an endangered species, and the use of the current legislation as a basis of wolf reintroduction violates the very spirit of that legislation. Nothing wrong with wolf reintroductions, but not under an endangered species act! We need to apply our very limited resources to species truly in danger and not squander them on a common, resilient predator with a history of remarkable recoveries. This is not merely a matter of money, but also of squandering good will and credibility. Moreover, current reintroductions need to be viewed primarily as precious experiments whose lessons we need to document and learn from. My review of matters pertaining to the Kenton Carnegie tragedy, points to serious deficits in scholarship pertaining to wolves. There has been far too little integration of available information. The bitter complaints of rural people affected by wolf-reintroductions, for instance, are based on perfectly valid fears grounded in reality. Their concerns need attention – and solutions. A historical review of wolves and humans shows that nobody has as yet succeeded living in peace with packs of wolves, unless there was a buffer of game, livestock and pets between wolves and humans, and the wolves were conditioned to shun people. Nor have we paid attention to the experiences of native people with wolves, who pointed out, correctly, that wolves eat, disperse and bury the evidence – be it of wolf-killed sheep, calves or humans. Note similar findings for livestock taken by wolves.⁵⁴ Wolf packs attacking dogs pulling sleds were not uncommon in the north or in Greenland. The premises of the reintroductions were faulty, a matter that today clarifies vital conceptions we have about wildlife populations and predation. Above all, we urgently need to find ways to insure that scholarship is disinterested and freed of political and bureaucratic advocacy.

3. We need to take seriously the matter of zoning, determining where large predators will be conserved and where not. This is an old, but important conception, most recently realized in the Wyoming wolf management scheme. More fundamentally, we need to discuss the whole matter of so-called ecosystem rehabilitation. During this process of re-establishing regional biodiversity there are three major steps, the return of herbivores, followed by the return of carnivores, followed by the return of parasites and diseases dependent on the preceding processes. We have experienced the heady return of large herbivores and game as well as the biodiversity clinging to their coat tails⁵⁵. Do we really need the diseases and parasites potentially dangerous to public health and agriculture? If not, then zoning is the answer. We have to take seriously means and ways of coexistence where we can very fruitfully look to history. If we can agree on zoning for large predators, then we can take advantage of the lessons of history, North American history in particular (where there has been a high ratio of prey to predators, wolves are shy, avoid humans and are the very image of romantically idealized wolves). As long as there is an abundance of prey surrounding wolves, they stick to such and avoid humans and their livestock. As long as there is a buffer of game and livestock between wolves and humans, they do not target humans as alternative prey.

4. There is a great *Public Good* that hunters give to society at large, which I may call here the “*freedom of the woods*”. It is based on the fact that an armed person acts quite differently from an unarmed one when meeting predators, and we have reason to believe that the predators notice the difference via sight, sound and smell. A confident person is quite intimidating to carnivores, while a fearful one merely encourages predators to confront people. Therefore, unarmed people in the backcountry encourage misbehaviour in predators to the detriment of predators. Secondly, and of great importance, is that *inefficient* hunting of predators *conditions such negatively* so that they avoid humans. Subsequently, hikers, campers, picnickers can go into the woods in safety as carnivores stay away from humans. The Achilles heel of carnivores is being stalked systematically, as such is done by them when preying on smaller or weaker members of their own species. Carnivores are cannibalistic, and grizzly bears and wolves are no exception. Consequently, being stalked is very likely a terrifying experience to bears or wolves. Hunted carnivores negatively conditioned will co-exist splendidly with humans. That’s the big lesson from our history where we lived together with carnivores in North America (or in Siberia). Where large carnivores are de facto protected, where they may multiply unimpeded, livestock, pets and eventually humans become their victims – let alone game animals⁵⁶.
5. We require large-scale carnivore conservation areas including areas where large predators may dwell unmolested by humans. This is an essential condition of any model of carnivore conservation. There must be places, large places, where they may live without interference by humans. Wherever we impose human use on lands where carnivores live, the security of humans invariably takes priority⁵⁷. Ironically, the only human entry into such carnivore reserves would be by *armed* persons so as to avoid any positive conditioning that would lead to predators approaching humans. I suggest that we consider the process of making our national parks core areas of carnivore conservation and switch tourism and recreation outdoor uses on large wild areas where humans are protected by the “freedom of the woods”. Yes, that’s a mighty big change from our present mentality, but it comes close to what the South Africans are doing where the national parks are for nature preservation and tourism is controlled so as to interfere as little as possible. We do need large wild recreation areas for wholesome outdoor activities and large carnivores can live there splendidly at low population levels while being negatively conditioned to humans. The sheer size of such recreational and multi use areas would insure viable carnivore populations.

The above is a prescription for rich, diverse game populations, viable native predator populations and lots of hunter participation in an annual abundant wild harvest of the land. This approach would safeguard the North American Model of Wildlife conservation by insuring active participation in wildlife matters by a politically active, large fraction of the population. In managing wildlife one is reminded of the French proverb that to have a beautiful park one needs a very sharp axe and a heart of stone!

For an independent assessment of the Kenton Carnegie tragedy see: Teague, M. 2008 A More Dangerous Game Bears On The Golf Course, Deer On The Windshield, Wolves On The Walk Back Home: How the decline of hunting is changing the natural order of predator and prey. *Sports Illustrated*, Volume 109, Issue 20, p. 53, November 24, 2008.

² Geist, V. 2003. Vancouver Island wolves. *The Virginia Wildlifer*, June 2003, pp. 35-39

³ Valerius Geist, 2008. Commentary. The Danger of Wolves. *Wildlife Professional* Vol 2, No. 4 pp. 34-35. Winter 2008 edition

⁴ One great Canadian Wolf specialist, Dr. Ludwig Carbyn, was not taken in by the myth. "In early 2000, top Canadian wolf authority Ludwig Carbyn made a startling prediction: "I think, in the new century, you will find a situation where a wolf or a pack of wolves is going to kill someone." Don Zaidle, [The big, bad wolf: officially, no human has ever been attacked by a wolf in North America, but unofficially ...](#) Sports Afield, August 1st, 2003. http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-21274290_ITM

⁵ A captive pack of nine wolf hybrids, kept as pets, killed its owner, Sandra L. Piovesan, of Salem Township, Pennsylvania, on July 17th 2006. Linda Wilson Fuoco and Chico Harlan, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette wrote that Ms. Piovesan treated her wolves like children, and said as much when neighbors asked about them. Ms. Piovesan said that "*they (the wolf-hybrids) give me unqualified love*". She fed the animals' road kill that sometimes caused the nearby neighborhood to smell. She said that she liked the wolf-dogs because they were pretty. While the notion of the "harmless" wolf is here not explicit, it is implicit. At risk are, clearly, the well-educated, caring persons who place their trust in science.

⁶ See Teague 2008 *ibid*.

⁷ Quoted from C. D. C. Linnell et al. 2002 *The Fear of Wolves*, Norse Institutt for Naturforskning. NINA Oppdragsmelding 731, Trondheim, Norway. ISBN 82-426-1292-7.

⁸ See Will N. Graves 2007 (edited by V. Geist) *Wolves in Russia*, Detselig, Calgary. Mikhail P. Pavlov, 1982. "*The Wolf in Game Management*", 2nd edition 1990; Publisher: Agropromizdat, Moscow.

⁹ The historian Dr. Antti Lappalainen (opetusneuvos.lappalainen@kolumbus.fi, +35895416946) published his research findings on lethal wolf attacks on humans in Finland under the title "*Suden jäljet*", *The Tracks of the Wolf*, ISBN 952-5118-79-7 Hämeenlinna: Karisto Oy, 2005. Capstick, P. H. 1981. *Maneaters*, Safari Press, Ca. pp. 108-114. Dr. Jouko Teperi, Finnish historian published 1977 of The Historical Society of Finland (Suomen Historiallinen Seura). (SUDET Suomen rintamaiden ihmisten uhkana 1800-luvulla), "Wolf as a threat to the rural population in Finland in the 19th century" ISSN 0073-2559, ISBN 951-9254-10-2.

¹⁰ (French) Moriceau, Jean-Marc (2007). *Histoire du méchant loup : 3 000 attaques sur l'homme en France*. pp. p.623. ISBN 2213628807. Jean-Marc Moriceau is a professor of modern history at the University of Caen and a specialist in rural history.

¹¹ Aldo Oriani and Mario Comincini 2002. Living with death in the eighteenth century http://www.storiadellafauna.it/scaffale/testi/oriani/oria_comi.htm

¹² Connolly, Sofia. 2000. Bringing wolves back to Sweden. BBC news, Feb. 24th 2000, 10:41 GMT

¹³ Hans Friedrich von Flemming. 1749. *Der Vollkommene Teutsche Jäger*, Leipzig. P. 108. *Brehms Tierleben*, p. 137 in my condensed ed. 1952, Safari Verlag, Berlin. D. Müller-Using, M. Wolf and E. Klinghammer 1975 p. 203 in *Grzimek's Animal Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12 Mammals III, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co. New York.

¹⁴ Jahala and Sharma 1997 Child-lifting by wolves in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, India. *J. Wildlife Research* 292:94-101). Jahal 2003 Status, Ecology and conservation of the Indian wolf *Canis lupus pallipes* Sykes *J. Bombay Natural History Society* 100 (2&3) Aug.- Dec. pp. 293-307). See also Rajpurohit, K. S. 1999. Child Lifting: wolves in Hazaribagh, India. *AMBIO* 28(2), 162-166.

¹⁵ Roy Stewart (2004) In his book about travels in Afghanistan "*The Places in Between*" (p. 123, Harcourt Books). On the Internet newkerala.com Kabul 18 Feb 2005, It was reported that hungry wolves were driven by freezing cold in the mountains to invade Afghanistan's villages and have killed and devoured four people in the last two weeks. This was reported by the official Bakhter News Agency (BNA). Heavy snowfall is driving wolves from the mountains toward villages and in addition to four people being killed by wolves 22 have been bitten in Paktia Province which borders Pakistan.

¹⁶ The Korean experience is summarized by Robert Neff in *Devils in the Darkness*, 2007/05/23, copyright 2007 *Ohmy News*. http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?menu=c10400&no=362934&rel_no=1&isPrint=print

¹⁷ Brett L. Walker. 2005. *The Lost Wolves of Japan*. Published by University of Washington Press

¹⁸ For instance: "On the arid steppes of western Uzbekistan, some 20 villagers have been reported injured by wolves in five months. Two of them -- in the Muinak District -- died in early February as a result of their wounds" Radio Free Europe,

March 15th 2005, Central Asia: in a story entitled *Cohabitation Of Wolves, Humans Proves Difficult*.

¹⁹ Also on the internet on timberwolfinformation.org/info/archieve/newspapers on 2/27/05 from Ankara Turkey it was reported that a ten year old boy named Onur Bahar was killed by a wolf in a field near his house on the outskirts of Talas. The wolf went for the boy's throat and torn his left arm off.

²⁰ An Iranian colleague reported that in rural areas of Iran villagers were disarmed and lived in great fear of wolves. Possession of weapons during the Shah's regime was severely punished by the secret police.

²¹ Baltazard. M., and M. Ghodissi (1954) Prevention of human rabies, treatment of persons bitten by rabid wolves in Iran. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 797-803.

²² Freuchen, P. 1935. *Arctic Adventure*. Farrar & Rinehart, New York. Peter Freuchen lost a companion to wolves (p. 23, pp. 329, 332), shot a wolf stalking his children (pp. 347-348), had harrowing experiences with wolves trying to enter his cabin (pp. 16-19). His writings support an observation made to me by a long time resident and hunter in Greenland: where there are wolves, there are no people and vice versa!

²³ Raipurohit, K. S. 1999. Child lifting: Wolves in Hazaribagh, India. *Ambio*, Vpl. 28. No. 2. pp. 162-166. March issue

²⁴ C. H. Doug Clarke, 1971 The beast of Gévaudan. *Natural History* Vol. 80 pp. 44-51 & 66-73

²⁵ Rutter, Russell J. and Douglas H. Pimlott 1968. *The World of the Wolf*. J. B. Lippincott C., Philadelphia & New York. David L. Mech 1970. *The Wolf*. The Natural History Press, Garden City, New York.

²⁶ See Brett L. Walker. 2005, who the terrible experience in Japan with rabid wolves that, ultimately, led to their extermination. Baltazard. M., and M. Ghodissi (1954) Prevention of human rabies, treatment of persons bitten by rabid wolves in Iran. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 797-803.

²⁷ Pavlov 1983 (see Graves 2007 appendix A); Linnell et al. 2002; Moriceau 2005; Graves 2007, Johnny Loe and Elvin Röskeft 2004 Large Carnivores and Human Safety. *Ambio* Vol. 33. No. 6 pp. 283-288.

²⁸ Brett L. Walker. 2005, *ibid*; Will N. Graves 2007, *ibid*.

²⁹ Between 1580-1830, 3,069 people were killed by wolves in France; of these 1,857 were killed by non-rabid wolves.. See Moriceau 2007 *ibid*.

³⁰ For an account of how rabid wolves act see Chapter 6, *Wolf Attacks on Humans* by Will Graves (2007) (edited by V. Geist) *Wolves in Russia*, Detselig, Calgary. Pp 87-103.

³¹ In an e-mail of March 29th 2009, Magnus Hagelstam writes: *Moriceau sticks to strict historical scholarship and I have not found mentions of what peasants thought, only of written contemporary testimony. These sources make it perfectly clear that the distinction was clear to all concerned. He presents separate statistics for victims of predatory attacks and victims of rabies and analyzes the two types of attack separately. After reading the book, it is obvious that rage was a well known disease and that the difference between predatory and rabid attacks and their aftermath was so obvious that nobody could have missed it.*

³² Moriceau 2007 *ibid*; Linnell et al. 2002 *ibid*.

³³ Hans Friedrich von Flemming addressed his encyclopedic work "*Der Vollkommene Teutsche Jäger*" (The fully experienced German hunter) to his Mighty Sovereign and Master, Friedrich Augusto, King of Poland in 1719, followed by a second volume in 1724. This massive two-volume work on wildlife and its management was published in Leipzig, Saxony, Germany. Flemming's account reveals in what fear wolves were held and to what lengths authorities went trying to eliminate such.

³⁴ See Walker. 2005. *ibid*.

³⁵ In his review of wolf attacks on humans the Russian academician Mikhail P. Pavlov, singles out three North American scientists who advanced the view that wolves were harmless. They were "D. Mech, D. Pimlott and R. Peterson..." see p. 176 in W. N. Graves 2007 *Wolves in Russia*. Detselig, Calgary.

³⁶ C. D. C. Linnell et al. 2002 *ibid*.

³⁷ I have been informed by Dr. Lu Carbyn who has an unparalleled record of observing wolves, that wolves rarely bury any part of the prey, and do so at best playfully.

³⁸ Banfield, A. W. F. 1964. Review of F. Mowat's *Never Cry Wolf*. *Canadian Field naturalist*. 78:52-54; Pimlott, D. H. 1966. Review of F. Mowat's *Never Cry Wolf*. *J. Wildlife Management*. 30:236-237.

³⁹ See Appendix A. Pavlov's chapter in Will N. Graves 2007 *Russian Wolves. Anxiety through the Ages*. Detselig, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

⁴⁰ Elis Pålsson 2003 *Vargens Näringssök och Människan*. ISBN 91-631-3651-1, Älmhult.

⁴¹ Appendix A. Pavlov's chapter in Will N. Graves 2007. *ibid*.

⁴² See A. Bryan Williams 1932. *Auf Hochwild in Canada* (German translation). P. 249. Williams relates how in 1923 a trapper, which newspapers reported killed and devoured by wolves, returned hale and hearty to civilization laden with furs.

⁴³ Johnny Loe and Elvin Röskeft 2004, *ibid*.

⁴⁴ Moriceau 2007 *ibid*.

⁴⁵ Linnell et al. 2002 *ibid*.

⁴⁶ Hans Friedrich von Flemming in 1749. *Der Vollkommene Teutsche Jäger*, Leipzig.

⁴⁷ See also Mark E. McNay 2002. Wolf-human interactions in Alaska and Canada: review of the case history. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 30(3):831-843, and Mark E. McNay 2002 *A case history of wolf-human encounters in Alaska and Canada*. Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, Wildlife Technical Bulletin 13.

⁴⁸ C. D. C. Linnell et al. 2002 *The Fear of Wolves*, Norse Institutt for Naturforskning. NINA Oppdragsmelding 731, Trondheim, Norway.

⁴⁹ Walker. 2005; Graves 2007; Pavlov 1983. *ibid*

⁵⁰ This is based not only on my own experience living for decades in wolf country, but also the prominent Canadian hunter-naturalist-administrator A. Bryan Williams PP. 250-254 *ibid*.

⁵¹ Klein, D. R. 1995. The introduction, increase, and demise of wolves on Coronation Island, Alaska. Pp 275-280 in L. Carbyn, S. H. Fritts, and D. R. Seip, editors. Canadian Circumpolar Institut; A.T. Bergerud and J.P. Elliott. 1998. Wolf predation in a multiple-ungulate system in northern British Columbia *Can. J. Zool.* 76: 1551–1569; Tom A. Bergerud. 2000. Caribou. Chapter 31 pp. 658-693 S. Demarais and P. Krausman (eds). *Ecology and Management of Large Mammals in North America*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ; Tom A. Bergerud, Stuart N. Luttich and Lodewick Camps 2008. The Return of Caribou to Ungava. McGill-Queens University Press, Montreal and Kingston. (1998). Bergerud, A. T. W. J. Dalton, H. Butler, L. Camps, R. Ferguson. 2007. Woodland caribou persistence and extirpation in relic populations on Lake Superior. *Rangifer*, Special Issue No. 17: 57-78. Robert A. Garrott, [Patrick J. White](#) and [Fred G.R. Watson](#) (Editors) 2009 *The Ecology of Large Mammals in Central Yellowstone: Sixteen Years of Integrated Field Studies* (Terrestrial Ecology) Academic Press, Volume 3 in the Terrestrial Ecology Series. Burlington, Ma. Carbyn, L. N. , Nicholas J. Lunn and Kevin Timoney. 1998 Trends in the distribution and abundance of bison in Wood Buffalo National Park. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 26(3) : 463-470.

⁵² Kay, C.E. 2006. Are predators killing your hunting opportunities? *Mule Deer Foundation Magazine* No.4:8-12.

⁵³ See L. David Mech, Luigi Boitani (eds) 2003. *Wolves: Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, ISBN 0226516962, 97802265169

⁵⁴ Mark Collinge 2008. Relative risks of predation on livestock posed by individual wolves, black bears, mountain lions and coyotes in Idaho. Pp. 14-16 in *The Outdoorsman* Jan-March 2008. Presented at the 23rd Vertebrate Pest Conference in San Diego during the third week in March 2008

⁵⁵ Geist, V., S.P. Mahoney, and J. F. Organ. 2001. Why hunting has defined the North American model of wildlife conservation. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference*. 66:175- 18. See also Chapter 2 pp. 77-132 in Geist, V. and I. McTaggart-Cowan 1995. *Wildlife Conservation Policy*. Detselig, Calgary.

⁵⁶ Will Graves 2007 *ibid*.

⁵⁷ Scott E. Nielsen, Stephen Herrero, Mark S. Boyce, Richard D. Mace, Bryon Benn, Micheal L. Gibeau and Scott Jevons. 2004. Modeling the spatial distribution of human-caused grizzly bear mortalities in the Central Rockies ecosystem of Canada. *Biological Conservation* [Volume 120, Issue 1](#), November 2004, Pages 101-113

Charles: This story is cited in: Boudreau, Jack: 1998. Caitlin Press Inc., P.O. Box 219, Madeira Park, B.C. V0N 2H0. The copy I have is a Fifth Printing, 2006. This little paperback is full of grizzly bear stories from the general area around and south of Prince George, B.C. These are accounts of the local residents, primarily trappers and others, living along the Fraser River and nearby lakes!! Prince George *The Leader*, April 2nd 1922. Trapper Ben Cochrane killed by a pack of wolves. Shot seven, clubbed four with rifle and still got killed. Broke gun. North of Fish River on Lake Winnipeg. Bones and pieces of clothing found.

Charles ,Wolf management is not a pipedream it has been going on in alaska and the Yukon for decades, at least 6 major monographs the latest no 152 (2003) Experimental reduction of wolves in the Yukon.... and the woodland caribou are increasing, the 40 mile herd has come back from 5,000 to 4,000 because of predator management and the latest COSEWic 2003 shows and increase of woodland caribou in the Yukon of over 20,000. Talk like this gets us nowhere tom

Ryder Bergerud Email: ryder_bergerud@hotmail.com ryder.bergerud@gmail.com Dr. A.T. Bergerud 1233 Isabella Point Road Salt Spring Island V8K 1T5 Phone: (250) 653-4346 Email: ryder_bergerud@hotmail.com