

Managing Wolves

**Biopolitics, Knowledge and Wilderness in the
Debate around Swedish Wolf Management**

Frida Timan

Examensarbete på kandidatnivå
Bachelor Thesis

HEKK02 HT15
Handledare: Anders Burman

Humanekologiska Avdelningen
Lunds Universitet

Abstract

The research of this thesis aims at exploring, and adding a contribution to, the academic work devoted to analyzing techniques for wildlife management using Foucauldian Biopolitics. This case study researches the attitudes of six pro-wolf people toward techniques for wildlife management. This research finds that in order to understand these attitudes, one has to combine the understanding of biopolitics with an understanding for the social constructedness of “Wilderness”. Moreover, this thesis argues that the interviewees’ attitudes toward techniques for wolf management reflect their understanding of the wolf, the wolf opponent and the pro-wolf person, through a review of their separate characteristics.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Aim and objective.....	2
Scope and constraints	2
Research questions	2
Background	3
A natural-social history of the Wolf in Sweden.....	3
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The hunted wolf.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>History of Wolves and Reindeer Husbandry of the Sami.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Wolves and Reindeer Husbandry of the Sami today.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>The mythological wolf.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>The shift in National Policy</i>	<i>5</i>
Methodology	6
Method for data collection.....	6
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Qualitative of quantitative methods?</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Interviews.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Sampling respondents.....</i>	<i>7</i>
Method for data analysis	7
<i>Hermeneutic circles and coding</i>	<i>7</i>
Research ethics	7
Working reflexively.....	8
Theoretical framework.....	10
Foucauldian Biopolitics	10
Political Ecology and “Wilderness”.....	11
Power/Knowledge.....	11
Feminist Epistemology.....	12
Introducing Six Pro-Wolf People	13
Analysis	16
The Biopolitics of Wolf Bodies.....	16
<i>Techniques for Management and Biopolitics</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Limits of Biopolitics and an Exploration of the Meaning of Space</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Appropriating the Wild</i>	<i>18</i>
The Hunter.....	19
<i>Killing and Appropriating</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Unprofessionalism</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Unknowingness.....</i>	<i>19</i>
The Pro-Wolf Person	20
<i>The Workings of Knowledge in Constituting the Pro-Wolf Person</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Unbiased Knowledge and the Right to Manage</i>	<i>20</i>
The Wolf.....	21
<i>Legal Incompetence</i>	<i>21</i>
Conclusion	22
References.....	23
Appendix 1.....	26
Interview guide.....	26

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank the amazing interviewees that participated in this study and so generously shared their beliefs, thoughts and experiences of wolves and nature as well as on the big questions regarding death and life. I could not have wished for more open and well-willing interviewees. Furthermore, it cannot be expressed enough just how grateful I am to friends and peers that so patiently supported me with astounding encouragement both in times of frustration and writer's block as well in times of inspiration and flow. A special thanks is directed to Martina, Love and Janine who took time to support, peer review and challenge the arguments of this thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank my supervisor for guidance and support in the process of back-and-forth that constituted the coming into being of this research. In conclusion, a final thanks is directed to my beloved sister Maja, who has a magical wolf howl.

Introduction

As I grew up, it was often told that the deep, dark and silent woods of Sweden are what make the country unique. My educators, family and adult friends (as we experience adults being nice to and patient with us as kids) talked about the forests as a place for peace, for being alone and experience something pristine, something greater than humanity itself far away from the up-beat tempo of Stockholm where I spent my childhood and adolescent years. The animals that inhabited these forests were also spoken of with awe, as wild and free creatures that could not be tamed and deserved our respect.

In studying Political Ecology and encountering that an understanding of nature and the animals that dwell there as explicitly *wild*, as in *human-free*, has been proven to have colonial implications as well as displacing and controlling effects (Robbins 2012:177-180), the memories of my childhood had all of a sudden attained a completely new meaning. This realization has been crucial to the come about of this thesis as it manifested an interest in conservation and wildlife management as themes that touch upon power, control and human perceptions of nature.

The Wolf, with its luring yellow eyes and folkloric shimmer is among many a symbol for wild, untamed and endangered nature. Could it be so that a closer look at the management of this species may set in motion interesting inquiries on wildlife, wilderness, control, power and perceptions of nature?

Aim and objective

The aim of this thesis is to make a humble contribution to the profound academic work (see for example Escobar 2008, Leach & Fairhead 1995, Chapin 2004) that explores how nature is interpreted, experienced and mediated in discussions, movements and conflicts on nature/wildlife/biodiversity-conservation. Research on wildlife conservation in particular has recently begun exploring what the Foucauldian concept of biopolitics may bring to this field of research (Rinfret 2009:572-3). As Rinfret (2009) argues, biopolitics constitutes a theoretical foundation that offers tools used to explore control, displacement and power in present day wildlife management.

Through exploring the techniques suggested for wolf management by six pro-wolf people (and the view on the wolf, the wolf opponent and the self, which they mediate) through the lens of Biopolitics and Political Ecology, I hope to add an interesting study to the body of research dealing with wildlife management, and additionally explore aspects of Swedish wolf management that has not before been researched. While many (e.g. Ekman 2010, Jonzén et al. 2013, Ericson & Haberlein 2003) have explored the social aspects of Swedish wolf management, no study has been done using a framework of Foucauldian Biopolitics and Political Ecology.

Scope and constraints

The study was conducted during ten weeks in Malmö/Lund and Stockholm/Uppsala, therefore time and place restrictions implies constrains on the scope of the research. This thesis will not include an evaluation of the ecological effects of wolves (for interest in that see e.g. Ripple & Beschta 2012). This thesis does further not intend to guide a positioning of being for or against wolves in Sweden, or advocate one position in particular. Moreover, this thesis does not explore, or take stand regarding, animal ethics in any way. Rather, this thesis should be read as a qualitative attempt to understand the views of six pro-wolf people on Swedish wolf management. Furthermore, no people that position themselves as being wolf opponents have been interviewed. In order to create an interesting in-depth analysis rather than a shallow comparative study, this constraint was needed, as time was restricted.

Research questions

What techniques for wildlife management is suggested by interviewees and how are they understood and motivated? What does the way to motivate and understand these techniques suggest about how interviewees understands the wolf, the wolf opponent and them selves, being pro-wolf people? In collecting the data, the importance of knowledge for proper wolf management was constantly emphasized. Therefore, an exploration of this theme will also be tended to.

Background

A natural-social history of the Wolf in Sweden

In researching Swedish wolf management, I have encountered a great variety of reactions to the wolves return ranging from anger to applause, from confusion to certainty. Wolf management is, I would say, a topic full of complex aspects to look further into. One of these is the relationship between wolves and reindeer. In all times, predators have posed a threat to pastoralists (Naturvårdsverket 1990:54). Furthermore, the reindeer holds a special relationship to predators, as it lives like a free animal yet is private property of the indigenous people Sami (ibid:3). As this aspect requires a thesis in it self, no exploration on this theme is offered in this thesis. Yet, in order to give this important aspect acknowledgment, a short review of the relationship between the Sami and the wolf in past and present time is presented below. Now, a brief history of Swedish wolves and review of some aspects of the contemporary wolf debate is in order, to provide a context for the upcoming analysis.

Introduction

In the late 1970s a lonely wolf strayed the northern landscapes of Sweden (Länsstyrelsen Kalmar 2015:2-3). After centuries of successful wolf bounties and policies for limitation of the species this wolf was called “The Last Wolf” (ibid). As of now, the species is back in larger numbers, causing both applause and anger (ibid). The wolf that during the past 400 years was critically hunted for posing a threat to human subsistence such as sheep herding and general hunting is now listed as an endangered species with determined supporters having its back (ibid).

The hunted wolf

In the 18th century King Gustav III decided that the right to hunt (before that exclusively held by the nobility) was to be made public (Ekman 2010:105). As a result, the amount of game drastically decreased in woods making wolves look for food elsewhere, not surprisingly in livestock pens (ibid). This intensified the existing conflict between human subsistence and the wolf (Länsstyrelsen Kalmar 2015:1), involving a systematic hunt entailing e.g. mandatory wolf hunts for Swedish men (Ekman 2010:117). In 1850, the wolf caused big problems but by the end of the century it was almost eradicated from the central and southern part of Sweden, vividly showing the extent of the hunt (ibid:106).

In 1983, precisely 100 years after the last wolf of the Swedish county Värmland was shot, a local resident encounters eight wolves when picking up his mail one morning (Ekman 2010:15). This is the first time a larger number of wolves are seen together since it gained its status as an endangered species in 1966 (ibid:15&170). Due to being an endangered species, these wolves are in a radically different position from the wolves of the last 400 years (Länsstyrelsen Kalmar 2015:2-3). As Ekman (2010) describes in his book *The Wolf*¹ there has been a winding road for wolves in Sweden since it was first noted that their numbers was on the rise. They have suffered from e.g. inbreeding (ibid:142-6) and both illegal and legal hunt (ibid:30-56). Despite these troublesome conditions there are now about 270 individuals in Sweden (Naturvårdsverket 2014:10-2). In 2014 it was decided that wolves should continue to

¹ My translation of the Swedish title: *Vargen*

be an endangered species in Sweden, whose physical wellbeing as a species is to be assured by Naturvårdsverket (ibid).

History of Wolves and Reindeer Husbandry of the Sami

In *Reindeers and Wolves*² Ryd (2007) has gathered testimonies of five Sami men describing the relationship between animals and the Sami in both past and present time. When these men grew up, in the early 20th century, wolves were only discussed when they had been spotted close by a reindeer horde or in neighboring communities (ibid:17-8). One did not fear for one's own life when hearing that a wolf was near (ibid:17), the wolf was only considered to pose threat to reindeer, which in times of wolves being present was guarded at night (ibid:48). According the testimonies in Ryd (2007) these watches were filled with suspense, even though it was made clear that humans had nothing to fear from wolves (ibid:48&55). The intriguing testimonies of the book also describes when and which reindeers were taken by wolves (Ryd 2007:32-5), why wolves avoided attacking starving reindeer (ibid:46-7) and how the traditional wolf hunt taking place on skis with spears could only succeed in times of deep snow (ibid:89).

Wolves and Reindeer Husbandry of the Sami today

The issue of how to politically deal with the wolf and reindeer interaction is a debated one. As wolves live in packs they tend to have a more severe impact on reindeer than other predators (Naturvårdsverket 1990:292). In order to compensate the economic losses of the Sami caused by increased wolf numbers encouraged by national policy, economic compensation is given (ibid). Due to this background, Sametinget (2015a) argues that the current national policy for wolf management fails to realize the problems that the reindeer husbandry economy faces due to wolf conservation (Sametinget 2015a). It is argued that the current mode of wolf conservation threatens the local knowledge and subsistence practices of the Sami and neglects their rights as indigenous people (Sametinget 2015a). The issue is not solely a matter of economic character, Sametinget (2015b) debated, the national policies are negligent of the local practices of the Sami, and that suggestions of how to better handle the coexistence of wolves and reindeer put forward by Sametinget have been ignored. The issue of the wolf and the Sami is hence a complex one touching upon history, politics and indigenous rights.

The mythological wolf

The wolf makes many appearances in folklore and contemporary tales: the most famous probably being the tale about Little Red Riding Hood (Ekman 2010:158). The tale has been so influential that Naturvårdsverket in 1977 named a report on wolves: "Little Red Riding Hood was lying"³ (ibid). The wolf was during the Middle Ages not called its proper name Ulv (as calling it by its proper name, just like in the case of the devil, meant to call on it to come) (ibid:108). It was instead called *Vargher* that literally meant damage-doer and is the predecessor of the contemporary Swedish word for the species; Varg (ibid).

² My translation of the Swedish title: *Ren och Varg*

³ My translation of the Swedish title: *Rödgluvan ljög*

The shift in National Policy

So, the wolf that literally carries the name “damage-doer” (Ekman 2010:108) is now by many believed to be a misunderstood species in need of knowledge to liberate it from old incorrect myths (ibid:189-203). Something has changed. In the 1930s killing a wolf was rewarded with a state bounty and priceless honor, as it takes persistence and skill to kill a wolf (ibid:169-70). Only a few decades later, in 1965, a photograph of three hunters posing in front of three killed wolves in the north of Sweden became one of the most controversial pictures of the time (ibid:171). Many people found it upsetting how proud and at peace the hunters looked showing off their catch, and it is believed that this picture accelerated the process of making the wolf an endangered species in 1966 (ibid). If unauthorized hunt was done after this shift in national policy, it was done in secrecy (ibid:172).

Methodology

Method for data collection

Introduction

In studying human ecology, anthropology and political ecology the great opportunities of talking to and in other ways interacting with people in order to understand their knowledge, experiences and perspectives have often been highlighted. This approach has always seemed very appealing to me, which has informed my perspective on what constitutes interesting academic methodology. Hence, it is likely that I have not arrived to the chosen methods for gathering the data of this thesis unbiased. Nevertheless, qualitative methods are required to gather data that may constitute the basis for an interesting analysis leading to answering the research questions.

Qualitative of quantitative methods?

The research questions of this thesis require a study of attitudes, which, according to Winchester (2000), can only be explored using qualitative methods (pp. 4-5). Bryman (2004) has a different take on what should inform the choice of either qualitative or quantitative method and argues that it is the desired *characteristics* of the data that is of importance, rather than the themes of the research (p. 45). One such characteristic that separates qualitative from quantitative methods is the aim to as fully as possible understand the perspective of the respondent (ibid). As the perspective of the respondent is crucial to answering the research questions of this thesis, qualitative methods are the most appropriate and will be used. When using qualitative methods, one will face the problem of having to draw information from its context as interviews or other materials are transformed in order to contribute to a more narrow analysis (Adams 2014:469). A researcher with a certain “scientific imagination”, as Adams (2014) puts it, directs this transformation and may in the process change the meaning of the data as presented by the respondent (p. 469), further elaborated on below.

Interviews

Cloke et al (2004) argues that there is some information one will only obtain if asked for (p. 125), in concurrence with this point I have chosen to base my study on six semi-structured interviews. The many traits of semi-structured interviews include the possibility to keep respondents on topic without losing the possibility for unexpected input (a shortcoming of the survey-like interviews) (ibid:162-3). Additionally, this structure allows the researcher to disentangle possible inconsistencies and explore ambiguities (Valentine 2005:110). It has been argued that semi-structured interviews therefore offer a middle way between talking freely and making sure to access data that can be used to answer the research questions (Flowerdrew & Martin 2005:76). The very important shortcoming of interviews as a method for data collection is the possibility of creating greater possibilities for certain answers, comments and conversations to emerge than others (Ryen 2011:93). This may be avoided by following up on what informants say, not using yes/no-questions, prepare questions that are open-ended and actively avoid hints encouraging certain answers/conversations (ibid:44-6). In order to make sure this was the case interview questions were discussed with peers and friends, and a pilot interview excluded from the research was performed.

Sampling respondents

In using qualitative methods I will not provide a report that explains the general opinions of the population of interest to this research based on a representative sample of respondents (Cloke et al. 2004:156). As it is the perspectives of the respondent that is of interest here, respondents have been sampled due to their participation in certain interest groups. In order to sample respondents for this thesis a message was posted on five different groups on Facebook expressing interest in wildlife conservation. One was a group with intent to gather pro-wolf people, the four other being Facebook groups of two of Swedens most influential environmental organizations. The respondents are thus limited to people with access to internet-facilities as well as people using Facebook actively, and also daring to contact someone they do not know and participate in a study. Respondents replied either to the email-address stated in the message or commented on the post. All people that responded were interviewed if they were pro-wolf. One person who was not pro-wolf also responded, as she wanted to ask me why I only wanted to talk to pro-wolf people. After having explained the aim of the research and constraints in time the person understood the choice of respondents.

Six interviews were done in order to gather the data of the research of this thesis, all being about one hour long and recorded as permission to do so was always granted. Four were telephone interviews and two took place in person. Two women and four men participated in the study, with a range of living location from Halland to Norrbotten. Observations beyond what was being said has in some cases also constituted a basis for analysis.

Method for data analysis

Hermeneutic circles and coding

Interviews was transcribed and revisited several times during the research, and soon a pattern became clear. This pattern informed emic codes, (e.g. “knowledge” and “killing”) which were applied to the data to see just how often, and in what context, these themes appeared. After outlining a general argument that was posed in all interviews (of course with some differences, I will get back to that) it was clear what theory could be used to best analyze this general argument, and put it in relation to history, power and political ecology. The analysis did hence precede the theoretical framework. After encountering the theories used, the data was revisited, showing things that were not clear at first. The circle in hermeneutics symbolizes this interpretative mode of analysis where the components of the research are revisited several times during the research in a circular mode, encouraging new interpretations, questions and possible meanings (Alvesson & Sköldberg 2008:330-1). This disaffirms the traditional view of the research process as a linear one (ibid:22).

Research ethics

As a researcher, one is equipped with the prerogative to direct research in choosing how questions are posed, answers are interpreted and in what way respondents making the research possible are portrayed (Cloke et al 2004:130). These unequal

relations of power between researcher and respondent have been critiqued by several voices such as those of feminists and postmodernists (Ryen 2011:12-3). It has also been argued that research that simply extracts information from respondents without giving something back is extractivist research, not that different from extractivist colonial economic relations (Burman: Under Review). This, in addition to the fact that respondents may be put at risk if participating in a study calls for ethical considerations when conducting academic research (Cloke et al 2004:374-5).

Cloke et al (2004) suggest that this all boils down to a 5-point checklist for all researchers: 1) Get informed consent 2) Do not make information intended for private use public 3) Avoid any risk of putting your informants at risk of harm 4) Do not exploit respondents 5) Be sensitive to the cultural context of the respondents, as well as their position within patriarchal and colonial power relations (p. 165). We should be careful not to say that all informants need to be anonymous in all research, at times it is highly important to include the name of the informant, to credit the originator of certain knowledge (Ryd 2010:256).

In this research this means that all respondents have accessed information about this thesis, its topics and aim, and additionally been given the opportunity to be anonymous. The organizations the respondents were found through are not named in this thesis, and the posts on Facebook used to find respondents are deleted. Things said for private use is not made public, but serves as background information for the thesis in general and has informed interview-questions for upcoming interviews. To not exploit informants and simply extract information needed for a research project is avoided by offering the final result to respondents, and after interviews send them a short summary of the interview, asking if they think I have interpreted them correctly. To be sensitive to the cultural/patriarchal/colonial positioning of an informant is elaborated on below.

Working reflexively

It has become important (due to a fairly recent questioning of western sciences' claim of objectivity and ability to present "the truth") to consider one's own biases when conducting academic research (Cloke et al 2004:24&165-7). To be reflexive: to reflect upon one's own subjective influence on the research process and following result as well as taking into account the way respondents are affected by participating in the study, is a crucial part of working with qualitative methods today (ibid). This includes a consideration of in what way research results may be influenced by one's own (as a researchers) experiences, expectations, knowledge, worldview etc. (Ryen 2011:162-3). What questions are being asked during interviews? What themes will one, as a researcher, encourage the respondents to talk about and what statements and themes will make it to the final thesis? Rather than conducting a thorough reflexive work during research in order to eradicate one's biases as a research, a reflexive work is done to make visible and reflect upon how the analysis is done in the research underlying this thesis (Alvesson & Sköldbberg 2008:487). As Alvesson & Sköldbberg (2008) argues empirical data is always the result of some kind of intervention in, or organization of the observations of, the primary data. This is absolutely crucial in order to make data understandable and interesting, but we need be aware of that process, and become active subjects in shaping and questioning it.

Alvesson & Skoldberg (2008) argue that a reflexive process includes this kind of reflection on three themes: 1) The object of study (being constructed by the researcher), 2) The researcher; (the constructing subject) and 3) The social context (that constructs the researcher) (p. 487). These three should all be considered in equal part during a reflexive process (ibid). It is therefore not solely interesting to consider the researchers backpack of biases, but also the current paradigm within the research field and current/present cultural beliefs that surrounds the researcher (ibid). In conducting the research constituting the basis of this thesis, it has become obvious that I as a researcher constantly find myself in between viewing the wolf as the wild, exotic animal and realizing the problems of conservation explored by political ecologists. As I find myself in a constant flux somewhere in between both opinions, I believe a reflexive analysis of myself, as a researcher, is constantly at work.

Theoretical framework

The research questions of this thesis requires a reading of the, by interviewees suggested, techniques for wolf management through a lens of Foucauldian Biopolitics. For reasons that will become clear in the forthcoming analysis, Political Ecology and the social constructedness of “Wilderness” will play a crucial part in expanding upon the insights from Foucauldian Biopolitics and pinpoint its shortcomings in exploring the motivations for wildlife management suggested by interviewees.

Furthermore, an exploration of how the wolf, the hunter and the pro-wolf person is mediated and explained in interviewees’ motivation of suggested techniques is required to answer the research questions as well. As knowledge so frequently appeared in the statements of the interviewees as a significant characteristic of the pro-wolf person on the contrary to wolf opponent, theories that may explore knowledge is needed. Foucauldian Power/Knowledge and Feminist Epistemology are thus useful.

Foucauldian Biopolitics

In *The History of Sexuality* first published 1976 Foucault argues that the sovereign in the classical age possessed the right to execute the death of those who challenged its sovereignty by transgressing its laws (Foucault 1998:135-6). At the time the symbol of the sovereign was the sword, indicating the right to “to take life or let live” (ibid:136). In what we refer to as modern time tough, this symbolism and right itself seems brutal (ibid:136-7). The waning of these techniques of power happened alongside a shift in attitudes as people started to sympathize with the condemned and question the very lawfulness of the sovereigns’ bodily brutality (ibid 2003:13). The new sovereign that grows out of these changes is an institution which main purpose is (and sovereignty is based on) the assurance of life and the wellbeing of its population (ibid 1998:137).

In this transformation, a whole range of new disciplines of science exploring the living human being (e.g. housing, migration etc.) came into being (Foucault 1998:140). In embracing this knowledge, humans did for the first time encounter themselves as living beings, with needs that has to be satisfied in order to stay as such (ibid:143). New institutions that politically dealt with the satisfaction of these needs so met light of day, manifesting the sovereignty of the sovereign in the management of life (ibid:141-3). This is the network of events constituting biopolitics; the control and management of bodies and behavior through what appears to be neutral institutions forerun/backed up by what appears to be objective knowledge (ibid:140-3). In the research field of analyzing wildlife management using biopolitics, it is especially interesting to explore the techniques used to manage the lives of the animals in question (Rinfret 2009). These techniques range from using radio transmitters to track wild animals movements, relocating them if needed, shutting animals out of certain spheres and using techniques that in different ways provides a stimuli suggesting that the wild animals do not repeat certain behaviors (ibid:573-6). Rinfret (2009) argues that the implementation of these techniques make wild animals

the objects of Foucauldian power; controlling beings *motivated* by the assurance of their lives (ibid:574-6).

Political Ecology and “Wilderness”

In the testimonies of the interviewees the need to protect wolves is a fundamental standpoint. It is argued that the wolf is a *wild* species, severely threatened by human practices. It is further argued that if this protection fails, wolves will not grow in number or live enjoyable lives in peace. This understanding of wolves as wild animals in need of protection is, as we shall explore in the analysis, a motive to implement techniques for wolf management, hence, a theory that way explore the wolves suggested *wildness* is needed.

In researching a characteristic of the environment as a social construct, political ecologists have repeatedly explored if and how this characteristic legitimizes certain power executed through e.g. governmental intervention, external land management or the like (Robbins 2012:124). As political ecologists are often normative, they often claim that constructs motivate and secure the power of an influential elite (ibid), proven in the case of e.g. of soil erosion facilitating colonial power in colonial Africa (ibid) and deforestation facilitating influence over local subsistence in West Africa (ibid:125).

The very concept of conservation as a strategy for securing the health of environments is according to Robbins (2012) based on a specific aesthetic and idea of nature as being at its best when human-free (pp. 178-81). This idea has repeatedly informed practices that in a colonial manner legitimizes the displacement of people making their subsistence in an area that are by externals understood as degraded by those practices and as hence being in need of conservation and restoration (ibid).

As Cronon (1996) makes clear in *The Trouble With Wilderness*, to say that nature is “Wild” has little, if any, proof in environmental history and former perceptions of the world. Wilderness, though referring to old untouched environments, is a fairly recent idea (ibid). The idea of Wilderness, Cronon (1996) argues, represents an island of not yet destroyed “wild” nature in a sea of modernity and human destruction (p. 7). In seeing that social constructs make way for certain rationalities, a certain way of acting in the environment (Robbinson 2012:124) the rationale the idea of Wilderness implies is that protection from destructive human impact is the way to preserve what is perceived as endangered environments (Cronon 1996:7).

Power/Knowledge

In statements of interviewees it is argued that knowledge is an important characteristic ascribed to pro-wolf people, yet lacking among wolf opponents. Interviewees further argue that because it is so, pro-wolf people are the only ones with legit ability to manage wolves in a way that is in the interest of wolves. Wolf opponents would on the contrary manage wolves in a way that benefits them selves. As Power/Knowledge explores the concept of truth, in relation to legitimization of control, this theory will prove useful in this thesis.

One of Foucault's major contributions to social theory was to manifest the genealogy of the intimate bond between knowledge and power and famously stating as cited in Robbins (2012) "Ideas are not powerful because they are true, they are true because of power" (p. 124). In *Madness & Civilization* [1961], *The Birth of the Clinic* [1963], *Discipline and Punish* [1975] as well as *The History of Sexuality* [1976] Foucault illustrates this as he investigates the simultaneous rise of institutions (such as the enforced hospitalization, prison and surveillance of mad men, criminals and the sick) and certain expert knowledges in a field of necessity to these institutions. The performers of expert knowledge, such as doctors, criminologists, psychologists etc. are all in a position of interpretative prerogative as to what is in the interest of the patient, criminal, mad man etc. and may therefore execute power through directing their life and behavior.

Feminist Epistemology

The pro-wolf peoples understanding of the wolf opponent proposes that the latter is unknowing, and unable to create knowledge about wolves that is not biased by their will to generate a wolf management that is beneficial to them. This inability is, to pro-wolf people, the reason for why wolf opponents should not be allowed to manage wolves. In order to understand the dynamics of this statement, the insights of Feminist Epistemology are useful.

One fundamental thesis in feminist epistemology is the recognition of that our place in the world (e.g. being female, of color etc.) affect our perspectives on that world and human practices in it (Narayan 2004:213). As the taken for granted standpoints in knowledge are often created in white and male settings, being female and/or of color provides access to other perspectives that may challenge this taken for granted standpoint, showing its hidden one-sidedness (ibid:213-5). Crucially important to feminist epistemology though, is the very real challenges such a quest is put to, as:

"[...] from its recorded beginnings, white western philosophy has posited evaluative, hierarchical divisions between the rational and the irrational, where only those who can claim – or are accorded – a place within the rational can expect the acknowledgment and respect, and the entitlement to social-political-epistemic authority, that a reason-venerating society confers upon some of its members." (Code 2007:212)

In other terms, one has to be a member of the social group seen as knowledgeable for one's knowledge to be acknowledged as rational, impartial and true (Code 2007:212). Exclusion from this knowledge-creating, rational and male/white group assigns one's knowledge traits of irrationality and biasedness, lending to its discrediting by people in the knowledge-creating group, as they are in the position of power to do so. Feminist Epistemology consequently shows us how excluding an actor from the knowledge creating group is in fact an act of power (Code 2007, Narayan 2004:213-5).

Introducing Six Pro-Wolf People

Before looking into the analysis of this thesis, it is worth taking a brief tour through some core points of the data and introduce the interviewees. This section provides a summary of each interviewee separately. Rather than presenting the data thematically, I wish to present the data in its context, and interviewees in a way that more fully shows their individual personality and contribution to this research.

Interviewee A: saw his interest for wolf conservation as being part of his interest and respect for nature in general. Interviewee A explained how he seizes every opportunity given to learn more about wildlife. In accompanying a wolf tracker from Naturvårdsverket as well as reading, watching documentaries etc. the interviewee has become all the more intrigued by the wolf, learning that it is incredibly intelligent and naturally avoids humans. As he now lives close to Stockholm and a wolf territory, he spends many nights outdoors, howling with wolves. Growing up in Värmland, interviewee A was surrounded by what he calls “macho-hunters⁴”. A group wanting to eradicate the wolf all together because the wolf threatens their major joy in life, the hunt. While he understands their position somehow, he does not sympathize with the appropriation of nature to meet human needs this group tends to: Nature should be free and protected from human impact. What this group needs is to adapt to wolf-presence, and learn that there is plenty of game for both.

According to interviewee A, the wolf opponents are unknowing, ruled by myths, old culture and feelings. Additionally, they are unable to embrace the facts presented to them. While feelings are important to consider they cannot constitute basis for shooting an animal which effects one either has to adapt to, or peacefully avert through properly protecting one’s domesticized animals, the interviewee argues. Humans are obliged to take these actions, rather than having the right to kill wolves, as humans have pushed further and further into the territory of the wild animals. He continues. “I don’t see the wolf with fear, I see it as a symbol for the wild and beautiful⁵ [...] it is an animal that cannot be controlled, and I believe many hunters today wants to control nature”. “I think nature should be wild and not manipulated by humans” he states.

Interviewee B got involved in the wolf-debate after the first licensed wolf hunt was approved after the endangered species act in 1966. Two common misunderstandings among wolf opponents concern interviewee B, as they legitimize fear and suggest that wolves lack right to live. These read: 1) Present-day wolves are re-introduced by humans and 2) Wolves are dangerous to humans. In irony, the interviewee stated: “hunters seem more afraid than others”, suggesting that being afraid supports their cause for legal hunt.

As this group consists of only a small fraction of Swedish hunters, the interviewee argue, their political influence on Swedish wildlife management is disproportionate to their numbers, Furthermore, the interviewee argues, this group lacks proper

⁴ My conclusion of the discussion we had on him being surrounded by people participating in what he explained as “macho-hunters-culture” which in Swedish translates to: Matchojägarkultur

⁵ My translation of the Swedish word: fina. The translation does not properly catch the meaning of the Swedish word and is hence explained in this footnote.

knowledge, is unprofessional, uneducated and biased, as their personal gain will always guide their reasoning rather than facts.

Ethically, the interviewee finds it unjustifiable to shoot animals to increase the number of game available to one self. As wolves contribute to the wellbeing of ecosystems, are a part of Swedish fauna, do not pose a threat to human subsistence if domesticized animals are properly protected, there is no rightful reason to kill a wolf. Furthermore, the interviewee experiences that humans have somehow become disconnected from nature, resulting in us not realizing the possible consequences of our present day mastering and appropriation of nature. It is argued, that the remaining nature must be protected from this human impact.

Interviewee C acknowledges that wolves affect people's subsistence and psychological wellbeing, and she expresses that it is important to recognize these effects in order to have a democratic wolf management. Yet, she argues, as there are ways to protect domesticized animals, and fear of wolves is a result of a lack of knowledge, there is no viable reason to kill wolves. "We have entered their [wild animals] territory [...] so we have to adjust to them" she argues.

This interviewee stated that political decisions informed by objective knowledge lead to safeguarding the interest of the wolf. As knowledge shows that fear is unnecessary and wolf-caused damage to subsistence is avoidable with proper protecting techniques, people embracing this knowledge will realize that the wolf has an inherent right to existence. Knowledge has the power to convert people from being wolf opponents to being pro-wolf people. She argues, "If all people embraced knowledge, I bet it would be to the benefit of wolves" the benefit of the wolf in this case is "to preserve as many wolves needed for a healthy wolf strain".

Interviewee D argues that wolf opponents and pro-wolf people relate to life and death in fundamentally different ways. This position was clearly illustrated as the interviewee told me about her son in law (who is a hunter and a wolf opponent) and his son, her grandson. According to interviewee C, her son in law will probably like to teach his son how to hunt in the future, an activity she sees as brutal and macho. The interviewee on the other hand will teach her grandson about the "cute little worms" doing a crucial job in the ecosystems, manifesting a respect and awe for all living creatures. "That poor child is going to be schizophrenic!" she stated.

Interviewee D furthermore argues that wolf opponents are mainly hunters, whose egoistic strive for more prey in addition to their will to kill and master nature motivates their fight for eradicating the wolf species. In her experience of discussing wolf conservation with hunters, this group is unknowing and unwilling to learn leading to them staying ignorant towards the fact that wolves are not dangerous, does not pose such a big threat to hunters' dogs and do not take that much game compared to hunters. The opinions of hunters are by the interviewee seen as a result of old myth/culture that persists in the confine groups they socialize in. In talking about her grandson, she stated, "He is super sweet in every way, but indoctrinated by his friends I think. He might not dare speak his opinion".

The interviewee believes that humans have to adapt to the presence of the wolf and so protect domesticized animals carefully with techniques that do not harm wolves. As

it is in the wolves' nature to take the easiest catch, humans have to make sure their animals are safe; "If there is a carnivore outside and I let the dog out, I have to realize that it could be attacked". Not protecting one's animals from the wolf is a sign of cruelty, according to Interviewee D.

Interviewee E found the lack of knowledge and hence unfounded hate among wolf opponents upsetting. This interviewee explained the wolf opponents opinion as "old flaring"⁶, informed by old culture persisting in a locked-in social milieu where it is code to hate wolves. Growing up in Dalsland he often heard people expressing fear of that wolves from the neighboring county, Värmland, would spread. Interviewee E have never been afraid of wolves though, he states, "I have been hunted by moose and all that" to state that it is more likely to be hurt by a moose than by a wolf. In agreement with other interviewees he argues that wolves are part of Swedish fauna, does not pose danger to humans and that it is possible (and a human responsibility) to protect one's domesticized animals from wolves. This results in a lack of legitimate motives to kill wolves.

The interviewee expresses that wolf opponents are hunters who would benefit from the wolves disappearance, as more game would become available to them. Interviewee E believed that objective knowledge of e.g. numbers showing the actual (low) impacts of wolves on human practices and the (high) positive impacts of wolves on the wellbeing of ecosystems, have the power to induce more positive attitudes toward wolves. As wolf opponents are negligent to the insights of objective knowledge though, this outcome is unlikely. "One has always hated the wolf and always will, one is not so perceptive to new traditions". Interviewee E argues.

Interviewee F expressed that the motives of wolf opponents are egoistic, uninformed and silly⁷. This interviewee suggests that wolf opponents, "the hunters mafia"⁸, constitute a small fraction of hunters. As they bribe politicians with free weekends in their "hunters palace"⁹ and have undemocratically much influence in relation to their number of supporters, calling them a mafia is fair. As wolves are self-regulating, the interviewee states, there could never be too many wolves. The notion of self-regulation was applied to all wild species, illustrated by lions on the savannah. If lions were able to take all antelopes, what then would they eat?

In the wording of this interviewee, the wolf is "the king of the forest"¹⁰. They have a crucial part to play in the ecosystem and are, like all carnivores, not dangerous to humans. Interviewee F argues that as wolves are few, their impact is low and humans have to adapt to their presence; there is no excuse to kill a wolf. Techniques existing for protection of domesticized animals should be implemented, in order to counteract the wolf hate among people losing livestock to wolves. Interviewee F was especially infuriated by hunters who argue: "The wolf kills my moose", as the moose is not property of hunters; they are a public good.

⁶ My translation of the Swedish expression: gammalt gräll

⁷ My translation of the Swedish word: fånigt

⁸ My translation of the Swedish expression: Jägarmaffian

⁹ My translation of the Swedish wording: jaktslottet

¹⁰ My translation of the Swedish wording: Skogens konung

Analysis

The Biopolitics of Wolf Bodies

Techniques for Management and Biopolitics

In all interviews, one standpoint in particular was fundamental to the reasoning of the interviewees: As we may protect domesticized animals from wolf attacks, and wolves are not dangerous to humans, there is no legitimate reason for killing wolves. To do so in order to stop wolves that made their way into the pen of one's sheep, rather than peacefully prevent wolves from entering that pen in the first place is, according to all interviewees, brutal and unjustifiable. Especially because techniques that protect domesticized animals from wolves without hurting wolves is widely available.

These techniques that interviewees suggested for Swedish wolf management range from carnivore fencing, protective animals such as lamas (whose spit apparently smells terrible to carnivores) and electrocuting vests for dogs. The shared trait of all techniques is that they do not harm wolves; rather, they peacefully shut them out of certain spaces or prevent them from hurting and killing certain bodies. Interviewee E & C argue that domesticized animals are like "free food" to wolves, therefore techniques that makes sure wolves do not kill domesticized animals, yet do not hurt them when trying, is needed. "Wolves act the way they do" Interviewee E concludes. Many of these techniques suggested by interviewees also generate stimuli that hope to encourage wolves to avoid repeating certain behaviors, e.g. the electroshock of electrocuting vests. "Wolves are intelligent, they learn so fast", interviewee A concludes.

Intriguingly, interviewees mainly speak of these techniques as ways to protect *wolves*, rather than the domesticized animals these techniques are developed to protect. If subsistence conflicts with wolves are eradicated, it is argued, it becomes unfounded to kill wolves. Interviewee B illustrated this as he spoke of why there is no wolf-hate in Rumania: There, he argues, herders accompany their domesticized animals all day, making sure no wolves attack. The result is that none or very few livestock are taken and there consequently is nothing to hate the wolf for. Hence, to manage wolf behavior is by interviewees seen as something done to protect wolves from the consequences of the human fury wolf-attacks trigger.

So, the motivation for implementing techniques suggested for wolf management is that they assure wolves' lives. In viewing this statement through a lens of biopolitics and power/knowledge we may detect some similarities between the characteristics of techniques for wolf management suggested by interviewees and the characteristics of biopolitics: Central to both is the control over bodies and life, through interferences that appears like neutral consequences of sciences (Foucault 1998:136-42). Control is the tool and end of biopolitics, which aims at generating certain behaviors that are beneficial to a sovereign, yet motivated by the assurance of the lives of its subjects (ibid).

It cannot be argued with that the techniques suggested by the interviewees actually protect human interests (such as the life of sheep, reindeer and dogs) yet is motivated by assurance of wolf lives. A resemblance between the suggested techniques and biopolitics is visible. Hence, it is possible to, from a biopolitical standpoint, argue that

the suggested techniques for managing Swedish wolves are in fact an execution of human power over wild animals. Interviewees find that techniques have to be peaceful to be implemented. Furthermore, in the scene of biopolitics, Foucault (1998) argues, a sovereign that uses killing to execute control is seen as old, obsolete, brutal and mastering (p. 135-7). It is hence tempting to argue that this rationality informs why interviewees ban any wolf management that imply killing.

To this point, biopolitics helps us detect controlling characteristics of the suggested techniques for wolf management; controlling animals yet are motivated by protecting lives, very much confirming the findings of Rifnet (2009). Contradictory though, it is not always allowed to manage wolves according to interviewees. In order to more fully account for the *motivations* of these techniques as suggested by interviewees, an exploration of *space* is needed; that is, a study of why management is acceptable in certain spaces, yet banned from others. This is needed to more fully capture the complexities surrounding the interviewees' motivations of these techniques, and there statements regarding when management is not acceptable.

Limits of Biopolitics and an Exploration of the Meaning of Space

The notion of space is best illustrated by interviewee D, who in response to hunters claim “wolves kill our game” stated, “But please, wild animals have to eat!”. However, when discussing wolves killing domesticized animals, the same interviewee argued that, “If one has bought animals one has to protect them [...] If they were my animals and I knew carnivores were near, I would protect them even more!” So, wolf management should entail protection of domesticized animals, but not protection of wild animals. Similar accounts were made in all interviews; wolf management should only entail protection of domesticized animals aiming at protecting wolves. Protection of wild creatures was simply not seen in the same way, in wild spheres wolves should be free from human impact. Consequently, space matters to interviewees in deciding if a technique is appropriate for wolf management or not. Hence, it is not solely a matter of the techniques' *nature* (being life assuring/death executing), as biopolitics suggests, but additionally in what *space* the technique is implemented (in wild/human spheres) that decides if interviewees find it acceptable.

As this thesis aims at exploring the *motivations* for suggested techniques of wildlife management, one cannot disregard the fact that when interviewees argued what techniques for wolf management are acceptable and which are not, they stated some kind of combination of an evaluation of the notion of *space*, and the notion of *nature*. As interviewee A makes clear about the motivations for the hunt the wolf opponents perform, a technique of wolf management he disapproves of: “You never eat wolves and you never use their skin. You just shoot it to get rid of it, for nature to fit you better [...] it's very tragic”. Accordingly, taken together the notion of space and the notion of nature of techniques for wolf management inform the interviewees' attitudes toward it. This suggests that while an analysis using biopolitics may help us detect control and power of the techniques as well as motivations based on the killing/life-assuring character of techniques, it cannot alone explain the ways in which techniques are *motivated* and *understood* as it appears that killing in itself is not always disregarded. Interviewee F argues clearly: “I have no problem with killing if it is necessary to survival, but when its done for selfish reasons and is a result of hate, then it is upsetting”. Hence, interviewees do not always disregard killing, only when it is

not productive¹¹. The variations in interviewees' attitudes to killing are endless, and a full review cannot be accounted for here. What we can conclude though, is that the biopolitical notion that motivation of controlling techniques lies in their life-assurance is insufficient when describing motivations in this case, as killing is not always disregarded. In order to detect and analyze this notion of space, to overcome the shortcomings of biopolitics as an analytical tool in this specific case our question of inquiry must be: Why protect wolves in the first place?

Appropriating the Wild

In reading the statements of interviewee A & F above, a killing that in a selfish manner appropriates nature is not an acceptable technique for managing wolves. This is related to a certain understanding of nature. Interviewee A expressed the essence of this perception so common in interviews: "The wolf is the symbol of wild and beautiful¹² nature [...] according to me that is something we have to respect... the wild and beautiful nature". Interviewee C also expressed this understanding of nature, saying "Humans are destructive, we have pushed so many species to extinction [...] it is our responsibility to protect nature and the animals that live there". To see nature as wild and under the threat of destructive human practices carries resemblance to how Cronon (1996) describes "Wilderness". According to him, this social construct implies an understanding of certain environments as islands of nature not yet destroyed by humans; a view that encourages exclusion of human practices from these environments in order to preserve them (Cronon 1996:7).

In looking at the interviewees' suggested techniques for wolf management, we may conclude that techniques that peacefully *push* the wild behaviors of wolves from a human sphere to a wild sphere are encouraged by interviewees, made clear by the fact that moose must be subject to wolves hunger, yet domesticized animals may be protected from such. The techniques are furthermore motivated by the fact that they protect wolves from the consequences of human fury. In reading the statements made by the interviewees through a lens of "Wilderness" we may conclude that this could be the idea that encourages the protection of wolves in the first place, rather than seeing this protection as merely the result of a power-thirsty sovereign biopolitics would have us conclude. "Wilderness" puts the characteristics of suggested techniques for wolf management made visible through an analysis of biopolitics in a greater context, revealing its motivation. Now, what does characteristics of suggested techniques made visible through "Wilderness" and biopolitics tell about how the interviewees understand the wolf opponent, the self (the pro-wolf person) and the wolf?

¹¹ My wording: Interviewees all stated that killing is acceptable if one needs to eat the meat it provides, and it is done in a way that makes sure animals do not suffer.

¹² My translation of the Swedish word: *fina*. This translation is not quite fair; the Swedish word "*fina*", in my opinion, expresses more appreciation of the thing it refers to and is less prone to be associated with looks than the word "beautiful".

The Hunter

Killing and Appropriating

First, an explanatory note is needed. The character that up until now has been referred to as the wolf opponent will from now on be called The Hunter. When the interviewees were asked: “who counteracts wolves” all, without exception, answered “hunters” although there was some disagreement on how many of Swedish hunters counteract wolves. Interviewee D expressed that all hunters are of this opinion, while interviewee F thought that only a minor fraction of Swedish hunters wants to kill wolves. From an analytical point of view the fact that the hunter is appointed the wolf opponent is intriguing, as the hunter both symbolize killing and an appropriation of a wild sphere, the two things wolf management should not entail according to the interviewees. The way the hunter interacts with wolves is hence the anti-thesis of the techniques suggested by pro-wolf people, which may contribute to the antagonism of this character in the testimonies of the interviewees.

Unprofessionalism

According to the interviewees, the hunter is unprofessional. Four of the six interviewees argued that the education to become a hunter is too short to provide hunters with information needed about nature to be given the right to legally shoot animals, and in times of license-hunts shoot wolves. “I think that if the wolf strain for any reason should be limited ... I don’t know what that reason would be but... then it should be done by professional hunters” Interviewee F said indicating that “the hunters mafia”, as he calls hunters, are not professional enough to manage wolves. Furthermore, the interviewees considered hunters to be ruled by their own interests. In five of six interviews it was expressed that hunters act in a selfish way, and therefore should not manage wolves, as they would appropriate the species to their benefit.

Unknowingness

The hunter is also understood as unknowing by the interviewees. One of the clearest distinctions between who the hunter and the pro-wolf person is exists in their respective relationship to knowledge: The hunter neglects knowledge, the pro-wolf person embraces it. Hunters are “partly unknowing, partly unwilling to learn. It seems like it has deep roots, the hate towards animals. Its incredible really, I don’t think they think straight, or want to think straight”, interviewee B argues. Additionally, Interviewee C reasons that if one embraces knowledge, one will realize that the old mythical sayings about wolves’ behavior as brutal etc., as well as the fear those beliefs causes, is unfounded and will disappear. Knowledge is hence something that has the power to convert people from a hunters’ attitude to a pro-wolf attitude. What is argued is that that an attitude informed by knowledge can only be a pro-wolf attitude. Consequently the hunters cannot be knowing because if they were, they would be pro-wolf people. In the terms of feminist epistemology, hunters are by pro-wolf people seen as excluded from the social group creating objective knowledge, unable to create knowing that is not irrational, biased and untrue.

Taking all of these characteristics of the hunter together, this character 1) Supposedly interacts with wolves in a way that contradicts both of the interviewees criteria of space and nature for accepted wolf management, 2) Is understood as unknowing and biased, and hence not a character that should manage wolves. In the rationale of “Wilderness” and biopolitics, the hunter acts in a way that is irrational; killing and

appropriating nature. This is the understanding of the hunter, mediated through suggested techniques for wolf management by pro-wolf people.

The Pro-Wolf Person

The Workings of Knowledge in Constituting the Pro-Wolf Person

According to the interviewees, the pro-wolf attitude is the given outcome of embracing objective knowledge, which interviewee C made clear. Furthermore, only pro-wolf people are seen as suitable for managing wolves, as their interest is strictly in the wolf, and hence not biased. Looking at this reasoning using tools from Power/Knowledge and Feminist Epistemology, we may conclude that in arguing that the pro-wolf attitude (managing wolves in a peaceful manner in only human spheres) is seen as the result of objective knowledge, pro-wolf people argue that this standpoint is somehow a neutral consequence of objective knowledge.

As concluded, the hunters' opinion can, in a rationale of "Wilderness", never be seen as a knowledge-informed opinion. This is due to the fact that "Wilderness" encourages a protection of nature implying absence of human impact. The discrediting of hunters opinion suggests that pro-wolf people constitute them selves, in relation to unknowing hunters, as knowing people. The fact that their suggested techniques for management are seen as the neutral outcome of objective knowledge mediates this self-image.

Unbiased Knowledge and the Right to Manage

As seen in the theoretical framework, the work by Foucault shows how knowledge and power are related; knowledge is considered true because of power (Robbins 2012:124). Power/knowledge is what gives the doctor permission to e.g. hospitalize "mad"¹³ individuals against their will in the name of it being in the "mad" individuals own interest (Foucault 1998:138-42). While a full analysis of power/knowledge in the case of the Swedish wolf would require a study in its own, an interesting reading of the supposed knowingness of pro-wolf people and the way it legitimized management of wolf lives as suggested in interviews is available. In naming technique for wolf management as the neutral outcome of science, we may point attention to the many times Foucauldian [1961] [1963] [1975] [1976] studies have shown how science legitimizes control and management of life in the age of biopolitics. In looking at this conclusion through the lens of "Wilderness" we may also see how the rationale offered by that concept induces protection, and hence provide legitimacy to any management that is understood as such.

In motivating techniques for wolf management/protection, the interviewees constitute themselves as knowing beings, with respect for the living and for nature. In understanding wolves as "Wild", they constitute them selves as people protecting the already so threatened wild nature from human destruction. As Interviewee D answered when I asked her why she had gotten involved in the debate: "I love all animals, I always have" and later on "I cannot bare to see yet another wild animal go extinct because of humans". Interviewee F also stated: "Hunters have never been at

¹³ Foucault argues that seeing this person as mad is a result of power, constituting truth for its own benefit (Foucault [1961]). That is why "mad" is marked with citation-marks in the text.

the frontiers defending nature”, expressing that they are not interested in preserving nature at all.

The Wolf

Legal Incompetence

The wolf is interesting to us because of two reasons. First and foremost, it is the animal that all the techniques reviewed in this thesis aims at managing and secondly, the suggested techniques for managing wolves mediate a very specific picture of who the wolf is. The wolf as portrayed by the interviewees is pretty much summarized in interviewee F’s statement: “Wolves are wild, the king of the forest [...] They have been hunted for so long and now avoids humans [...] They want to live in peace far away from us”. Wolves are “wild creatures that want to be free” according to interviewee E.

Without exception, all the interviewees expressed what is and what is not in the interest of the wolf. In doing so, they take it upon themselves to be some kind of spokes persons for the species. Moreover, humans are by the interviewees expressed to be the actor responsible for directing wolf behavior from human spheres; a sheep killed by a wolf is not solely a consequence of wolf behavior, but more importantly a consequence of human unwillingness to protect one’s animals from wolves. This is what Interviewee C argues when she states that if one loses a few reindeer to a wolf, one cannot be angry at the wolf but must rather think “What could I have done to prevent this?”. Humans are understood as a creature that, on the contrary to wolves, may choose to perform or surrender from performing specific behaviors. When I asked interviewee B why it is ok for wolves to kill while it is not ok for humans to do so he stated that “wolves have no choice, they have to”.

Pro-wolf people hence claim the right to interpret what is in the interest of the wolf, something that often results in management that sees to human interests motivated by wolf protection, as noted above. In claiming that humans are responsible for the deaths of unprotected domesticized animals caused by wolves, the wolf is somehow seen as legally incompetent. In a biopolitical reading, this understanding of the wolf implies that they, due to their inability to take responsibility for their own actions are in need of the management of a supervisor to make sure to protect it from the consequences of its own behavior. What motivates this protection could be understood along lines of “Wilderness”, suggesting that wolves are one of the few still free-living animals, that needs to be protected from destructive human influence.

As we have seen, the interviewees find the wolf a symbol for the wild. Additionally, it is an animal that needs to be protected, which implies control. To be daring, “Wilderness” constitutes wolves in a way that motivates and provides rationality to a managing and controlling of wolf bodies.

Conclusion

We may conclude that suggested techniques for wolf management by the six pro-wolf people that participated in this study might be seen as techniques for controlling wolves. However, the right to manage wolves is excluded to certain spaces and certain techniques (which refers to them having to be of a peaceful nature). While biopolitics may illuminate the fact that the nature of the technique for management is important in the interviewees' evaluation of that specific technique, it cannot answer why that is so. In seeing that the social construct "Wilderness" induces a rationale of human protection of what is considered part of that wilderness may expand upon the insights of Foucauldian biopolitics and suggest how the very protection and consequently management of life is motivated in the first place.

This implies a certain understanding of the hunter, the pro-wolf person and the wolf. The hunter violates both the cornerstone of wilderness and biopolitics, they appropriate nature and they kill. Furthermore, they are seen as unknowing, as pro-wolf people believe that objective knowledge induces pro-wolf attitudes. The pro-wolf person is hence a character that constitutes itself as knowing, able to embrace knowledge and present management that will benefit the wolf, unbiased by personal interests. The right to manage wolves is hence exclusively held by the knowledgeable group, and according to the interviewees that is pro-wolf people. Knowledge is hence an important basis for constituting the own identity as the one with right to manage wolves. On the ending note, the understanding of the wolf mediated in the suggested techniques is a creature that is legally incompetent and requires human protection. The notion of protection both finds ground in the rationale of Foucauldian Biopolitics and "Wilderness".

To conclude, this exploration of suggested techniques for wolf management suggest that an inquiry of such that only analyzes them through a lens of biopolitics, misses out on insights offered when theoretically combining Foucauldian Biopolitics with notions on "Wilderness". Furthermore, in concluding that techniques for managing wolves mediate a certain understanding of the people and species around us shows that our perceptions of nature has the power to inform how we constitute our selves, others and the creatures with whom we share our lands.

References

- Adams, G. (2014). Decolonizing methods: African Studies and qualitative research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31(4), pp.467–474.
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldböck, K. (2008). *Tolkning och Reflektion*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burman, A. (2015). Are Anthropologists Monsters? Under Review: *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*.
- Chapin, M. (2004). A Challenge to Conservationists. *World Watch*, 17(6), pp.17-33.
- Code, L. (2007). Feminist Epistemologies and Women's Lives. in Martín Alcoff, L & Feder Kittay, E (eds). *The Blackwell Guide to Feminist Philosophy*. Oxford:Blackwell Publishing .
- Cloke, P., Cook, I., Crang, P., Goodwin, M., Painter, J. and Philo, C. (2004). *Practicing Human Geography*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Cronon, W. (1996). The Trouble With Wilderness. *Environmental History*, 1(1), pp.7-28.
- Ekman, H. (2010). *Varg*. Stockholm: Nordstedts
- Ericsson, G. and Haberlein, T. (2003). Attitudes of hunters, locals and the general public in Sweden now that the wolves are back. *Biological Conservation*, 111(2), pp.149-159.
- Escobar, A. (2008). *Territories of Difference*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003). [1975]. *Övervakning och straff*. Lund: Arkiv Förlag
- Foucault, M. (1998). [1976]. *History of Sexuality Vol. 1. The Will to Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books
- Foucault, M. (1994). [1963]. *The Birth of the Clinic*. New York: Vintage Books
- Foucault, M. (1988). [1961]. *Madness and Civilization*. New York: Vintage Books

Jonzén, N., Sand, H., Wabakken, P., Swenson, J., Kindberg, J., Liberg, O. and Chapron, G. (2013). Sharing the bounty—Adjusting harvest to predator return in the Scandinavian human–wolf–bear–moose system. *Ecological Modelling*, 265, pp.140-148.

Leach, M. and Fairhead, J. (1995). False Forest History: Rethinking some West African Environmental Narratives. *World Development*, 23(6), pp.1023-1035.

Länsstyrelsen Kalmar. (2015). *Faktablad Varg*. Accessible online: [<http://www.lansstyrelsen.se/kalmar/SiteCollectionDocuments/Sv/djur-och-natur/rovdjur/Faktablad%20Varg.pdf>]. Read: 12-11-15.

Narayan, U. (2004). The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist. in Harding, S (eds). *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Naturvårdsverket. (2014). *Nationell Förvaltningsplan för Varg*. Accessible online: [<http://www.naturvardsverket.se/upload/miljoarbete-i-samhallet/miljoarbete-i-sverige/regeringsuppdrag/2014/forvaltningsplaner-rovdjur/nationell-forvaltningsplan-varg.pdf>]. Read 25-11-15.

Naturvårdsverket. (1990). *Renar och Rovdjur*. Solna: Naturvårdsverket Förlag.

Sametinget (2015a). – *Styrelsen kritisk till Naturvårdsverkets analys*. Accessible online: [<https://www.sametinget.se/97727>] read: 17-12-15

Sametinget (2015b). Naturvårdsverket äventyrar arbetet med förvaltningsverktyg. Accessible online: [<https://www.sametinget.se/97915>] read 17-12-15

Rinfret, S. (2009). Controlling Animals: Power, Foucault and Species Management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 22(6), pp.571-578.

Ripple, W. and Beschta, R. (2012). Trophic Cascades in Yellowstone: The first 15 years after wolf reintroduction. *Biological Conservation*, 145(1), pp.205-213.

Robbins, P. (2012). *Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ryd, L. (2010). Att arbeta med muntliga källor – Intervjuhandledning. In Túnon, H & Dahlström, A (eds). 2010. *Nycklar till kunskap, om människans bruk av naturen*. Stockholm: Centrum för biologisk mångfald, Uppsala & Kungl. Skogs- och Lantbruksakademin.

Ryd, Y. (2007). *Ren och Varg*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.

Ryen, A. (2011). *Kvalitativ Intervju*. Edition 1:2. Malmö: Liber

Valentine, G. & Cook, I. & Flowerdrew, R. & Martin, D. (2005). In Flowerdrew, R & Martin, D (eds.) *Methods in Human Geography*. Second Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Winchester, H. (2000). Qualitative Research and its Place in Human Geography. In Iain Hay (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1

Interview guide

Intro:

- Thank you
- Informed consent & Anonymity
- Can I record?
- Inform about study

To remember:

- No yes/no questions
- HOW
- WHY
- IN WHAT WAY

Possible questions:

1. Why did you choose to participate?
2. Why are you interested in the issue of wolf conservation?
3. What would you like to say to a wolf opponent?

Themes:

1. Experience of wolf opponents
2. Experience of wolves, wolf opponents, people being pro wolf and the debate in general
3. City/countryside contraposition
4. Knowledge
5. Northern Sweden and Reindeer Husbandry
6. [Added after the 3d interview] Difference between managing life (fencing etc....) and killing
7. [Added after 4th interview] Why did people stop disliking wolves?